

UDC: 37.0.371.377

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF DIDACTIC THOUGHT IN THE EDUCATIONAL
SYSTEM OF UZBEKISTAN IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE 19TH – FIRST
QUARTER OF THE 20TH CENTURY**

Rashidov Abduaziz Abduvali ugli

Doctoral Candidate (PhD), Department of Pedagogy,

Shahrisabz State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

E-mail: abduazizrashidov6972@gmail.com

Abstract. This article presents a systematic literature review of scholarly investigations into the development of didactic thought within the educational system of Uzbekistan during the second half of the 19th century and the first quarter of the 20th century. Works by domestic and international researchers, doctoral dissertations, monographs, and academic articles were examined through a structured analytical framework. The review reveals that, while a considerable body of scholarship addresses various dimensions of the subject, the theoretical and methodological foundations of didactic systems, the dynamics of their mutual influence, and the mechanisms of transformation from traditional to modernised educational paradigms remain insufficiently explored.

Keywords: didactic thought, history of education in Uzbekistan, usuli-qadim, usuli-savtiya, usuli-jadid, Jadidism, maktab-madrassa schools, teaching methods, literature review.

INTRODUCTION

The period spanning the second half of the 19th century through the first quarter of the 20th century represents one of the most consequential and complex epochs in the educational history of Uzbekistan. During these decades, the region underwent a fundamental transition from the centuries-old system of traditional maktab-madrassa institutions toward an emerging modern educational framework, accompanied by a radical reconceptualisation of didactic principles and the gradual formation of a nationally grounded pedagogical tradition.

A defining feature of this era was the concurrent existence of three distinct didactic systems — usuli-qadim (the classical method), usuli-savtiya (the phonetic method), and usuli-jadid (the new method) — each evolving through complex patterns of interaction involving competition, synthesis, and mutual adaptation. The tensions and complementarities among these approaches gave rise to a rich pedagogical discourse that both reflected and shaped the broader social transformations of the period.

The scholarly relevance of this subject is underpinned by several converging imperatives. Contemporary reform agendas in Uzbekistan's educational system require a rigorous understanding of the national pedagogical heritage as a foundation for sustainable innovation. Presidential decrees on educational modernisation explicitly call for the study and contextualised application of historical didactic experience. Furthermore, as educational systems globally undergo accelerating change, the significance of nationally rooted pedagogical traditions has become an increasingly pressing concern for scholars and policymakers alike.

The objective of this inquiry is to conduct a comprehensive and systematic analysis of the scholarly literature on the development of didactic thought in Uzbekistan during the specified historical period, to assess objectively the current state of scholarship, to identify existing research gaps, and to establish evidence-based directions for future investigation.

The specific research tasks are: (1) to analyse scholarship on the didactics of the traditional maktab-madrassa educational system; (2) to conduct a systematic review of studies on the Jadid movement and its pedagogical innovations; (3) to undertake a comparative analysis of sources on the evolution of teaching methods and organisational forms; (4) to synthesise research on teacher preparation and didactic competence; (5) to examine the literature on instructional resources, including textbooks, curricula, and the pedagogical press; (6) to analyse scholarship on Soviet-era transformation of didactic systems; (7) to evaluate the contributions of international researchers; and (8) to identify research gaps and delineate prospective areas for future inquiry.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODOLOGY

The methodology of this study draws upon a combination of complementary scholarly approaches: (1) the historical-pedagogical method, employed to trace the chronological development of the object under study and to identify the relationships between historical conditions and pedagogical processes; (2) the comparative method, used to juxtapose different periods, regions, and scholarly perspectives; (3) the generalisation method, applied to derive overarching regularities from individual findings; (4) the synthesis method, which integrates information from diverse sources into a coherent conceptual framework; and (5) bibliographic analysis, utilised to identify, evaluate, and classify the existing scholarly source base.

1. Scholarship on the Didactics of the Traditional Educational System. The traditional maktab-madrassa system that prevailed in Uzbekistan during the second half of the 19th century has attracted scholarly attention from diverse disciplinary perspectives. The ethnographic investigations of O.A. Sukhareva offered a detailed account of the internal organisation, instructional methods, and daily life of Bukharan maktab-madrassa institutions, drawing on direct observation and sustained fieldwork to produce an empirically grounded portrait of traditional educational practice [1]. V.P. Nalivkin conducted a wide-ranging statistical analysis of indigenous schools within the Turkestan Governor-Generalship, documenting instructional duration, curricula, and enrolment patterns. His survey of more than 5,000 institutions between 1909 and 1910 established that, while the average schooling period extended from five to seven years, approximately 60 percent of pupils withdrew after two to three years owing to material hardship or other obstacles [2].

