

Criteria for Assessing the Development of Historical Thinking in Pre-Service History Teachers: A Conceptual and Diagnostic Framework

Farxod Ulugbekovich Djumaniyazov

PhD Researcher, Samarkand Institute of Agroinnovations and Research, Uzbekistan

Received: 30 June 2026; **Accepted:** 27 July 2026; **Published:** 25 August 2026

Abstract: The development of historical thinking is increasingly regarded as a central component of professional preparation for future history teachers. Effective history teaching requires more than the reproduction of factual knowledge; it requires the ability to evaluate historical evidence, contextualize events and human actions, identify causal relationships, compare competing interpretations, reason from multiple perspectives, and construct evidence-based historical arguments. Despite the growing international literature on historical thinking and reasoning, the assessment of these competencies in pre-service history teachers remains methodologically challenging, particularly in teacher education contexts where disciplinary reasoning must be integrated with pedagogical competence.

This study aims to develop a conceptual and diagnostic framework for assessing the level of historical thinking among pre-service history teachers. The study employs a conceptual-methodological research design based on an integrative analysis of international scholarship on historical thinking, historical reasoning, source evaluation, contextualization, multiperspectivity, epistemic cognition, and history teacher education, supplemented by relevant literature and policy documents from Uzbekistan.

The synthesis resulted in four interrelated assessment criteria: methodological-analytical, interpretative-multiperspectival, axiological-ethical, and reflective-pedagogical/prognostic. For each criterion, observable indicators and appropriate assessment tasks are proposed. In addition, three developmental levels - reproductive, interpretative, and creative-analytical - are specified as a provisional diagnostic rubric.

The proposed framework extends established models of historical reasoning by connecting disciplinary historical practices with the professional and reflective competencies required of future history teachers. The framework may serve as a basis for designing diagnostic instruments, source-based assignments, assessment rubrics, and future empirical validation studies in history teacher education.

Keywords: Historical thinking; historical reasoning; pre-service history teachers; historical contextualization; source evaluation; multiperspectivity; historical interpretation; assessment; teacher education.

Introduction: Contemporary history education is undergoing a conceptual transition from the transmission and memorization of established historical narratives toward the development of students' capacity to investigate, interpret, and reason about the past. Within this perspective, knowing history does not simply mean remembering dates, personalities, political events, or chronological sequences. Historical

competence involves understanding how claims about the past are constructed, how evidence is evaluated, why historical interpretations may differ, and how events should be situated within their temporal, spatial, social, political, and cultural contexts [1, 2].

This distinction is particularly important in the preparation of future history teachers. A teacher who possesses extensive factual knowledge but cannot

critically examine sources, compare interpretations, identify causal complexity, or contextualize historical actors may reproduce history as a fixed body of information rather than present it as a discipline based on evidence, interpretation, and reasoned argument. Consequently, the quality of history teacher education depends not only on what prospective teachers know about the past but also on how they think historically and how effectively they can transform disciplinary reasoning into pedagogical practice [3, 4].

Wineburg conceptualized historical thinking as a form of reasoning that often differs from ordinary or intuitive thinking. When individuals encounter historical sources, they may naturally interpret the past according to contemporary assumptions. Historical reasoning, by contrast, requires attention to authorship, context, evidence, chronology, and the conditions under which historical actors made decisions [3].

Van Drie and Van Boxtel proposed one of the most influential frameworks for historical reasoning. Their model identifies several interconnected activities: asking historical questions, using historical sources, contextualizing historical phenomena, constructing arguments, employing substantive historical concepts, and using metahistorical concepts such as cause, change, evidence, and significance. These activities demonstrate that historical reasoning cannot be reduced to factual recall. Instead, it represents a coordinated system of disciplinary practices [1].

A related framework developed by Seixas and Morton describes six historical thinking concepts: historical significance, evidence, continuity and change, cause and consequence, historical perspectives, and the ethical dimension. These concepts emphasize the interpretative character of historical knowledge and demonstrate that competent historical thinking requires students to move beyond simply knowing “what happened” toward examining how knowledge about the past is produced and justified [5].

