
CONFERENCE ARTICLE**The Methodology Of Maintaining An Electronic Portfolio In The Teaching Of Comparative Pedagogy****Mirzaraximova Zilola Mirzohid qizi**

Researcher, Namangan State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

Abstract: The article substantiates a methodology for maintaining an electronic portfolio as a means of organising and assessing students' learning activity in the discipline of comparative pedagogy within pedagogical higher education. The author proceeds from the thesis that comparative pedagogy, whose epistemic core consists not in the accumulation of information about foreign educational systems but in the mastery of the procedure of comparison itself, requires a form of learning record capable of preserving, structuring and rendering visible the cumulative analytical work of the student. The electronic portfolio is accordingly interpreted not as a digital repository of completed assignments but as a didactic system that integrates the collection of artefacts, their purposeful selection, reflective commentary and criterion-based assessment. Relying upon the comparative-analytical method, pedagogical modelling and the systemic approach, the study correlates the classical stages of comparative inquiry formulated by G. Bereday with the structural components of the learning portfolio and, on this basis, constructs a model in which each section of the portfolio corresponds to a distinct stage of comparative analysis. The stages of portfolio maintenance, the criteria of its assessment and the levels of reflective depth are defined. The concluding propositions determine the conditions under which the electronic portfolio becomes an instrument for forming the comparative-analytical competence of future teachers in Uzbekistan.

Keywords: Comparative pedagogy, electronic portfolio, comparative method, juxtaposition, tertium comparationis, educational borrowing, reflection, artefact, formative assessment, comparative-analytical competence, credit-module system.

INTRODUCTION

Within the system of pedagogical higher education, comparative pedagogy occupies a position whose significance has grown in direct proportion to the internationalisation of educational policy. The future teacher enters a professional environment in which reforms are routinely justified by reference to foreign experience, international assessment programmes shape national priorities, and the vocabulary of best practice circulates across borders with remarkable speed. Under these conditions the capacity to evaluate a foreign educational solution critically, rather than to admire or reject it wholesale, becomes a component of professional competence in its own right. The teaching of the discipline, however, frequently reduces it to a sequential survey of national systems, in which the student memorises descriptive information about the structure of schooling in several countries and reproduces it at the examination. A discipline whose essence is comparison is thus taught and assessed in a manner that requires no comparison whatsoever. The epistemological objection to such a reduction was formulated at the very origins of the modern discipline. M. Sadler insisted that what lies outside the school — the history, character and social forces of a nation — is more decisive for understanding its education than what lies within the school walls, and he cautioned against the naive expectation that practices gathered abroad, like cuttings taken from various plants in a foreign garden, would take root when set in native soil [9, p. 309–310]. The pedagogical implication of this proposition is that comparative knowledge is intrinsically contextual: a fact about a foreign education system acquires meaning only when interpreted in relation to the forces that produced it. Knowledge of this kind cannot be transmitted as a set of ready-made statements; it must be constructed by the learner through a sequence of analytical operations. The most influential operationalisation of this constructive process was proposed by

G. Bereday, who divided comparative inquiry into four successive stages: description, in which pedagogical data on each system are systematically collected; interpretation, in which these data are evaluated in the light of history, economics, politics and the social sciences; juxtaposition, in which the data from different systems are arranged side by side according to common categories in order to establish criteria of comparison and to formulate a hypothesis; and comparison proper, in which the hypothesis is tested through simultaneous analysis [2, p. 9–27]. Of fundamental importance for didactics is the cumulative character of this sequence: each stage generates an intellectual product that serves as material for the next, and the quality of the final comparison depends upon the preservation of everything produced earlier. A learning form in which each assignment is submitted, graded and discarded is structurally incapable of supporting such cumulation. The contemporary significance of comparative competence is further clarified by research on policy borrowing in education. D. Phillips and K. Ochs proposed a model in which borrowing proceeds through the stages of cross-national attraction, decision, implementation and internalisation, and they emphasised that each stage is filtered through the context of the borrowing country and may be accompanied by a substantial transformation of the original model [8, p. 451–455]. For future teachers this model possesses direct practical value, since they will themselves be the implementers of borrowed solutions. The ability to trace a borrowed practice through these stages, to distinguish the rhetoric of attraction from the realities of implementation, and to anticipate the transformations the practice will undergo in a new setting represents a higher-order learning outcome that the discipline should deliberately cultivate. The portfolio constitutes the form of learning organisation best suited to these requirements. In the classical interpretation of F.L. Paulson, P.R. Paulson and C.A. Meyer, a portfolio is a deliberately assembled

collection of a learner's work that demonstrates effort, progress and achievement, and it becomes a genuine portfolio only when the learner takes part in choosing its contents, when explicit criteria govern both selection and evaluation, and when it contains evidence of self-reflection [7, p. 60]. The transition to the electronic form substantially extends these possibilities. G. Lorenzo and J. Ittelson describe the electronic portfolio as a digitally assembled body of evidence representing an individual, a group or an institution, and they stress that it is more than a collection: it also serves to organise work created in different applications, to regulate who may view it, and to stimulate reflection and the exchange of feedback [5, p. 1–2].