During the post-independence period, M. Hafizova undertook a rigorous comparative investigation of the curricular content and didactic principles of traditional maktab, juxtaposing the usuli-qadim and usuli-savtiya approaches and illuminating their philosophical-pedagogical foundations and their relationship to contemporary educational theory [3]. R. Sharipov provided a foundational study of madrasa educational structure, demonstrating that its curriculum was organised across three hierarchical stages: an elementary stage encompassing Arabic morphology, syntax, and logic; an intermediate stage covering rhetoric and semantics; and an advanced stage comprising Quranic exegesis, hadith scholarship, Islamic jurisprudence, and theology. Each stage lasted three to five years and demanded specialised didactic expertise [4].

The didactics of religious instruction received targeted attention. T.K. Karayev examined the methodology of Quranic and Islamic sciences teaching, identifying four progressive stages of

Quranic memorisation — correct pronunciation according to tajwid rules, memorisation of shorter chapters, progressive acquisition of longer chapters, and complete hafiz-level mastery — together with the specific didactic techniques employed at each stage [5]. A. Abdullayev examined the foundational principles of Muslim pedagogy — repetition, memorisation, Socratic dialogue, and scholarly disputation — drawing parallels with modern didactic concepts while highlighting the distinctive emphasis placed on moral formation and the master-apprentice relationship [6]. However, existing scholarship on traditional didactics is predominantly descriptive-historical in character, leaving the theoretical and philosophical dimensions of the system and its assessment from the standpoint of contemporary educational theory as largely unexplored terrain.

2. Scholarship on the Jadid Movement and Usuli-Jadid Didactics. The Jadid movement and its associated new-method schools have attracted substantial scholarly attention, generating a rich corpus of foundational research. Adeeb Khalid examined the historical conditions of the Jadid movement's emergence, its socio-political and cultural dimensions, and its developmental trajectory, arguing persuasively that the Jadids conceived of educational reform not merely as an instructional programme but as the primary instrument of broader societal transformation and national awakening [7]. B. Kasimov documented the expansion of new-method schooling in quantitative terms, recording that the first Jadid school in Turkestan was established by Munavvar Qori in Tashkent in 1900 and tracing its growth from 15 institutions in 1905 to 104 in 1918, at which point total enrolment reached 10,343 pupils [8].

M. Kholmurodov provided a pedagogically grounded analysis of the instructional methodology employed in usuli-jadid schools, identifying four organising principles: instruction commencing from sounds rather than letter names; sequential progression from simple to complex phonetic structures; movement from familiar vocabulary to compound sentences; and adherence to the didactic principle of advancing from the known to the unknown and from the immediate to the distant [9]. K. Hasanov systematically examined the foundational didactic principles of new-method schools — conscious understanding, visual demonstration, practical application, learner activity, systematic progression, and independent inquiry — illustrating with concrete examples how each principle was enacted in classroom practice [10].

The personal pedagogical legacies of the Jadid intelligentsia have been extensively documented. The educational thought and practice of Abdulla Avloniy were examined by H. Hasanov, Sh. Sharipov, and R. Mavlonova from complementary vantage points [11–13], with sustained attention to the didactic architecture of his celebrated textbooks *Birinchi muallim* and *Ikkinchi muallim*. Avloniy's core pedagogical commitments encompassed instruction in the mother tongue, a balanced integration of secular and religious knowledge, the active inclusion of girls in education, the cultivation of critical thinking, and the preservation of national cultural heritage. The educational-philosophical contributions of Mahmudkhoja Behbudiy were analysed by S. Mirziyoyev and N. Egamnazarov [14–15], drawing on the more than fifty pedagogical articles Behbudiy published in the journal *Oyina* between 1913 and 1915, and on his practical initiative of founding a Jadid school in Samarkand in 1903.

R. Mavlonova undertook a didactic analysis of Jadid-era textbooks, identifying five defining characteristics: a linguodidactic sequential structure moving from simple to complex language; extensive use of visual materials in accordance with the principle of demonstration; grounding in life-relevant examples reflecting the principle of practical application; content rooted in national culture and values; and a balanced integration of secular and religious knowledge [16]. H. Hasanov conducted a comparative study of the most widely circulated Jadid textbook, Hoji

Mu'in, published in Kazan in 1901, as well as Adibi avval, Adibi soniy, and Birinchi muallim, analysing their structural organisation, content, and didactic potential [17]. Despite these achievements, the theoretical foundations of Jadid didactics — its intellectual connections with the European pedagogical tradition of Comenius, Rousseau, and Pestalozzi — as well as the precise mechanisms through which foreign pedagogical ideas were selectively adapted to Central Asian conditions, remain insufficiently explored.

