



# CRITERIA AND INDICATORS FOR ASSESSING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PATRIOTIC EDUCATION

Xamidov Amin Abdulloevich

Independent Researcher of the Karakalpakstan branch of the Research Institute of Pedagogical Sciences of Uzbekistan named after Qori Niyoziy Nukus, Uzbekistan, Karakalpakstan

## Abstract

This article substantiates a criteria-and-indicators framework for assessing the effectiveness of patriotic education in general secondary schools. The research aim is to design a measurable model (criteria, indicators, and data-collection tools) aligned with national policy documents and international civic education frameworks. Methods include document analysis, structuring outcomes across “knowledge–values–behaviour” components, and designing a mixed assessment approach (tests, questionnaires, observations, portfolios). The main result is an indicator matrix suitable for school-level monitoring and feedback. Conclusions address validity, transparency, and ethical requirements for educational evaluation.

**Keywords:** Patriotic education; effectiveness; criteria; indicators; civic education; values; student engagement; monitoring; assessment design; school climate; mixed methods.

## Introduction

Within national education policies (including those of Uzbekistan), patriotic education is institutionalized not merely as an “extracurricular” activity but as an integral component of a holistic education and upbringing system, requiring systematic planning, monitoring, and managerial accountability. In particular, the introduction of the school subject “Tarbiya” was justified by the objective of fostering students’ universal values more deeply and “educating them in the spirit



of patriotism and humanism,” as well as by the need to modernize the organization of moral and character education in schools [4].

At the same time, state концепции военно-патриотического воспитания молодежи establish outcome-oriented benchmarks (e.g., the development of loyalty to the readiness to fulfill civic duties and constitutional obligations) and explicitly mandate regular monitoring and reporting within the framework of policy “roadmaps.” However, the practical question of how to operationalize and measure the effectiveness of patriotic education remains complex: what is amenable to assessment are not slogans or declarative statements, but rather measurable indicators such as domain-specific knowledge, value orientations, behavioral patterns, and manifestations of civic responsibility within the school environment and broader community. In the scholarly literature on the pedagogy of patriotism, evaluative frameworks frequently emphasize target criteria, with particular salience attributed to the axiological dimension (hierarchies of value orientations) and the behavioral dimension (readiness to engage in collective action through communication, collaboration, and active civic participation) [6].

### **Literature Review**

The regulatory framework of Uzbekistan simultaneously delineates the substantive content of educational objectives and the requirements for organizational oversight. The Law on Education conceptualizes the educational environment as one that ensures high effectiveness of both the instructional process and spiritual–moral development, while also institutionalizing mechanisms for the assessment of knowledge and competencies. Within the domain of youth policy, the Law on State Youth Policy formalizes the necessity of monitoring and evaluation—including at the level of local governance—as instruments for enhancing the effectiveness of youth engagement initiatives. A key policy instrument at the school level is the resolution on the phased introduction of the subject “Tarbiya,” which is positioned as an integrated curriculum (incorporating, inter alia, “Odobnoma,” “Vatan tuyg‘usi,” and “Milliy istiqlol g‘oyasi...”). Its conceptual framework is explicitly aligned with state educational standards, the structure of qualification requirements, competency-based outcomes, and assessment procedures [4].



In the domain of spiritual–moral education, the resolution on the “Uzluksiz ma’naviy tarbiya konsepsiyasi” directs pedagogical interventions toward the formation of stable personal dispositions and an early-age orientation toward national traditions, which is methodologically significant for constructing age-differentiated “indicator ladders.” The military-patriotic dimension is articulated through conceptual frameworks that define education as a multi-level, systemic activity of both state and society, aimed at fostering loyalty to the الوطن, readiness to fulfill civic duties, and the capacity to safeguard societal and state interests. [5] In the current концепция for 2023–2027, outcomes are operationalized in terms of anticipated personal and social effects, ranging from increased prestige of military service and civic consciousness to the strengthening of “ideological immunity” and family values [10].

International research in civic education provides a useful “mapping” of measurable domains. For instance, the ICCS (International Civic and Citizenship Education Study) framework structures assessment around cognitive outcomes (civic knowledge and reasoning) and affective-behavioral outcomes (attitudes and engagement), while also accounting for antecedent factors and educational processes. [11] Approaches to evaluating democratic competencies and civic culture in the Council of Europe’s frameworks emphasize the integration of pedagogy, assessment, and a whole-school approach, thereby recognizing the importance of the broader educational environment. [12] A comparable logic underpins the assessment of “global competence” in OECD studies, where evaluation encompasses both cognitive components and survey-based measures of contextual and attitudinal characteristics, which is methodologically aligned with the measurement of civic and patriotic orientations [13].