Research on source-based historical learning provides additional evidence for this position. Nokes, Dole, and Hacker demonstrated the educational importance of teaching students historical reading heuristics [6]. Reisman’s document-based Reading Like a Historian intervention similarly demonstrated the value of disciplinary reading practices in which students engage

with multiple historical documents rather than relying exclusively on textbook narratives [7].

Contextualization represents another fundamental dimension of historical competence. Historical actors cannot be adequately understood by evaluating their decisions exclusively according to contemporary social and moral norms. Historical contextualization requires the reconstruction of the temporal, geographical, political, social, and cultural environment in which an event or decision occurred. Huijgen et al. therefore describe contextualization as an essential history-specific competency and developed an observation framework to examine how teachers promote it in classroom instruction [8].

Causal reasoning is equally important. Historical developments rarely result from a single cause, and students need to distinguish between structural conditions, immediate causes, motives, triggers, and long-term consequences. Research by Stoel, Van Drie, and Van Boxtel demonstrates the importance of explicitly teaching strategies and second-order concepts that enable students to produce more sophisticated causal explanations [9, 10].

Historical thinking also requires multiperspectivity. Historical narratives are constructed from evidence but may foreground different actors, social groups, geographical scales, or historiographical interpretations. Kropman, Van Drie, and Van Boxtel found that exposing learners to texts containing greater multiperspectivity can result in representations of historical events that include a wider range and greater nuance of perspectives [11]. This finding is particularly relevant to the education of future history teachers, because teachers select sources, textbook passages, questions, and interpretations that shape learners’ representations of the past.

The epistemological beliefs of teachers and teacher candidates further influence history instruction. If history is understood as a fixed collection of indisputable facts, teaching is likely to focus on reproduction. If all interpretations are considered equally subjective, however, students may fail to understand the disciplinary criteria used to distinguish stronger historical arguments from weaker ones. A more sophisticated epistemological stance recognizes both the interpretative character of history and the

importance of evidence, methodological criteria, and reasoned justification [12].

This challenge is especially significant for pre-service teachers. Wansink, Akkerman, and Wubbels identified tensions among student history teachers as they attempted to balance historical factuality with interpretation [13]. Similarly, Monte-Sano and Cochran demonstrated that learning to teach historical thinking requires teacher candidates to integrate attention to learners, disciplinary content, and pedagogical practice [4].

The preparation of highly qualified teachers is also a strategic priority in Uzbekistan. National reforms emphasize the systematic development of pedagogical higher education institutions, the incorporation of advanced international experience, modernization of educational programmes, improvement of professional teacher preparation, and closer integration of education, research, and practice [14]. These priorities create a need for assessment tools capable of measuring not only knowledge acquisition but also professionally significant cognitive and methodological competencies.

Uzbek scholarship on history education similarly emphasizes the need to modernize teaching methodology and employ interactive, analytical, problem-based, and learner-centred approaches. In particular, Toshpo'latova highlights the role of interactive methods, problem-based learning, visualization, discussion, and simulation in increasing students' engagement with historical content [15].

Despite these developments, a methodological problem remains: How can the level of historical thinking of future history teachers be assessed in a way that simultaneously captures disciplinary reasoning, interpretative competence, value-oriented judgement, reflection, and the ability to apply historical knowledge pedagogically?

Accordingly, the purpose of this study is to develop a conceptual and diagnostic framework for assessing the development of historical thinking among pre-service history teachers.

The study addresses the following research questions:

1. What theoretical components of historical thinking are most relevant to the professional preparation of future history teachers?

2. Which observable criteria and indicators can be used to assess these components?

3. How can different levels of historical thinking development be qualitatively differentiated?

4. Which assessment tasks are most appropriate for diagnosing historical thinking within teacher education?

The proposed framework seeks to integrate internationally established disciplinary concepts with the professional requirements of history teacher education.

METHODS

1. Research design

The study employed a conceptual-methodological research design rather than an experimental design. Its purpose was not to estimate intervention effects or statistically generalize findings to a population but to construct a theoretically grounded assessment framework that can later be subjected to empirical validation.