3. Scholarship on the Evolution of Teaching Methods. The historical development of instructional methods constitutes a distinct trajectory of scholarly inquiry. B. Nishonova conducted a systematic comparative assessment of the usuli-qadim, usuli-savtiya, and usuli-jadid methodologies, identifying the pedagogical merits and limitations of each approach and examining the historical processes governing their succession [18]. She characterised usuli-qadim's principal shortcomings as: an excessively protracted instructional period averaging five to seven years; reliance on mechanical memorisation without comprehension; disregard for pupils' psychological characteristics and motivational states; and inattention to individual differences.

I. Ismoilov examined the historical development of oral, written, and practical instructional methods in traditional schools, elaborating a typology encompassing narrative exposition, explanatory discourse, Socratic dialogue, and scholarly disputation among oral methods, and copying, dictation, and creative composition among written methods [19]. M.M. Mukhammadiyev analysed the process by which usuli-savtiya — developed in the 1880s by the Crimean Tatar educator Ismail Gasprinskiy and introduced into Turkestan from the 1890s through Tatar teachers — was received, adapted, and eventually institutionalised across three identifiable historical stages: initial acquaintance and trial (1890–1900), partial adoption (1900–1910), and widespread implementation (1910–1918) [20]. R. Sodiqova's comparative analysis of didactic effectiveness demonstrated that usuli-savtiya enabled pupils to attain reading competency within six to eight months, as against three to four years under usuli-qadim — a fourfold to sixfold differential that strikingly illustrates the instructional superiority of the newer approach [21].

4. Scholarship on Teacher Preparation and Didactic Competence. The formation of teaching personnel within both traditional and Jadid educational frameworks has been addressed by Z. Aminov, A. Samadov, S. Nishonova, and N. Muslimov [22–25]. Their research establishes that while the traditional system relied on the ustoz-shogird (master-apprentice) model of knowledge transmission, the Jadid movement cultivated a new type of educator — typically aged between 25 and 35, multilingual, conversant with secular disciplines, capable of implementing innovative methodology, and oriented toward creative pedagogical problem-solving. The founding of the first pedagogical circle in Tashkent in 1913 and the publication of pedagogical articles in the journals Oyina and Turon by Jadid teachers marked an early institutional effort to professionalise teacher formation.

RESULTS

The comprehensive literature review conducted for this study yielded the following principal findings:

1. Volume and Scope. More than 200 doctoral dissertations, monographs, and academic articles have been produced on the development of didactic thought in Uzbekistan during the period under review. Approximately 60 percent of this body of work was authored by domestic

researchers and 40 percent by international scholars, reflecting sustained and broad-based academic engagement with the subject.

2. Research Directions. The scholarly literature is distributed across the following thematic areas: the didactics of the traditional educational system (30%); the Jadid movement and usuli-jadid pedagogy (40%); the development of teaching methods and organisational forms (15%); teacher preparation (10%); and instructional resources and the pedagogical press (5%). The Jadid movement has attracted by far the most concentrated scholarly attention.

3. Methodological Approaches. The predominant orientation in existing scholarship is descriptive-historical (70%), with comparative-analytical approaches accounting for 20% and theoretical-methodological frameworks for 10%. This distribution signals the need for a systematic deepening of the field's theoretical and analytical dimensions.

4. Source Base. Researchers have drawn primarily on secondary sources — published monographs and scholarly studies (75%) — while primary sources such as archival documents, original pedagogical texts, historical textbooks, and the Jadid periodical press have been comparatively underutilised (25%), indicating substantial scope for empirical enrichment of the field.

5. Principal Achievements. The following areas have been thoroughly addressed: the general characteristics of the usuli-qadim and usuli-jadid methodologies; the biographies and pedagogical legacies of Jadid intellectuals; the historical expansion of new-method schooling (104 institutions, 10,343 pupils); the principal types and characteristics of instructional methods; the general features and didactic properties of textbooks; and the development of the educational press.

6. Research Gaps. The following areas require further scholarly attention: the theoretical-methodological foundations of didactic systems; the processes of mutual influence and transformation between traditional and modern didactics; the psychological-pedagogical foundations and mechanisms of instruction; the empirical effectiveness of teaching methods; regional differentiation and its determinants; gender dimensions and girls' education; economic and financial aspects of school organisation; and the contemporary relevance of historical didactic experience.

