PEDAGOGICAL CONDITIONS FOR IMPROVING THE METHODOLOGY OF EDUCATING HIGHER EDUCATION STUDENTS ON THE BASIS OF NATIONAL AND SPIRITUAL VALUES

Abdullaeva Rayxon Atanazarovna
Urgench State Pedagogical Institute; Associate Professor, Department of Preschool Education; ORCID: 0009-0003-2440-7964
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0003-2440-7964

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24127149 · Received: 5 November 2026 · Accepted: 8 November 2026 · Published: 11 November 2026

Abstract: This article offers a theoretical and methodological analysis of the pedagogical conditions that support improvements in the methodology of educating higher education students on the basis of national and spiritual values. It compares sources on national pedagogical heritage, constructive alignment, self-determination theory, and formative assessment. Pedagogical conditions are distinguished from methods, methodology, and observable outcomes. Seven conditions are systematised: identifying initial needs; aligning objectives and assessment; supporting student choice; allowing time to review work; enabling teachers to conduct collaborative analysis; providing reliable and accessible resources; and regularly monitoring teaching methodology. Improvement is presented as a process of making justified changes to tasks, support, or assessment procedures in response to difficulties identified in student work, and examining these changes against subsequent evidence.

Keywords: national and spiritual values, higher education, values education methodology, pedagogical conditions, pedagogical diagnosis, constructive alignment, student agency, formative assessment, feedback, reflection

Introduction

A student's ability to explain a national value, apply it in a particular decision, and take responsibility for that decision requires different learning tasks. For example, stating what respect means is not the same activity as listening to another person, checking evidence, and justifying one's own view in a contentious situation. This distinction should be taken into account when improving values education methodology in higher education. Teachers need to define precisely what action is expected of students and what support they need to learn how to perform it.

In this article, national and spiritual values are understood as ethical meanings and criteria formed through a people's historical and cultural experience that guide individuals' attitudes towards themselves, others, work, and society. Attention to the mother tongue, respect for cultural heritage, conscience, honesty, solidarity, and responsibility can provide a basis for translating this content into learning tasks. Their pedagogical interpretation at university is connected to students' independent thinking, professional preparation, and social experience.

The starting point for improving teaching methodology is to explain a difficulty arising in learning activities. A student's brief or unsupported answer may reflect a lack of understanding of the content, an unclear task, an inaccessible source, or insufficient time to express an idea. Each possibility calls for a different pedagogical decision. It is therefore methodologically unjustified to draw conclusions about a student's overall spiritual and moral character directly from an observed outcome.

J. Biggs emphasises the interrelationships among components of the teaching system when improving educational quality; adding an individual technique does not automatically resolve misalignment within the system [3; p. 350]. This view also clarifies a methodological question for education based on national and spiritual values: which relationship among objectives, content, tasks, and assessment needs to be reconsidered? Appropriate pedagogical conditions must be created to address this question on the basis of evidence.

The article aims to substantiate the pedagogical conditions through which initial and ongoing evidence of student activity can inform decisions to improve values education methodology. To this end, it distinguishes key concepts, compares national and international sources, demonstrates how these conditions can be put into practice, and proposes a procedure for monitoring methodological changes. The research question is as follows: under what conditions can teachers identify students' difficulties, develop appropriate learning tasks and forms of support, and examine subsequent outcomes?

Literature Review

In the section "The Education of Thought" in The Turkic Rose Garden, or Ethics, A. Avloniy links the development of thinking to teachers' attention and support, emphasising the close connection between instruction and values education [1; p. 13]. The section "Moral Education" explains that teachers should put the knowledge they teach into practice and set an example through their conduct [1; pp. 13–14]. These historical views provide a basis for analysing the relationship among teachers' questioning, their explanation of expectations, and their adherence to those expectations in their own practice. The specific university tasks discussed here are methodological adaptations developed in this article.

R. Mavlonova, B. Normurodova, and N. Rahmonqulova emphasise respect for learners' individuality, rights, and opinions [2; p. 6]. Their handbook addresses the assessment of learners' moral development, consideration of age and psychological characteristics, and the integration of instruction and values education [2; p. 58]. It also stresses that subsequent educational activities should build on previous outcomes and that plans should be feasible in local conditions [2; p. 136]. These ideas, which primarily concern school education, are applied here with due consideration for

© 2026 Bulletin of International Journals · Germany · ISSN 2750-3402 · CC BY 4.0

university students' independence and the characteristics of their fields of study.