The research literature on electronic portfolios distinguishes two functions that are frequently confused in practice. H. Barrett drew a distinction between the portfolio as process, a working space in which the learner collects and reflects upon evidence of learning, and the portfolio as product, a showcase assembled for presentation and summative evaluation, associating the former with assessment for learning and the latter with assessment of learning [1, p. 436–440]. Her findings indicate that learner engagement depends heavily upon the reflective dimension and upon the learner's sense of ownership of the portfolio. J. Zubizarreta similarly identifies reflection, documentation and collaboration as the three indispensable components of a learning portfolio and argues that reflection is the element that transforms a collection of documents into an instrument of learning [10, p. 20–28]. Without it, the portfolio degenerates into an archive. In the conditions of Uzbekistan these considerations acquire particular relevance in connection with the transition of higher education institutions to the credit-module system, the expansion of the share of independent work in curricula, and the formation of new models of university activity oriented towards international standards [6, p. 325–328]. The electronic portfolio corresponds organically to the logic of the credit-module system, since it renders independent work visible, cumulative and assessable. At the same time, its introduction into the training of future teachers is connected with the broader task of forming the spiritual and philosophical worldview of young people within the system of continuous education, in which comparative knowledge serves both to open the national tradition to the world and to protect it from uncritical imitation [3, p. 314–316; 4, p. 10–13]. The aim of the present article consists in the substantiation of a methodology for maintaining an electronic portfolio in the discipline of comparative pedagogy, including its structural model, the stages of its maintenance and the criteria of its assessment. The scientific novelty of the work lies in constructing the structure of the portfolio in direct correspondence with the stages of comparative inquiry, whereby the portfolio ceases to be an external form of reporting and becomes the procedural embodiment of the comparative method itself.

The study relies upon the comparative-analytical method, applied to the principal conceptions of the educational portfolio and of the comparative method in education in order to identify points of structural correspondence between them. The method of pedagogical modelling has been used to construct a structural-functional model of the electronic portfolio for the discipline of comparative pedagogy. The systemic approach has made it possible to consider the portfolio as an element of the integral educational process, connected with the content of the discipline, with the organisation of students' independent work and with the system of assessment. The material of the investigation comprises classical and contemporary works on the methodology of comparative education, on educational policy borrowing and on the theory and practice of learning portfolios.

The first result consists in a structural model of the electronic portfolio in which the sections correspond to the stages of comparative inquiry. The first section, the descriptive dossier, contains the data collected by the student on the systems selected for comparison: structural diagrams, legislative extracts and statistical indicators drawn from national and international

sources, each item accompanied by a reference to its origin. The second section, interpretive analyses, contains short analytical texts explaining the features of each system through its historical, cultural, economic and political context. The third section, juxtaposition matrices, contains comparative tables constructed according to explicitly formulated criteria — the *tertium comparationis* — together with the hypothesis that emerges from them. The fourth section, comparative studies, contains the final comparative essay and the analysis of a case of educational borrowing structured according to the stages identified by Phillips and Ochs. A cross-cutting reflective journal accompanies all four sections. The second result concerns the stages of maintaining the portfolio, which reproduce the transition from the working portfolio to the presentation portfolio. At the planning stage the student, together with the teacher, determines the units of comparison — countries, levels of education or specific phenomena such as teacher training or assessment — and formulates the initial comparative question. At the collection stage all materials produced during the semester are accumulated in the working portfolio. At the selection stage the student chooses the artefacts that most adequately demonstrate progress in mastering the comparative method and substantiates this choice. At the reflection stage each selected artefact is supplied with a commentary answering three questions: what was done, what was understood, and how the student's view of the compared systems has changed. The presentation stage involves the public defence of the portfolio before the group, and the concluding stage involves criterion-based assessment. The third result concerns the assessment of the portfolio, which must evaluate not only products but the development of comparative thinking. The criteria include the accuracy and reliability of description, the depth of contextual interpretation, the validity of the chosen criteria of comparison, the substantiation of comparative conclusions and the depth of reflection. For the last criterion three levels are distinguished: descriptive reflection, which merely recounts the work performed; analytical reflection, which identifies the causes of difficulties and the shifts in understanding; and critical reflection, in which the student questions the assumptions underlying his own initial judgements about foreign and national education. Assessment is conducted at intermediate checkpoints with written feedback from the teacher and peer review, so that the portfolio functions as assessment for learning before it becomes an object of summative evaluation. The fourth result concerns the conditions and risks of implementation. Technically, the portfolio may be maintained within the institution's learning management system or on specialised platforms that support the separation of working and presentation views and the control of access. Pedagogically, the principal risk is formalism: where the portfolio is perceived as an additional bureaucratic obligation, students fill it with mechanically copied descriptions of foreign systems, and the reflective component is reduced to ritual phrases. This risk is mitigated by the requirement that every artefact be accompanied by a reflective commentary, by an adequate weighting of the portfolio within the credit-module assessment system, and by the digital and methodological competence of the teacher.