## Methodology

Methodologically, it is advisable to conceptualize the evaluation of patriotic education effectiveness as a mixed-methods design that integrates quantitative and qualitative data sources, enabling triangulation of findings. Such an approach encompasses knowledge testing, measurement of value orientations, behavioral observation, and analysis of educational artifacts (e.g., portfolios). This design aligns with international civic education frameworks, in which cognitive outcomes are assessed alongside attitudes and engagement.



To operationalize the value–semantic component, pedagogical research frequently employs psychosemantic methodologies. For instance, a dissertation study on the patriotic education of upper secondary students employed an adapted version of the “personal differential” technique to identify the degree of internalization of civic-patriotic values, involving the construction of semantic units and expert calibration procedures [6].

Regarding the behavioral component, in addition to student self-reports, observable indicators are of critical importance. These include participation in collective activities (“common cause”), constructive communication, collaboration, and the demonstration of an active civic stance—characteristics that are consistently identified in the literature as constituting the core of the behavioral criterion. 6 At the same time, frameworks on democratic culture competencies recommend portfolio-based and descriptor-driven approaches, which allow for documenting progress in skills, attitudes, and values through evidence of student activity and reflective practices.

From the perspective of the management cycle, it is methodologically appropriate to differentiate evaluation across multiple levels: (a) the student level (learning outcomes), (b) the school level (organizational structures and environment), and (c) the level of interagency programs (monitoring of roadmaps and reporting). This multilevel logic is explicitly reflected in the 2023–2027 framework, which institutionalizes quarterly reporting by implementing bodies, systematic monitoring of implementation processes, and the conduct of studies aimed at assessing youth opinions for evaluating overall effectiveness.

## **Results and Discussion**

An operationally viable model of effectiveness should establish a clear linkage between “normatively articulated objectives” and measurable indicators. In the context of Uzbekistan, this entails that indicators demonstrate alignment, at a minimum, with: (1) the objectives of the school subject “Tarbiya” (i.e., the cultivation of patriotism and humanism, the formation of civic identity, competencies, and assessment procedures); (2) the objectives of military-patriotic frameworks (including loyalty to the nation, civic duty, and resilience to radical ideologies); and (3) the monitoring and feedback mechanisms institutionalized

within “roadmaps.” The following section proposes a matrix of criteria and indicators that may be employed both for school-level (internal) monitoring and for reporting on character education programs.

**Table 1 Criteria and indicators at the student level**

Result component	Criteria (what we evaluate)	Examples of measurable indicators (what we record)	Main tools
Cognitive	Civic and patriotic knowledge and understanding	Knowledge of norms and responsibilities of citizenship; understanding the role of government institutions; knowledge of national history and cultural symbols; solving "civic choice" cases	Thematic test + situational tasks (cases); mini-essay with grading rubric
Value-semantic	A hierarchy of values, where civic and patriotic values occupy leading positions	priority of "service to society/country" among life goals; stability of attitudes such as "responsibility, respect for traditions, civic duty"; consistency of values and behavior	attitude scales (Likert); psychosemantic "personality differential"; interview/focus group (point validation)
Behavioral	Readiness to participate in a common cause and an active position	regular participation in school/social initiatives; volunteering/assistance to the community; participation in student government; fulfilling social roles in projects	achievement portfolio; participation records (journals, certificates); homeroom teacher "activity map"
Social and communicative (as part of behavioral)	Constructive communication and collaboration	Teamwork skills; constructive conflict resolution; adherence to school ethics standards; empathy and respect for others	Observation using a checklist; assessment in group projects; self-assessment/peer assessment using descriptors
"Ideological stability" (target effect of concepts)	Ability to recognize and resist radical/destructive influences	recognition of manipulation and extremist narratives in cases; digital hygiene skills; willingness to seek help from adults/services	situational tasks + short questionnaire; case discussions within the framework of "Tarbiya"

This matrix is fundamentally grounded in a tripartite framework of “knowledge–values–behavior,” aligning with the conceptual logic of international civic education frameworks, which distinguish between cognitive outcomes and affective–behavioral outcomes. Simultaneously, it reflects established research criteria—specifically axiological and behavioral dimensions—commonly employed in pedagogical models of patriotic education.

