
CONFERENCE ARTICLE**The Creative Potential Of Comparing International And National Pedagogical Experience In Teaching Pedagogical Disciplines****Madiyev Otamurod Bobomurodovich**

Independent Researcher, Gulistan State University, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This study examines the theoretical and methodological potential of comparing national pedagogical heritage with contemporary foreign pedagogical experience for developing the creativity of future teachers. The article provides a comparative analysis of the educational views of representatives of Jadid pedagogical thought — Abdulla Avloniy, Mahmudkhoja Behbudiy, and Abdurauf Fitrat — alongside modern creative pedagogy concepts (Dewey, Vygotsky, Guilford, Torrance, Bloom, Lipman). The methodological originality of the work lies in avoiding mechanical transfer of historical ideas into contemporary theory; instead, the motivational-contextual foundation of each viewpoint is revealed, substantiating the possibilities of their transformation under present-day conditions. The author demonstrates that the Jadid pedagogical logic linking creativity to national-spiritual responsibility becomes effective only when synthesized with the instrumental apparatus of modern methodology. This approach forms the theoretical foundation of a comparative-didactic adaptation methodology applicable to the training system of future teachers.

Keywords: National pedagogical heritage, Jadid pedagogy, creative thinking, future teacher, comparative approach, didactic adaptation, constructivist pedagogy, critical thinking, interdisciplinary education, pedagogical creativity.

INTRODUCTION

Comparing national pedagogical heritage with contemporary international pedagogical experience is an important means of enriching the theoretical and methodological foundations for developing creativity in prospective teachers. Such comparison not only facilitates an understanding of historical educational experience but also reveals the internal conceptual relationships between pedagogical ideas that emerged in different cultural and historical settings. It thereby makes it possible to distinguish the universal aspects of creative thinking from those shaped by national traditions. Jadid pedagogy, which emerged in the early twentieth century, was essentially reformist. It sought to replace memorization-based approaches in traditional education with methods aimed at developing students' capacity for independent thought, inquiry, and creative activity. The educational philosophy advanced by Abdulla Avloniy in his work **Turkiy Guliston yoxud axloq**, Munavvar Qori Abdurashidkhanov's methodological approaches in Jadid schools, and Abdurauf Fitrat's enlightenment ideas all regarded the awakening of individuals' intellectual and creative potential as a primary aim of pedagogical activity [1]. Central to these views was recognition of the child as an active participant in learning, the development of the child's natural interests, and the connection of learning with practical needs. In substance, these principles resonate with the foundations of contemporary constructivist pedagogy.

Among modern international pedagogical theories, John Dewey's theory of experience-based education and the principle of "learning by doing" are consistent with the Jadid educators' emphasis on acquiring knowledge through practical activity [2]. Similarly, Lev Vygotsky's concept of the zone of proximal development explains how a child's creative potential unfolds through social interaction and pedagogical support; in this respect, it is close to the individualized teacher-student relationship practiced in Jadid schools. Nevertheless, a

fundamental distinction exists between the two traditions. Whereas Jadid pedagogy understood creativity primarily within the context of national and spiritual awakening and responsibility for the nation's future, contemporary Western approaches, particularly the creativity theories of J. P. Guilford and E. P. Torrance, examine creativity as an individual psychological characteristic measured through divergent thinking, originality, and flexibility [3]. An analysis of these similarities and differences suggests that two essential qualities should be integrated in the future teacher: a sense of moral and ethical responsibility rooted in national pedagogical heritage, and command of the methodological tools developed by contemporary educational science. Their dialectical unity cultivates not only the ability to think creatively but also the competence to apply this ability in ways that respond to the needs of the national education system. This argument directly informs the comparative approach to didactic adaptation developed in the present research, whose mechanisms of practical implementation are considered in a subsequent section.

When comparing the views of Abdulla Avloniy, Mahmudkhoja Behbudiy, and Abdurauf Fitrat with contemporary theories of creative pedagogy, the principal methodological risk lies in removing historical ideas from the contexts in which they originated and artificially fitting them into present-day terminology. Analysis must therefore begin by understanding the internal logic of each historical position on its own terms. Only then should functional similarities and differences be identified, without equating historical views with contemporary theories. At first glance, the unity of knowledge and morality advocated in Avloniy's educational philosophy may resemble modern theories combining creativity and moral education. Their methodological foundations, however, differ. For Avloniy, creative thinking was not an independent educational end; rather, it was a means of advancing the enlightenment of the

nation [1]. His position thus approaches an instrumental conception of creativity, in which creativity is understood not merely as individual self-expression but as an instrument for accomplishing a social and historical mission. In contemporary creative pedagogy, particularly in Torrance's model of creative thinking, creativity is more often approached as a process of personal self-understanding and self-expression [3]. The apparent similarity between the traditions is therefore limited: although both value unconventional thinking, its underlying purposes are markedly different. One privileges social and national responsibility, whereas the other emphasizes individual psychological development.