An integrative analytical approach was used because historical thinking is a multidimensional construct discussed across several overlapping research traditions, including historical reasoning, historical literacy, disciplinary reading, epistemic cognition, historical empathy, contextualization, multiperspectivity, and history teacher education [1, 5, 16].

2. Sources of conceptual evidence

The theoretical synthesis was based primarily on four groups of literature:

1. foundational scholarship defining historical thinking and its disciplinary characteristics;

2. peer-reviewed studies examining specific historical reasoning competencies such as sourcing, contextualization, causal reasoning, multiperspectivity, and argumentation;

3. studies investigating history teachers and pre-service history teachers;

4. Uzbek scholarly and policy sources concerning history education and professional teacher preparation.

Priority was given to established international publications in educational psychology, curriculum studies, teacher education, and history education.

Major conceptual contributions included the works of Wineburg, Lévesque, Van Drie and Van Boxtel, Seixas and Morton, and Ercikan and Seixas [1, 3, 5, 16, 17].

Empirical research was used to refine observable dimensions. Studies of disciplinary source reading [6, 7], historical contextualization [8], causal reasoning [9, 10], multiperspectivity [11], epistemological beliefs [12], and teacher cognition and practice [13, 18] were particularly relevant.

3. Analytical procedure

The conceptual analysis was conducted in four stages.

Stage 1: Identification of recurring historical-thinking constructs

The literature was examined to identify competencies repeatedly regarded as central to disciplinary historical thinking.

Stage 2: Conceptual clustering

Related competencies were grouped into broader categories. For example, sourcing, corroboration, evidence evaluation, contextualization, and causal reasoning were clustered within a methodological-analytical dimension.

Stage 3: Adaptation to teacher education

The disciplinary components were examined in relation to the professional responsibilities of future history teachers. This stage was necessary because the ability to reason historically does not automatically guarantee the ability to teach historical reasoning.

Stage 4: Development of diagnostic indicators

Each criterion was operationalized using observable performances that could potentially be assessed through essays, source analyses, case studies, debates, lesson-design tasks, reflective writing, and simulations.

2.4. Principles for constructing the framework

Four methodological principles guided the framework.

First, construct comprehensiveness was required. The assessment could not be restricted to factual knowledge.

Second, observability was essential. Each abstract criterion had to be connected with behaviours or products that could be assessed.

Third, professional relevance was required. The framework had to reflect the future teacher's ability to

transform historical reasoning into instructional decisions.

Fourth, assessment triangulation was preferred. Because historical thinking is multidimensional, no single test format is sufficient. Multiple forms of evidence should therefore be combined [17].

RESULTS

1. A four-criterion framework of historical thinking

The conceptual synthesis resulted in four interrelated criteria for assessing historical thinking in pre-service history teachers:

1. methodological-analytical;
2. interpretative-multiperspectival;
3. axiological-ethical;
4. reflective-pedagogical/prognostic.

These criteria should not be understood as isolated abilities. Rather, they represent mutually reinforcing dimensions of sophisticated historical reasoning.

1.1. Methodological-analytical criterion

The methodological-analytical criterion concerns the ability to investigate the past through disciplinary procedures rather than accept historical information uncritically.

Its central indicators include:

- formulating meaningful historical questions;
- distinguishing primary and secondary sources;
- identifying authorship, purpose, audience, and conditions of source production;
- evaluating source reliability and limitations;
- corroborating information across multiple sources;
- detecting agreement and contradiction between documents;
- establishing chronological relationships;
- contextualizing events in temporal, geographical, political, social, and cultural settings;
- identifying short-term and long-term causes;
- distinguishing causes from triggers and consequences;
- constructing claims supported by relevant historical evidence.

These indicators are consistent with disciplinary frameworks in which sourcing, contextualization, argumentation, evidence use, and causal explanation constitute central historical reasoning practices [1, 7, 9, 10].

A student demonstrating a high level of methodological-analytical competence does not merely reproduce a source. The student asks who produced it, why it was produced, what information it provides, what it cannot demonstrate, and whether other available evidence supports the same interpretation [3, 6, 7].

1.2. Interpretative-multiperspectival criterion

Historical evidence does not automatically produce a single narrative. Historians select, organize, contextualize, and interpret evidence. Therefore, future teachers need to understand both the evidentiary and interpretative nature of historical knowledge [3, 5, 16].