In Biggs's constructive alignment approach, learning objectives, teaching methods, and assessment are directed towards the same intended activity [3; p. 361]. This principle helps express an educational objective through an observable task. If the objective is to justify an ethical decision, students need to compare alternative solutions and explain their choices. In this article, the approach serves as a theoretical basis for analysing the alignment between the teaching and assessment of content related to national and spiritual values.

R. Ryan and E. Deci explain individuals' conscious acceptance of values and expectations in terms of the needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness [4; pp. 73–74]. In their interpretation, autonomy denotes conscious and voluntary action; it can be compatible with a sense of belonging to a community [4; p. 74]. This perspective clarifies the need to explain the rationale for an educational task and to provide opportunities for reasoned choice and meaningful support. Students' internalisation of an external requirement should not be equated with intrinsic motivation arising from interest in the activity itself.

D. Nicol and D. Macfarlane-Dick propose principles of feedback in higher education that encompass the clarification of objectives and quality criteria, self-assessment, dialogue, opportunities to improve work, and the provision of useful information to teachers [5; p. 205]. Their approach is important for explaining the pedagogical action that follows assessment. In this article, feedback is interpreted as an interconnected process through which students can revise their responses and teachers can address weaknesses in task design.

UNESCO's guide to global citizenship education discusses the use of descriptive feedback, self-assessment, portfolios, and reflective writing in assessment [6; p. 57]. In monitoring programme quality, it recommends considering objectives, resources, teacher competence, the learning environment, and outcomes, and using the information obtained to inform improvement decisions [6; p. 58]. This source supports the joint analysis of individual tasks within values education methodology and the conditions under which they are implemented.

UNESCO's report on the futures of education notes the need to support higher education teachers' pedagogical learning and development [7; p. 60]. Its guide to citizenship education in a digital age emphasises the critical evaluation of information for reliability, relevance, and fitness for purpose [8; p. 17]. The recommendations in the latter guide are primarily intended for school-age learners; in this study, they are adapted to tasks involving the use of sources in higher education. The sources reviewed reveal complementary aspects of methodological improvement through content, motivation, alignment, and feedback.

Discussion and Methodology

Research Methodology and Concepts

The study is theoretical and methodological in nature and uses content analysis of sources, comparison, and pedagogical design. Literature was selected on the basis of its direct relevance to the topic, the availability of original texts, and the possibility of checking statements against specific pages. The units of analysis were a learning difficulty, the conditions explaining it, a methodological decision, and the evidence used to examine that decision. In adapting historical and school-based recommendations to university education, students' independent decision-making, professional orientation, and experience of collaboration were taken into account.

Methodology is interpreted as an interconnected arrangement of objectives, content, methods, tools, sequencing, and assessment. A method is a way of performing a particular task within this arrangement. Pedagogical conditions, in turn, refer to characteristics of the environment, relationships, time, and resources that make it possible to justify and implement methodological decisions. For example, while case analysis is a method, providing time for students to explain their decisions freely and reconsider them is a pedagogical condition. An outcome is identified through observable evidence in a specific piece of student work. The conditions and rubric proposed below represent the author's synthesis, and their practical effectiveness needs to be examined in a separate empirical study.

Pedagogical Conditions for Improving Teaching Methodology

The first condition is the opportunity to collect sufficient evidence to identify initial learning needs. Diagnosis may combine a brief scenario-based task, an explanation supported by sources, and questions that identify difficulties in completing the task. Teachers distinguish what students know, what actions they can perform, and where they need support. For example, a student who can explain a value but does not clarify its meaning in a particular situation is given a task that compares alternative decisions. A student who cannot access a source is first provided with that resource. Such distinctions help determine the type of support needed; a single response is not used to draw conclusions about stable personal qualities.