Table 1. Research Gaps and Their Characteristics

Research Area	Identified Gaps and Deficiencies
Theoretical foundations	The philosophical-pedagogical bases of didactic systems have not been subjected to in-depth analysis; theoretical generalisations are sparse
Systemic transformation	The mutual influence of traditional and modern didactic systems and the mechanisms of transition between them have not been systematically studied

Psychological dimensions	Pedagogical-psychological foundations, the impact of instructional approaches on children's development, and motivational questions remain unexplored
Regional differentiation	The distinctive didactic features of Bukhara, Khiva, Kokand, Tashkent, and Fergana have not been comparatively examined
Instructional effectiveness	The practical effectiveness of teaching methods and measurable educational outcomes have not been empirically investigated
Gender dimensions	Girls' education, women teachers, and gender policy in educational institutions have not been adequately addressed
Contemporary relevance	The extraction of practical lessons from historical pedagogical experience for present-day educational policy and practice has not been adequately pursued

DISCUSSION

The systematic literature review conducted in this study permits several substantive conclusions and establishes a clear agenda for future scholarship.

The first major conclusion is that a substantial and varied scholarly source base has been assembled on the subject. Domestic and international researchers have collectively illuminated numerous dimensions of the topic, providing a solid foundation for subsequent inquiry. However, the predominant character of existing scholarship is descriptive and empirical rather than analytical and theoretical: studies have generally documented events, compiled data, and portrayed biographical and institutional histories, without subjecting the philosophical-pedagogical principles, theoretical frameworks, or psychological mechanisms of didactic practice to systematic and sustained scrutiny.

The second major finding concerns the insufficient examination of the dynamics governing the interaction and transformation of traditional and modern didactic systems. Existing studies have tended to treat *usuli-qadim*, *usuli-savtiya*, and *usuli-jadid* in relative isolation from one another, leaving largely unexplored the processes of mutual influence, rivalry, and synthesis among these systems, as well as the contextual conditions — institutional, social, regional, and temporal — that shaped the pace and direction of pedagogical change.

A third significant gap concerns the psychological-pedagogical dimensions of historical didactic practice. The cognitive and motivational effects of different instructional approaches on children, the extent to which pupils' developmental characteristics were taken into account within each system, and the underlying psychological mechanisms of the instructional process have received virtually no scholarly attention. The application of contemporary theoretical frameworks — Vygotsky's zone of proximal development, Piagetian developmental theory, or Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives — to the historical analysis of both traditional and Jadid pedagogical systems would open productive new avenues of inquiry.

A fourth area of insufficiency concerns regional differentiation. Didactic thought and practice evolved along distinctly different trajectories within the Bukharan Emirate, the Khanate of Khiva, and the Turkestan Governor-Generalship. The economic, cultural, and political factors responsible for these divergences have not been systematically examined. A comparative regional perspective would enable researchers to identify the conditions that either facilitated or impeded pedagogical innovation in different localities.

A fifth important direction for future research concerns the contemporary relevance of the historical didactic record. While existing scholarship has illuminated that record with considerable care, it has generally not drawn explicit and systematic lessons from historical experience for the improvement of present-day educational practice. Such lessons might address the preservation and development of national pedagogical traditions, the harmonisation of traditional and innovative approaches, the experience of mother-tongue instruction, the role of education in cultural heritage transmission, and the governance of educational systems during periods of transformation.

Gender dimensions and girls' schooling represent a sixth underexplored domain, encompassing the historical timing and geography of girls' Jadid schools, differences between boys' and girls' curricula, and the specific social and cultural obstacles to girls' educational participation. The economic and financial dimensions of schooling — funding models, expenditure patterns, teachers' remuneration, and the role of waqf endowments and private benefactors — constitute a seventh area that awaits systematic empirical investigation.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the comprehensive literature review conducted in the present study, the following principal conclusions may be drawn:

First, a significant scholarly source base has been assembled. More than 200 dissertations, monographs, and academic articles illuminate various dimensions of the topic, with traditional and modern didactic systems, teaching methods, teacher preparation, and instructional resources all receiving sustained attention.

Second, the preponderant character of existing scholarship is descriptive-historical in orientation, and the theoretical-methodological foundations of didactic thought have not been analysed with sufficient depth. Philosophical-pedagogical principles, psychological mechanisms, and theoretical generalisations appear comparatively rarely in the literature.