Indicators of this criterion include:

- distinguishing historical facts from historical interpretations;
- identifying the author's perspective and assumptions;
- comparing different interpretations of the same event;
- recognizing the influence of social position, interests, ideology, and historical context on perspectives;
- examining an event from the viewpoints of different historical actors;
- differentiating an actor's historical perspective from a later historian's interpretation;
- avoiding simplistic presentism;
- acknowledging uncertainty when evidence is incomplete;
- evaluating interpretations according to evidence rather than treating all interpretations as equally valid;
- constructing a reasoned interpretation after comparing competing accounts [5, 11, 12].

Multiperspectivity is especially important because national historical narratives may foreground some actors while marginalizing others. Kropman et al. demonstrate that students' historical representations can become more nuanced when learning materials

explicitly incorporate multiple perspectives [11].

For future teachers, this competence additionally involves selecting classroom materials that enable pupils to encounter different voices and designing questions that require comparison rather than passive acceptance [11, 18].

1.3. Axiological-ethical criterion

Historical thinking is not entirely value-neutral. Decisions concerning historical significance, remembrance, responsibility, injustice, violence, cultural heritage, and collective memory frequently contain ethical dimensions [5, 17].

The axiological-ethical criterion therefore evaluates whether prospective teachers can:

- explain why particular events are historically significant;
- differentiate historical explanation from moral condemnation;
- recognize the relationship between historical memory and identity;
- interpret national and universal human values within their historical development;
- evaluate controversial events through evidence and contextual understanding;
- distinguish historical actors' values from present-day values;
- consider consequences of historical actions for different social groups;
- discuss ethical questions without replacing historical inquiry with ideological assertion;
- recognize the educational responsibility involved in teaching sensitive or contested historical topics [5, 17].

This component is related to the ethical dimension identified in established historical-thinking models, but its inclusion in the present framework also has an explicitly professional purpose. A future teacher must not only make historical judgements but also organize classroom discussion of morally and politically sensitive histories in a balanced and evidence-based manner [5, 17].

1.4. Reflective-pedagogical/prognostic criterion

The fourth criterion distinguishes the proposed

framework from models focusing exclusively on school students. Future teachers need to be able to reflect on their own historical reasoning and transform disciplinary knowledge into pedagogy [4, 18].

Indicators include:

- identifying gaps in one's own historical knowledge;
- explaining how one arrived at a historical conclusion;
- identifying which evidence most strongly influenced an interpretation;
- reconsidering a conclusion when new evidence appears;
- designing source-based learning tasks;
- formulating inquiry questions appropriate for school students;
- anticipating common misconceptions or

presentist interpretations;

- selecting teaching strategies suitable for complex or controversial topics;
- encouraging students to justify historical claims with evidence;
- incorporating reflection and feedback into history lessons;
- connecting historical patterns with contemporary questions without making deterministic predictions.

The term prognostic does not imply that historical study allows precise prediction of future events. Rather, it refers to the professional capacity to use understanding of historical processes to anticipate possible learning difficulties, instructional consequences, and broader implications of historical patterns.

2. Operationalization of the criteria

Table 1. Proposed criteria, indicators, and assessment methods

Criterion	Core indicators	Recommended assessment evidence
Methodological-analytical	Sourcing, corroboration, contextualization, causation, evidence use, argumentation	Document analysis, source comparison, historical essay, causal map, evidence-based case study
Interpretative-multiperspectival	Comparison of interpretations, perspective recognition, avoidance of presentism, historiographical awareness	Multiple-source task, historiographical comparison, structured debate, interpretation essay
Axiological-ethical	Historical significance, ethical judgement, historical memory, contextual evaluation of values	Controversial-issue case, reflective essay, ethical dilemma analysis, seminar discussion
Reflective-pedagogical/prognostic	Metacognition, lesson transformation, inquiry design, diagnosis of misconceptions, reflective self-assessment	Lesson plan, microteaching, reflective journal, teaching portfolio, task-design assignment

Source: Author's conceptual synthesis based on the theoretical and empirical literature on historical thinking, reasoning, assessment, and history teacher education [1, 3–13, 16–18].