Mahmudkhoja Behbudiy's views on educational reform, particularly his idea of harmonizing the "two forms of knowledge"—secular and religious learning—display a partial methodological affinity with contemporary interdisciplinary approaches [1]. Nevertheless, a mechanical analogy must be avoided here as well. For Behbudiy, the purpose of integrating areas of knowledge was to prepare educated individuals capable of meeting society's practical needs and engaging with real life. Contemporary interdisciplinary pedagogy, for example the STEAM approach, focuses on developing the ability to generate novel and original solutions at the intersection of different fields of knowledge [2]. The methodological value of Behbudiy's position therefore lies not in its superficial resemblance to contemporary interdisciplinarity but in its historically grounded justification for integrating knowledge in response to practical life requirements. This offers a methodological lesson for the present day, when education risks becoming disconnected from lived realities.

Among Abdurauf Fitrat's pedagogical ideas, his emphasis on critical thinking and independent judgment offers a deeper methodological parallel. Fitrat considered the capacity to critically assess accepted claims more important than simply receiving ready-made truths in the educational process [1]. This view is consonant with the higher cognitive levels of Benjamin Bloom's taxonomy—analysis, synthesis, and evaluation—and is also close to the methodology of critical and philosophical discussion in Matthew Lipman's *Philosophy for Children* program [3]. A closer methodological examination, however, reveals an important difference. Fitrat promoted critical thinking chiefly in the context of social and political awakening, as a means of resisting colonialism and ignorance. Contemporary critical-thinking pedagogy, by contrast, generally develops it as a universal cognitive competence, a methodological skill that can be applied across contexts.

The methodological conclusion of the foregoing analysis is that the scientific value of comparing Jadid thinkers' educational heritage with contemporary creative pedagogy lies not in equating them but in identifying the particular motivational and contextual foundations of each historical idea and explaining how those foundations may be transformed under contemporary conditions. In other words, Jadid pedagogy bequeaths to us not a ready-made teaching methodology but a rationale for linking creativity to national and historical responsibility. Incorporating that rationale into the preparation of future teachers requires the methodological instruments of contemporary pedagogy, including Torrance's and Guilford's diagnostic tools and Lipman's discussion techniques. Such instruments, however, can become effective in this context only when informed by national and spiritual values. It is precisely this synthesis—the unity of historical content and contemporary methodological form—that provides the theoretical foundation for the comparative-didactic adaptation model presented in the subsequent section.

Conclusion

The comparative analysis of national pedagogical heritage and contemporary international educational experience substantiates the view that creativity among future teachers cannot be developed effectively by relying exclusively on either

Jadid pedagogy or modern Western theories. Rather, the methodological potential of both traditions should be brought together in a dialectical synthesis. The analysis of the views of Abdulla Avloniy, Mahmudkhoja Behbudiy, and Abdurauf Fitrat shows that Jadid thinkers did not regard creativity as an end in itself. Instead, they interpreted it as a means of advancing national enlightenment, social progress, and spiritual renewal. This instrumental and socially oriented understanding differs substantially from the individual-psychological orientation of contemporary creative pedagogy, including Guilford's and Torrance's models of divergent thinking, the cognitive hierarchy of Bloom's taxonomy, and Lipman's method of critical-philosophical discussion. Yet this difference should not be used to set the traditions against one another; it offers a basis for recognizing their complementary nature.

The comparison leads to an important methodological conclusion: mechanically transferring historical pedagogical ideas into contemporary teaching methods lacks scholarly justification. A more defensible approach is first to identify the specific motivational and contextual basis of each historical view and then to enrich it using modern methodological instruments. This makes it possible to develop a qualitatively new approach to creative pedagogy, rooted in national and spiritual values while equipped with contemporary diagnostic and pedagogical tools. In particular, the affinities between Dewey's and Vygotsky's theories and the Jadid emphasis on learning through practical activity, the functional proximity of Behbudiy's "two forms of knowledge" to modern interdisciplinary education, and the cognitive parallels between Fitrat's advocacy of critical thinking and the methodologies of Bloom and Lipman together establish a theoretical basis for a comparative-didactic adaptation model applicable to teacher education.

National pedagogical heritage thus provides the value-oriented foundation that connects creativity in prospective teachers with national and moral responsibility, while international educational experience supplies the instrumental and methodological means of putting that foundation into practice. By synthesizing these components, the continuity between historical and contemporary pedagogical thought can be maintained. This synthesis can foster not only professional creative competence in future teachers but also a responsible form of creativity that contributes to the long-term development of the national education system.

References

1. Avloniy A. *Turkiy guliston yoxud axloq* [Turkic Gulistan, or Ethics]. – Tashkent: O'qituvchi, 1992. – 214 p.
2. Behbudiy M. *Tanlangan asarlar* [Selected Works]. – Tashkent: Ma'naviyat, 1999. – 232 p.
3. Fitrat A. *Tanlangan asarlar* [Selected Works]. Vol. I. – Tashkent: Ma'naviyat, 2000. – 256 p.
4. Dewey J. *Democracy and Education*. – New York: Macmillan, 1916. – 434 p.
5. Vygotsky L.S. *Mind in Society*. – Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978. – 159 p.
6. Guilford J.P. *The Nature of Human Intelligence*. – New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967. – 538 p.
7. Torrance E.P. *Guiding Creative Talent*. – Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1962. – 278 p.
8. Bloom B.S. *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. – New York: David McKay Company, 1956. – 207 p.
9. Lipman M. *Thinking in Education*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991. – 280 p.