The second condition is alignment among objectives, content, tasks, and assessment. For each session, the action students will perform and the evidence demonstrating that action are defined in advance. For example, a task analysing a situation involving participants with differing interests is appropriate for the objective of justifying a fair decision. Assessment considers the reasons for the decision, its consequences, and alternative solutions, as well as the definition of the concept. This is where the alignment emphasised by Biggs takes practical form [3; p. 361]. If a task requires only reproduction of information, its question and expected response format are redesigned to match an objective focused on justification.

The third condition is a dialogue environment that supports students' ideas and choices. Teachers explain the purpose of a task and provide opportunities to consider several solutions and ask questions. Ryan and Deci associate understanding the rationale for an activity, having a choice, and freedom from excessive external pressure with internalisation [4; p. 74]. On this basis, students are expected to justify their own decisions rather than repeat the teacher's views. In discussion, personal beliefs or cultural affiliations are not assessed; observation focuses on listening, referring to evidence, and communicating respectfully. Teachers use clarifying questions to turn disagreement into discussion.

© 2026 Bulletin of International Journals · Germany · ISSN 2750-3402 · CC BY 4.0

The fourth condition is the allocation of time for activity, reflection, and revision. The connection among an initial piece of work, the feedback it receives, and its improved version should be visible in the learning process. Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick discuss feedback on work in progress, two-stage assignments, and opportunities for resubmission [5; p. 213]. In tasks concerning national and spiritual values, students explain which value informed their decisions, how they considered other people's interests, and why they changed their decisions. As a methodological adjustment, a consultation and revision stage is introduced before final submission.

The fifth condition is teachers' collaborative analysis of methodology and agreement on assessment criteria. Avloniy emphasises the unity of teachers' words and the practical examples they set [1; pp. 13–14]. At university, this requirement can be reflected in transparent criteria, honest use of sources, and consistent feedback to students. A subject teacher and a colleague independently assess several anonymised samples of student work and discuss the reasons for any differences. If the ambiguity lies in a criterion, its descriptor is revised; if it lies in the task explanation, the instructions are clarified. UNESCO recommends connecting teachers' professional development with their everyday work and reflection on that work [7; pp. 84, 87].

The sixth condition is the reliability of the sources underpinning content and access to resources. The author, edition, page, and historical context of a text are identified; oral recollections, literary interpretations, and verified information are distinguished. The need to critically evaluate digital information is also addressed in UNESCO's guide [8; p. 17]. On this basis, the article proposes providing students with annotated texts, working links, and, where necessary, printed copies. Opportunities to complete a task orally or in writing are determined while retaining the common objective. Once a barrier involving resources or modes of expression has been removed, students' understanding of the content itself is reassessed.

The seventh condition is regular monitoring that translates feedback into methodological decisions. Teachers record the difficulty identified, what they changed in response, and the evidence observed in subsequent work. Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick specifically highlight the use of assessment information to adapt teaching [5; p. 214]. For example, if students write general conclusions without identifying their sources, a stage distinguishing source material from personal interpretation is added to the next task. A brief departmental discussion of teaching methodology considers this change alongside samples of subsequent work. These records thus inform the planning of the next session.

Table 1. Pedagogical conditions and the examination of methodological changes

Pedagogical condition	Identified difficulty	Methodological change	Evidence for review
Initial diagnosis	The cause of the difficulty is unclear	A brief task and a clarifying question	Selection of support appropriate to the need
Alignment with the objective	The task does not require the action specified in the objective	Realignment of the question and assessment	A sample response aligned with the objective
Supportive dialogue	The student repeats a supplied view	Choice, open questions, and evidence-based discussion	An independently justified decision
Time for revision	Feedback is not used	Interim consultation and resubmission	Two versions of the work and an explanation
Collaboration among teachers	The criterion is interpreted differently	Clarification of the criterion using sample work	Reasoned assessment comments
Reliable and available resources	The source or access format is unsuitable	Adaptation of the source, explanation, or submission format	Individual work demonstrating use of the resource
Regular monitoring of teaching methodology	The same difficulty recurs	Recording the reason for the change and reassessing it	Change observed in the subsequent task

These conditions operate in conjunction with one another. If a student's difficulty is identified but there is no time to revise the work, the use of diagnostic information is limited. If a resource is provided without explaining the criteria for its use, its availability alone may not provide sufficient support. Pedagogical analysis therefore considers not only the presence of an individual condition but also its relationships with other conditions. The continuity and planning appropriate to local circumstances emphasised by Mavlonova and her co-authors explain the organisational basis of these relationships [2; p. 136].