The table demonstrates that assessment of historical thinking requires performance-based tasks in addition

to conventional knowledge tests [17].

A multiple-choice examination may identify whether a

student knows when an event occurred but cannot adequately demonstrate whether the student can compare competing evidence, contextualize historical actions, or construct an evidence-based historical explanation [17].

3. Recommended diagnostic tasks

Task 1. Multiple-source historical investigation

Students receive three sources concerning the same event - for example, an official political document, a personal testimony, and a later historical interpretation.

They are asked to:

1. identify the origin and purpose of each source;
2. evaluate its evidentiary value and limitations;
3. identify similarities and contradictions;
4. contextualize the sources;
5. construct a conclusion supported by evidence.

This task primarily measures methodological-analytical and interpretative competence and is consistent with source-based approaches to historical reasoning and assessment [6, 7, 17].

Task 2. Causal explanation

Students answer a problem such as:

“Why did this historical transformation occur, and which causes were most significant?”

A high-quality response should distinguish between structural conditions, medium-term developments, immediate causes, human agency, and triggering events rather than provide an undifferentiated list [9, 10].

Task 3. Historical perspective-taking

Students are presented with a historically controversial decision and asked:

“How might this decision have appeared reasonable or necessary to different actors living at that time?”

The task assesses whether the student can reconstruct historical perspectives without automatically imposing present-day assumptions [5, 8, 11].

Task 4. Historiographical comparison

Students compare two historians’ interpretations of the same event and identify:

- the central thesis of each;
- evidence used;
- differences in causal explanation;
- different actors emphasized;
- strengths and limitations of each interpretation.

Such a task is particularly suitable for assessing awareness of the interpretative and evidentiary character of historical knowledge [5, 12, 16].

Task 5. Pedagogical transformation

Students transform a complex historical problem into a classroom inquiry.

For example:

“Design a 45-minute lesson in which secondary-school pupils examine whether a particular historical reform should be interpreted primarily as political modernization, social control, or a combination of both.”

The student must select sources, formulate questions, anticipate misconceptions, and create assessment criteria.

This activity allows historical reasoning and professional pedagogical competence to be assessed simultaneously [4, 18].

4. Developmental levels of historical thinking

On the basis of the theoretical synthesis, three developmental levels are proposed.

Table 2. Proposed developmental levels

Level	Characteristics
Low: Reproductive	Primarily reproduces textbook information; treats sources as transparent carriers of facts; provides monocausal explanations; has difficulty contextualizing historical actors; relies heavily on ready-made interpretations.
Medium: Interpretative	Recognizes relationships between events; performs partial source analysis; identifies several perspectives; demonstrates basic contextualization but may have difficulty independently evaluating

	competing interpretations or constructing a fully evidence-based argument.
High: Creative-analytical	Critically evaluates and corroborates sources; provides contextualized and multicausal explanations; compares perspectives and historiographical interpretations; constructs evidence-based arguments; reflects on limitations of knowledge and transforms historical reasoning into pedagogically meaningful tasks.

Source: Author's conceptualization.

The numerical boundaries originally proposed for diagnostic use - 40–60% for the reproductive level, 61–80% for the interpretative level, and 81–100% for the creative-analytical level - should be treated as provisional interpretive bands rather than empirically validated cut-off scores.

Before these percentages are used for high-stakes assessment, the instrument should undergo empirical validation, including expert review, pilot testing, examination of internal consistency, inter-rater reliability, construct validity, and appropriate cut-score determination [17].

This distinction is essential because theoretically proposed developmental levels and statistically validated scoring thresholds are not identical methodological constructs.

5. Suggested analytic rubric

A four-point rubric may be used for each criterion:

- 1 – Insufficient: The performance provides little evidence of disciplinary historical reasoning.
- 2 – Basic/Reproductive: The student demonstrates factual knowledge but limited independent analysis.
- 3 – Competent/Interpretative: The student analyses evidence, contextualizes events, and produces reasoned interpretations with some limitations.
- 4 – Advanced/Creative-analytical: The student consistently integrates source criticism, contextualization, multiperspectivity, evidence-based argumentation, reflection, and pedagogical application.