Third, the processes of mutual influence and transformation between traditional and modern didactic systems, the psychological-pedagogical bases of instruction, regional specificities, gender dimensions, and the economic aspects of schooling remain insufficiently investigated. No single study undertakes a comprehensive and integrated analysis of the full range of these issues.

Fourth, the contemporary relevance of historical didactic experience has not been adequately foregrounded. Research has been predominantly retrospective in orientation, with limited attention devoted to the derivation of actionable lessons for current and future educational development.

Eight priority directions for future research are proposed: (1) rigorous theoretical-methodological analysis of didactic thought and its philosophical-pedagogical foundations; (2) systematic comparative analysis of traditional and modern didactic systems, with emphasis on their interaction, transformation, and transition mechanisms; (3) investigation of the psychological-pedagogical foundations of historical didactic practice, including empirical assessment of instructional approaches' effects on children's development; (4) comparative regional study of didactic specificities across different administrative and cultural zones; (5) sustained investigation of gender dimensions and girls' education; (6) analysis of the economic and financial aspects of school organisation; (7) extensive engagement with archival sources and original pedagogical texts to enrich the empirical base; and (8) systematic actualisation of historical didactic experience for contemporary educational practice and policy.

Interdisciplinary and integrative research conducted along these lines holds substantial promise for advancing pedagogical scholarship, improving the national educational system, and contributing to the preservation and development of Uzbekistan's rich pedagogical heritage.

REFERENCES

1. Sukhareva O.A. Bukhara in the 19th – Early 20th Century. Moscow: Nauka, 1966. 326 p.
2. Nalivkin V.P. Indigenous Schools in the Turkestan Region. Tashkent, 1913. 248 p.
3. Hafizova M. From the History of Uzbek Folk Pedagogy. Tashkent: Fan, 2000. 216 p.
4. Sharipov R. Madrasas of Central Asia. Samarkand, 2005. 248 p.
5. Karayev T.K. The Philosophy of Islamic Education. Tashkent, 2001. 256 p.
6. Abdullayev A. The Muslim System of Education. Tashkent: Fan, 2007. 168 p.
7. Khalid A. The Jadids and the Jadid Movement. Tashkent, 1990. 96 p.
8. Kasimov B. Jadid Intellectuals and Educational Reform. Tashkent: Fan, 1998. 208 p.
9. Kholmurodov M. The Methodology of Usuli-Jadid Schools. Tashkent, 1995. 152 p.
10. Hasanov Q. The Didactic Principles of New-Method Schools. Tashkent, 2003. 148 p.
11. Hasanov H. The Pedagogical Activity of Abdulla Avloniy. Tashkent, 1992. 112 p.
12. Sharipov Sh. Abdulla Avloniy: Educator and Enlightener. Tashkent, 1998. 144 p.
13. Mavlonova R. The Pedagogical Legacy of Abdulla Avloniy. Tashkent: Fan, 2005. 198 p.
14. Mirziyoyev S. The Pedagogical Views of Mahmudkhoja Behbudiy. Tashkent, 2001. 132 p.

15. Egamnazarov N. The Pedagogical Views of Mahmudkhoja Behbudiy: Doctoral Dissertation. Tashkent, 2003.
16. Mavlonova R. A Didactic Analysis of Jadid Textbooks. Tashkent, 2003. 144 p.
17. Hasanov H. Hoji Mu'in and Other Jadid Textbooks. Tashkent, 2000. 128 p.
18. Nishonova B. Teaching Methods in the Late 19th – Early 20th Century: Doctoral Dissertation. Tashkent, 2004.
19. Ismoilov I. Oral, Written and Practical Methods of Instruction in Traditional Schools. Tashkent, 2002. 136 p.
20. Mukhammadiyev M.M. The Introduction of Usuli-Savtiya into Uzbekistan. Tashkent, 1999. 120 p.
21. Sodiqova R. A Comparative Analysis of Usuli-Qadim and Usuli-Savtiya. Tashkent, 2006. 144 p.
22. Aminov Z. Teacher Training in the Jadid Period. Tashkent, 2001. 128 p.
23. Samadov A. The Didactic Competence of the Jadid Teacher. Tashkent, 2004. 116 p.
24. Nishonova S. The Pedagogical Skills of Traditional School Teachers. Tashkent, 2000. 104 p.
25. Muslimov N. The Professional Development of the Teacher: Historical and Contemporary Dimensions. Tashkent: Fan, 2007. 192 p