The Improvement Procedure and a Practical Scenario

The proposed improvement procedure consists of collecting initial evidence, forming a hypothesis about the cause of a difficulty, planning an appropriate change, applying it in a teaching session, analysing new evidence, and determining the next decision. At each stage, the teacher's task is defined by specific questions: Where did the student encounter difficulty? What support was provided? What changed in the work? Which issue remains unresolved? Introducing many changes simultaneously makes it difficult to explain their individual effects. Selecting a focused methodological issue at the outset helps organise meaningful observation.

A hypothetical scenario entitled "Respect for Teachers and Academic Integrity" illustrates this procedure. Students are told that a teacher's presentation contains a historical claim with an unclear source, which needs to be checked before they use it in their own work. They explain how they would ask a question respectfully, which sources they would compare, and how they would present the findings of their verification. The task requires students to reconcile respect, scholarly responsibility, and honesty within a single decision. The scenario is a methodological example developed for a teaching session.

If an initial response contains only the general statement that "teachers should be respected," without specifying how the claim will be checked, the teacher does not immediately

© 2026 Bulletin of International Journals · Germany · ISSN 2750-3402 · CC BY 4.0

interpret it as a deficiency in values. The teacher first checks whether the student has understood the task, then provides support with comparing sources and formulating a respectful question. The subsequent task explicitly addresses the "selected source," the "reason for verification," and the "form of communication." Students revise their initial responses and explain which evidence influenced their decisions. The teacher analyses the changes in the revised responses, while students explain which support they used and how they used it.

Students then independently address another situation to which the same criteria apply. For example, they may be asked to check an inadequately sourced claim in a report prepared by a peer and provide a respectful comment. Source selection, justification, and communication quality are observed in the new work. Considering the initial response, the teacher's support, and subsequent work together makes it possible to explain the change. Success in the new task is not, however, taken as automatic evidence that a stable moral quality has developed across all real-life situations.

Assessment Criteria and Methodological Decisions

Assessment is organised along two lines. The first examines whether the conditions were actually provided: Were the criteria explained in advance? Was the source available? Was time allowed for revision? The second analyses the content of students' work: Did they connect the value to the situation, justify their decisions, and use the feedback? Recording these two lines separately helps distinguish the implementation of the methodology from evidence of student learning. UNESCO likewise recommends considering process, outcomes, and context together in programme evaluation [6; pp. 57–58].

Table 2. A descriptive rubric for analysing student activity

Criterion	Requires support	Performs with partial independence	Performs independently with supporting evidence
Connecting content to the situation	Lists values, but their connection to the situation is unclear	Explains the connection with the help of a guiding question	Explains the meaning of the value in relation to the situation
Justifying a decision	States a view without specifying sources or consequences	Provides evidence, but analysis of alternatives is limited	Compares sources, consequences, and alternatives
Responsibility in collaboration	The task and individual contribution are unclear	Completes and explains the assigned task with support	Honours agreements and provides evidence of the contribution
Using feedback	The reason for and nature of the revision are unclear	Improves some parts in response to recommendations	Revises the work and justifies the changes

The levels in the rubric describe performance on the specific task assigned. Criteria are selected to match the content of each task; the criterion of responsibility in collaboration is applied to activities in which both a group task and individual contributions can be observed. Each criterion is assessed separately; combining them into an overall "level of spirituality" is not proposed. A student may work independently on one criterion while needing support on another. Where evidence is insufficient, "not observed" is recorded and an additional task is assigned. This approach indicates the next step for students and the necessary adjustment to the task or support for teachers. The descriptors are discussed with students before the session.

Methodological decisions draw on a comparison of completed work, observations during discussion, records of individual contributions, and students' own explanations. For example, a successful group presentation does not demonstrate that all members have learned equally; individual justifications are therefore also obtained. In their feedback, teachers identify the observed performance, the relevant criterion, and a feasible next action. A general comment such as "your evidence is insufficient" is supplemented with an explanation of how to clarify the source or the consequences. Students describe what they changed in their work in response to this feedback.