If four major criteria are assessed, the raw score may range from 4 to 16. More detailed rubrics may divide each criterion into several sub-indicators.

Within the proposed framework, an analytic rubric makes it possible to identify not only whether performance is weak or strong but also which dimensions require further development - for example,

sourcing, contextualization, interpretation, ethical judgement, or pedagogical reflection [17].

DISCUSSION

The framework developed in this study supports the view that historical thinking is not a single cognitive skill but a coordinated combination of disciplinary practices. This conclusion corresponds closely with the conceptualization of historical reasoning in which questioning, source use, contextualization, argumentation, substantive concepts, and metahistorical concepts function as interacting elements [1].

The methodological-analytical criterion also aligns with empirical research on disciplinary reading. Nokes et al. demonstrated the importance of explicitly teaching heuristics for interpreting historical texts [6], while Reisman showed that document-based instruction can shift history learning away from textbook-dependent reproduction toward disciplinary inquiry [7].

These findings have direct implications for teacher education. If pre-service teachers themselves have limited experience evaluating primary and secondary sources, their capacity to develop comparable competencies among school pupils may also be constrained. Assessment of future history teachers should therefore incorporate authentic disciplinary and source-based activities [4, 18].

The importance of contextualization in the present model is supported by Huijgen et al., who conceptualized the ability to situate historical phenomena within temporal, spatial, and social contexts as a domain-specific history competency [8]. Contextualization is especially important for avoiding presentism, because learners may interpret historical actors using current knowledge and assumptions that were unavailable to people in the past [3, 8]. A competent future teacher must recognize this problem

and design instruction that reconstructs relevant historical contexts.

The interpretative-multiperspectival criterion addresses another central challenge. History simultaneously involves factual constraints and interpretative processes. This creates an epistemological difficulty for both pupils and teachers. Wansink et al. describe this tension as a “certainty paradox” among student history teachers: educators are expected to teach pupils that historical accounts are interpretations while also demonstrating that not every interpretation is equally justified [13].

The proposed framework addresses this difficulty by treating interpretation as evidence-constrained reasoning. The ability to acknowledge multiple interpretations does not require epistemological relativism. Instead, students should learn to assess interpretations by examining the quality and relevance of evidence, contextual coherence, explanatory power, and methodological reasoning [5, 12, 16].

Research on epistemological beliefs in history education similarly indicates that sophisticated historical reasoning requires students to understand that historical claims are constructed while also being evaluated according to disciplinary criteria [12].

Multiperspectivity is closely related to this issue. The high developmental level in the proposed framework requires future teachers to analyze events from different perspectives rather than adopt a single predetermined narrative. The findings of Kropman et al. are important because they indicate that the inclusion of multiple perspectives in learning materials can influence the range and nuance of perspectives represented by students [11].

For teacher education, this suggests that historical thinking is shaped not only by learners’ abilities but also by curriculum design, source selection, textbook structure, teacher questioning, and classroom discourse [11, 18].

The axiological-ethical criterion extends historical reasoning into the domain of historical significance, collective memory, values, and responsibility. This dimension is particularly important in contexts where history contributes to citizenship, cultural identity, and national memory [5, 17].

However, value-oriented history education requires

methodological caution. An emphasis on values should not replace evidence-based historical inquiry. Future teachers need to distinguish between understanding why historical actors acted as they did and ethically evaluating the consequences of those actions. Historical perspective-taking should not become moral approval, just as moral disagreement should not eliminate the need for contextual understanding [5, 16, 17].

The reflective-pedagogical/prognostic criterion constitutes the most teacher-education-specific component of the framework. Existing historical-thinking models frequently focus primarily on the reasoning of school students. Pre-service teachers, however, operate at two levels simultaneously: they must think historically themselves and be able to organize conditions in which others learn to think historically [4, 18].

Research on teacher education supports this distinction. Monte-Sano and Cochran show that prospective teachers must coordinate disciplinary content, pedagogical concerns, and understanding of learners [4]. Voet and De Wever likewise found important relationships between teachers’ conceptions of historical inquiry, beliefs about the nature of history, and classroom practice [18].