The effectiveness of school-based education cannot be reduced to an aggregate “average patriotism score.” Rather, it necessitates systematic oversight of contextual conditions and institutional processes, particularly given that national policy frameworks explicitly mandate regular monitoring of “roadmap” implementation, quarterly reporting, and the conduct of youth opinion research. To this end, organizational and process-oriented indicators are introduced:

**Table 2**

Level	Indicators (minimal set)	How to measure
Resources	teacher preparation (courses/methodological support for Tarbiya); availability of plans and programs; partnership with families/community	records of professional development for teachers; audits of plans and programs; partnership map with families/community
Processes	regularity and diversity of educational activities; student self-governance engagement; adherence to the principle of “holistic education and upbringing”	calendar of events; self-governance protocols; internal expert assessment of lessons/activities
Outcomes / Feedback	school monitoring of “Tarbiya” effectiveness; analysis and adjustment of results based on research findings	monitoring reports; pedagogical councils; program adjustments based on data
Outcomes / Feedback	school monitoring of “Tarbiya” effectiveness; analysis and adjustment of results based on research findings	monitoring reports; pedagogical councils; program adjustments based on data

A feasible implementation scenario at the school level could be conceptualized as follows. First, diagnostic assessment should be embedded within the “Tarbiya” curriculum by assigning, for each educational stage (primary, lower secondary, upper secondary), a concise set of evaluative instruments—such as a standardized test, a case-based task, and a mini-portfolio. This approach is consistent with the “Tarbiya” framework, which prescribes phased progression through minimum requirements, competency benchmarks, and structured assessment procedures [12].

Second, assessment indicators should be aligned with the objectives of military-patriotic education frameworks. For instance, dedicated scales may be employed to operationalize constructs such as “pride in the armed forces/readiness for



service” and “civic disposition,” as these are explicitly identified as expected outcomes in the 2023–2027 policy framework.

Third, a cyclical monitoring and feedback mechanism should be instituted. On a quarterly basis, aggregated (non-identifiable) data should be collected and analyzed to compare trends across classes and cohorts, thereby informing evidence-based program adjustments. This iterative process mirrors the systemic monitoring and youth opinion research envisaged in the policy “roadmap” for evaluating program effectiveness.

Crucially, assessment indicators must function as formative tools for enhancing the educational environment rather than as punitive metrics. International competency frameworks for democratic culture emphasize the importance of pedagogically sound and ethically grounded assessment practices integrated across the whole-school context.

## Conclusion

Thus, an evaluation system for the effectiveness of patriotic education in schools should meet several methodological and governance requirements: (1) regulatory alignment with the objectives of the “Tarbiya” framework as well as youth and military-patriotic policies; (2) a tripartite methodological structure encompassing cognitive (knowledge), axiological (values), and behavioral domains; (3) a multi-source evidence base, including tests, surveys, observations, and student portfolios; and (4) integration into a continuous cycle of monitoring and program improvement. The proposed matrix of criteria and indicators operationalizes otherwise abstract educational aims into observable and comparable outcomes while maintaining pedagogical validity. Within this framework, the value-based (axiological) criterion is conceptualized as the salience of civic and patriotic values within an individual’s hierarchy of orientations, whereas the behavioral criterion is defined as the readiness to engage in collective action, manifested through communication, collaboration, and an active civic stance.

## References

1. UDC 37.035 “Social Education”, subsection 37.035.6 “National, Folk, and Patriotic Education.”
2. Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. 422, dated July 6, 2020. On the phased introduction of the subject “Tarbiya” in

- general secondary educational institutions (objectives, structure, competencies, and assessment procedures).
3. Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. 267, dated June 29, 2023. On the Concept for 2023–2027 aimed at improving the effectiveness of military-patriotic education (monitoring and evaluation of effectiveness).
  4. Concept “Yoshlarni harbiy-vatanparvarlik ruhida tarbiyalash” (definition, goals, objectives, principles, and methods).
  5. Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. 1059, dated December 31, 2019. “Uzluksiz ma’naviy tarbiya konsepsiyasi” (priority areas of spiritual and moral education).
  6. Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan “On Education” (No. O’RQ-637, September 23, 2020) (definitions and regulatory framework of education and upbringing).
  7. Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan “On State Youth Policy” (No. O’RQ-406, September 14, 2016) (monitoring and evaluation of youth policy effectiveness).
  8. UNESCO. Global Citizenship Education: Topics and Learning Objectives. Paris: UNESCO.
  9. International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA). ICCS 2016 Assessment Framework. Amsterdam: IEA.
  10. UNESCO. Global Citizenship Education (GCED): International Framework (pedagogical guidelines and learning outcomes of civic education).
  11. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). PISA 2018 Global Competence Framework/Handbook. Paris: OECD Publishing.
  12. Council of Europe. Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture: A Teacher’s Guide. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
  13. Datskiy, V. A. Patriotic Education of Senior School Students in the Teaching and Educational Process of a General Secondary School. Cand. Sci. (Pedagogy) dissertation. Moscow, 2006.