Subsequent empirical testing should compare the content and difficulty of initial and final tasks and examine the clarity of the criteria and agreement among assessors. Comparisons should take account of initial preparation, the amount of pedagogical support, and the repetition of the task. An observed improvement may also be associated with repeated practice or additional support; an appropriate comparative design is needed to establish the causal effect of the methodology. The practical effectiveness of the proposed conditions and assessment tools needs to be examined through empirical testing organised in this way.

Conclusion

Improving the methodology of educating higher education students on the basis of national and spiritual values requires the revision of learning tasks, pedagogical support, and assessment procedures in light of evidence from student activity. When the meaning of a value is expressed through students' decisions, collaboration, and accountability, an observable basis for improvement emerges. Pedagogical conditions have been understood here as the environment that makes it possible to collect and interpret this evidence and translate it into practical decisions.

The theoretical analysis systematised the identification of initial needs, alignment between objectives and assessment, support for students' ideas, time for revision, collaboration among teachers, reliable and accessible resources, and regular monitoring of teaching methodology. The relationships among these conditions connect the process of improving student work with improvements in teachers' methodological decisions. In practice, these conditions are expressed through support tailored to a difficulty, clarification of tasks, and examination of changes in a new task.

The proposed scenario and descriptive rubric focus on observing the application of values to situations, justification of decisions, responsibility in collaboration, and the use of feedback. In practical implementation, the provision of pedagogical conditions and the quality of student work should be assessed separately but in relation to one another. Further research may clarify how this framework functions across different fields of study and university contexts, which

© 2026 Bulletin of International Journals · Germany · ISSN 2750-3402 · CC BY 4.0

types of support are needed, and whether learned actions are retained in new situations.

References

[1] Avloniy A. Turkiy guliston yoxud axloq [The Turkic Rose Garden, or Ethics]. — Tashkent: Yoshlar nashriyot uyi, 2018. — 96 pp. — ISBN 978-9943-5318-1-9. https://portal.guldu.uz/download-edfiles-29670.pdf

[2] Mavlonova R., Normurodova B., Rahmonqulova N. Tarbiyaviy ishlar metodikasi: o‘quv qo‘llanma [Methods of Educational Work: A Study Guide]. — Tashkent: Tib-kitob, 2010. — ISBN 978-9943-348-12-7. https://jdpu.uz/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Tarbiyaviy-ishlar-metodikasi.Mavlonova-R.pdf

[3] Biggs J. Enhancing Teaching through Constructive Alignment // Higher Education. — 1996. — Vol. 32, No. 3. — pp. 347–364. — DOI: 10.1007/BF00138871. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00138871

[4] Ryan R. M., Deci E. L. Self-Determination Theory and the Facilitation of Intrinsic Motivation, Social Development, and Well-Being // American Psychologist. — 2000. — Vol. 55, No. 1. — pp. 68–78. — DOI: 10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68

[5] Nicol D. J., Macfarlane-Dick D. Formative Assessment and Self-Regulated Learning: A Model and Seven Principles of Good Feedback Practice // Studies in Higher Education. — 2006. — Vol. 31, No. 2. — pp. 199–218. — DOI: 10.1080/03075070600572090. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090

[6] UNESCO. Global Citizenship Education: Topics and Learning Objectives. — Paris: UNESCO, 2015. — ISBN 978-92-3-100102-4. https://www.unesco.org/sites/default/files/gcedtopicsandlearningobjectives_01.pdf

[7] International Commission on the Futures of Education. Reimagining Our Futures Together: A New Social Contract for Education. — Paris: UNESCO, 2021. — ISBN 978-92-3-100478-0. — DOI: 10.54675/ASRB4722. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000379707

[8] UNESCO. Global Citizenship Education in a Digital Age: Teacher Guidelines. — Paris: UNESCO, 2024. — ISBN 978-92-3-100658-6. — DOI: 10.54675/BBSJ1884. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000388812

© 2026 Bulletin of International Journals · Germany · ISSN 2750-3402 · CC BY 4.0