The proposed framework therefore considers the ability to design an evidence-based historical inquiry task as a higher-level professional indicator than simply performing such an inquiry personally.

This distinction is significant for professional assessment. A student may be capable of producing a sophisticated historical essay but still struggle to transform the same reasoning into age-appropriate questions, source sets, assessment criteria, or productive classroom dialogue.

The framework also has practical significance for teacher education in Uzbekistan. National educational reforms emphasize improvement in pedagogical preparation, modern educational programmes, incorporation of advanced international experience, scientific research, and stronger connections among higher education, science, and professional practice [14]. Uzbek methodological literature also emphasizes the use of interactive and problem-oriented approaches in history teaching [15]. A criterion-based historical-thinking framework can therefore contribute to shifting

evaluation from predominantly reproductive knowledge assessment toward competence-oriented professional diagnosis.

The framework may be incorporated into:

- history teaching methodology courses;
- teaching practicums;
- microteaching;
- portfolio assessment;
- source-analysis seminars;
- final qualification assessments;
- professional competence diagnostics.

At the same time, the proposed model should not be interpreted as a completed standardized instrument.

Several methodological limitations must be acknowledged.

First, the framework is theoretical and requires empirical validation.

Second, the four criteria may overlap during authentic historical reasoning. For example, a source-comparison task may simultaneously involve contextualization, interpretation, ethical judgement, and reflection. Such interdependence is consistent with multidimensional conceptions of historical reasoning [1, 17].

Third, historical performance may vary depending on the historical topic, students' prior knowledge, and the characteristics of the learning materials. The influence of textual and representational characteristics has also been demonstrated in research on multiperspectivity [11].

Fourth, language and disciplinary literacy may influence historical reasoning performance. Weak written expression may obscure sophisticated historical understanding, while fluent expression does not by itself guarantee sophisticated disciplinary reasoning. The relationship between language, procedural knowledge, and historical-thinking assessment therefore requires careful attention [17].

Fifth, cultural and curricular contexts may influence what counts as historically significant and which controversial historical topics are suitable for classroom assessment [5, 17].

Future research should therefore test the framework with samples of pre-service history teachers from

several higher education institutions. Expert validation could first be used to examine content validity. Pilot testing could then evaluate task difficulty and rubric clarity. Inter-rater reliability would be particularly important for essay, source-analysis, and portfolio tasks [17].

Subsequent studies may employ factor analysis to examine whether the four proposed dimensions emerge empirically and whether they are sufficiently distinct. Relationships between historical thinking scores, academic achievement, pedagogical competence, teaching practicum performance, and epistemological beliefs may also be investigated.

Such empirical work would transform the current conceptual framework into a validated diagnostic instrument suitable for broader application.

CONCLUSION

The development of historical thinking among pre-service history teachers is a fundamental condition for improving the quality of history education. Professional competence in this field cannot be adequately assessed by measuring factual knowledge alone. Future history teachers must be capable of investigating evidence, contextualizing historical phenomena, identifying causal relationships, comparing perspectives, evaluating competing interpretations, constructing evidence-based arguments, reflecting on their own reasoning, and converting disciplinary practices into effective teaching strategies.

Based on an integrative analysis of international history education research and the professional context of teacher education, this study proposes four criteria for assessing historical thinking: methodological-analytical, interpretative-multiperspectival, axiological-ethical, and reflective-pedagogical/prognostic.

The methodological-analytical criterion evaluates disciplinary inquiry through source criticism, corroboration, contextualization, causal analysis, and argumentation. The interpretative-multiperspectival criterion measures the ability to compare perspectives and evidence-based interpretations. The axiological-ethical criterion addresses historical significance, values, collective memory, and responsible judgement. The reflective-pedagogical/prognostic criterion connects historical reasoning with metacognition and the professional capacity to design learning

experiences.

Three qualitative developmental levels - reproductive, interpretative, and creative-analytical - are also proposed. These levels offer a preliminary structure for diagnosing students' progression from factual reproduction toward independent and professionally applicable historical reasoning.