Conclusion

The analysis undertaken permits the following conclusions. First, the essence of comparative pedagogy is procedural rather than informational: the discipline forms not a store of facts about foreign systems but the capacity to compare them in context. The widespread practice of teaching it as a descriptive survey contradicts this essence, and the electronic portfolio resolves the contradiction by making the process of comparison itself the object of learning and assessment. Second, the methodological core of the proposed approach lies in the structural correspondence between the stages of comparative inquiry and the sections of the portfolio. Description, interpretation, juxtaposition and comparison are embodied in the descriptive dossier, the interpretive analyses, the juxtaposition matrices and the comparative studies, which ensures the cumulation of

intellectual products that the stepwise logic of comparison requires. Third, reflection is the decisive component that distinguishes a portfolio from an archive. The differentiation of descriptive, analytical and critical levels of reflection provides a criterion for evaluating the development of comparative thinking, while the sequence of intermediate checkpoints converts the portfolio into an instrument of assessment for learning rather than merely of its final registration. Fourth, the effective implementation of the methodology in Uzbekistan depends upon the integration of the portfolio into the credit-module system with an appropriate weight in assessment, upon the preparation of university teachers for its methodological support, and upon its connection with the broader aims of continuous education. The prospect of further research consists in the experimental verification of the model and in the development of diagnostic instruments for measuring the comparative-analytical competence of future teachers.

References

1. Barrett H.C. Researching Electronic Portfolios and Learner Engagement: The REFLECT Initiative // *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*. – 2007. – Vol. 50, № 6. – P. 436–449.
2. Bereday G.Z.F. *Comparative Method in Education*. – New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964. – XVI, 302 p.
3. Ergashbaev S. O'zbekiston sharoitida uzluksiz ta'lim tizimi orqali yoshlarning ma'naviy dunyoqarashini rivojlantirish // *Объединяя студентов: международные исследования и сотрудничество между дисциплинами*. – 2025. – Т. 1, № 1. – С. 314–316.
4. Ergashbayev S. Uzluksiz ta'lim tashkil etish orqali yoshlarning ma'naviy-falsafiy dunyoqarashini yuksaltirish // *Bulletin of Contemporary Researches: Multidisciplinary*. – 2025. – Vol. 1, № 1. – P. 10–13.
5. Lorenzo G., Ittelson J. An Overview of E-Portfolios / ed. by D. Oblinger. – Boulder: EDUCAUSE Learning Initiative, 2005. – 27 p. – (ELI Paper; 1).
6. Mirzaolimjon o'g'li M.M., Shohbozbek E. Yangi O'zbekistonning ta'lim siyosati va universitetlarning yangi modellari // *Pedagogik islohotlar va ularning yechimlari*. – 2025. – Vol. 16, № 01. – B. 325–328.
7. Paulson F.L., Paulson P.R., Meyer C.A. What Makes a Portfolio a Portfolio? // *Educational Leadership*. – 1991. – Vol. 48, № 5. – P. 60–63.
8. Phillips D., Ochs K. Processes of Policy Borrowing in Education: Some Explanatory and Analytical Devices // *Comparative Education*. – 2003. – Vol. 39, № 4. – P. 451–461.
9. Sadler M. How Far Can We Learn Anything of Practical Value from the Study of Foreign Systems of Education? // *Comparative Education Review*. – 1964. – Vol. 7, № 3. – P. 307–314.
10. Zubizarreta J. *The Learning Portfolio: Reflective Practice for Improving Student Learning*. – 2nd ed. – San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2009. – XXXVI, 351 p.