The principal contribution of the framework lies in combining disciplinary historical thinking with the professional competencies of future teachers. Historical thinking is therefore conceptualized not merely as the ability to understand the past but as the ability to critically investigate it, justify interpretations, recognize complexity, and teach others to do the same.

The framework can serve as a theoretical basis for developing assessment rubrics, source-based diagnostic tasks, portfolios, microteaching criteria, and future empirical instruments. Its next stage of development should involve systematic expert evaluation and empirical validation among pre-service history teachers.

REFERENCES

1. Van Drie, J., & Van Boxtel, C. (2008). Historical reasoning: Towards a framework for analyzing students' reasoning about the past. *Educational Psychology Review*, 20(2), 87–110. doi:10.1007/s10648-007-9056-1.
2. Thorp, R., & Persson, A. (2020). On historical thinking and the history educational challenge. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 52(8), 891–901. doi:10.1080/00131857.2020.1712550.
3. Wineburg, S. (2001). *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts: Charting the Future of Teaching the Past*. Temple University Press.
4. Monte-Sano, C., & Cochran, M. (2009). Attention to learners, subject, or teaching: What takes precedence as preservice candidates learn to teach historical thinking and reading? *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 37(1), 101–135. doi:10.1080/00933104.2009.10473389.
5. Seixas, P., & Morton, T. (2013). *The Big Six Historical Thinking Concepts*. Nelson Education.
6. Nokes, J. D., Dole, J. A., & Hacker, D. J. (2007). Teaching high school students to use heuristics while reading historical texts. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(3), 492–504. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.99.3.492.
7. Reisman, A. (2012). Reading like a historian: A document-based history curriculum intervention in urban high schools. *Cognition and Instruction*, 30(1), 86–112. doi:10.1080/07370008.2011.634081.
8. Huijgen, T., Van de Grift, W., Van Boxtel, C., & Holthuis, P. (2017). Teaching historical contextualization: The construction of a reliable observation instrument. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 32(2), 159–181. doi:10.1007/s10212-016-0295-8.
9. Stoel, G. L., Van Drie, J. P., & Van Boxtel, C. A. M. (2015). Teaching towards historical expertise: Developing a pedagogy for fostering causal reasoning in history. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 47(1), 49–76. doi:10.1080/00220272.2014.968212.
10. Stoel, G. L., Van Drie, J. P., & Van Boxtel, C. A. M. (2017). The effects of explicit teaching of strategies, second-order concepts, and epistemological underpinnings on students' ability to reason causally in history. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 109(3), 321–337. doi:10.1037/edu0000143.
11. Kropman, M., Van Drie, J., & Van Boxtel, C. (2023). The influence of multiperspectivity in history texts on students' representations of a historical event. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 38, 1295–1315. doi:10.1007/s10212-022-00644-7.
12. Stoel, G. L., Logtenberg, A., Wansink, B. G. J., Huijgen, T., Van Boxtel, C., & Van Drie, J. (2017). Measuring epistemological beliefs in history education: An exploration of naïve and nuanced beliefs. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 83, 120–134. doi:10.1016/j.ijer.2017.03.003.
13. Wansink, B. G. J., Akkerman, S. F., & Wubbels, T. (2016). The certainty paradox of student history teachers: Balancing between historical facts and interpretation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 56, 94–105. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2016.02.005.
14. President of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (2022). Resolution No. PQ-289 of June 21, 2022, on measures to improve the quality of pedagogical education and further develop higher educational

institutions training pedagogical personnel.
Tashkent, Uzbekistan.

15. Toshpo'latova, S. S. (2024). Tarix fanini o'qitishda samarali metodlar [Effective methods in teaching history]. *Modern Science and Research*, 3(11), 774–782. doi:10.5281/zenodo.14205716.
16. Lévesque, S. (2008). *Thinking Historically: Educating Students for the Twenty-First Century*. University of Toronto Press.
17. Ercikan, K., & Seixas, P. (Eds.). (2015). *New Directions in Assessing Historical Thinking*. Routledge. doi:10.4324/9781315779539.
18. Voet, M., & De Wever, B. (2016). History teachers' conceptions of inquiry-based learning, beliefs about the nature of history, and their relation to the classroom context. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 55, 57–67. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2015.12.008.