BG Pulse Journal USA
ISSN:1947-2536 http://www.bgpulseusa.com/index.php/bg
BG PULSE JOURNAL

TA’LIM TASHKILOTLARIDA LIDERLIK SALOHIYATINI RIVOJLANTIRISH VA BOSHQARISH MEXANIZMLARI

Ergasheva Shohsanam Qodirjon qizi

Toshkent shahridagi Puchon universiteti

70410801 – Menejment: Ta’lim menejmenti mutaxassisligi 1-bosqich magistr talabasi

Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24016603

Annotatsiya. Maqolada ta’lim tashkilotlarida liderlik salohiyatini rivojlantirishning nazariy asoslari va uni boshqarish mexanizmlari tahlil qilinadi. Liderlik va menejment tushunchalarining o‘zaro nisbati, rahbarning liderlik salohiyati tarkibi (kognitiv, shaxsiy-axloqiy, ijtimoiy-kommunikativ va strategik komponentlar) yoritilgan. Xorijiy tadqiqotlar va mahalliy normativ hujjatlar tahlili asosida normativ-institutsional, tanlov va zaxira shakllantirish, kasbiy rivojlantirish, motivatsion-baholash hamda tashkiliy madaniyat mexanizmlaridan iborat yaxlit model taklif etiladi. Maqolaning oxirida O‘zbekiston ta’lim tizimi sharoitida mazkur mexanizmlarni joriy etishga oid amaliy tavsiyalar keltirilgan.

Kalit so‘zlar: ta’lim menejmenti, liderlik salohiyati, maktab direktori, transformatsion liderlik, taqsimlangan liderlik, kasbiy rivojlanish, boshqaruv mexanizmi.

Аннотация. В статье рассматриваются теоретические основы развития лидерского потенциала в образовательных организациях и механизмы управления этим процессом. Раскрыта структура лидерского потенциала руководителя, предложена модель, включающая нормативно-институциональный, кадровый, профессионально-развивающий, мотивационно-оценочный механизмы и механизм формирования организационной культуры. Даны практические рекомендации для системы образования Узбекистана.

Ключевые слова: менеджмент образования, лидерский потенциал, директор школы, трансформационное лидерство, распределённое лидерство, профессиональное развитие.

Abstract. The article analyses the theoretical foundations of leadership capacity development in educational institutions and the management mechanisms that support it. It describes the structure of a school leader’s leadership capacity and proposes a five-component model: normative-institutional, selection and succession, professional development, motivational-evaluative, and organizational culture mechanisms. Practical recommendations are offered for the education system of Uzbekistan.

Keywords: educational management, leadership capacity, school principal, transformational leadership, distributed leadership, professional development.

Introduction

Ongoing changes in the education system have fundamentally altered the requirements placed on school and university leaders. Only a few years ago, the head of a school or higher education institution was mainly occupied with carrying out top-down instructions, maintaining documentation, and ensuring discipline. Today, however, an institution enjoys a degree of autonomy: it designs its own development programme, seeks partners, builds a teaching team, and is accountable for results. Both the Law “On Education” and the Concept for the Development of

the Public Education System until 2030 identify improvement of governance, greater independence of educational organizations, and increased responsibility of leaders as distinct priorities.

In practice, a marked gap remains between these requirements and leaders' actual preparedness. Often a strong classroom teacher is appointed deputy principal and later principal, yet without specialized preparation in team management, strategic planning, or overcoming resistance to change. A good teacher does not automatically become a good leader; the two roles demand different skills. Leadership capacity must therefore be treated not as a casually acquired trait, but as a resource that can be purposefully developed and managed.

The aim of the study is to identify the theoretical foundations for developing leadership capacity in educational organizations and to substantiate systemic mechanisms for managing it. To achieve this aim, the following tasks were set: to distinguish the concepts of leadership and management; to determine the structural components of an education leader's leadership capacity; to classify mechanisms for capacity development; and to outline problems and solutions for implementing them in Uzbekistan. The study employed comparative analysis of scholarly literature, review of regulatory documents, a systems approach, and modelling methods.

Leadership and Management: The Relationship between the Concepts

Views on leadership have evolved for more than a century. Early research sought innate traits of outstanding individuals; later attention shifted to behavioural styles and then to contingency approaches. At the present stage, leadership is more often explained as a process—an emergent phenomenon arising from interaction between the leader and the team. The leader's personal qualities matter, but they are not the sole factor.

J. Kotter's distinction is frequently cited: management is associated with keeping a complex system in order, whereas leadership is associated with directing change. A manager plans, allocates resources, and exercises control; a leader sets direction, persuades people to follow it, and inspires them. In education this distinction is even clearer, because the "product" is not an object but people—teachers' professional pathways and students' futures. Analysing theories of educational administration, T. Bush notes that leadership is grounded in values and purpose, while management rests on orderly, effective operation; in practice, however, the two must complement each other.

It is important not to set these concepts in opposition. An "inspiring" leader without clear organizational order may lead a team into a dead end, while a "technically efficient" leader without values cannot develop an institution. In this article, leadership capacity is understood as a leader's ability to combine managerial authority with leadership competencies in order to guide a team toward shared goals and manage change facing the institution.

Several models of educational leadership are widely discussed in the literature. Transformational leadership, tracing back to the work of J. Burns and B. Bass, focuses on a leader's capacity to orient team members toward goals beyond self-interest and to raise their motivation and moral maturity. K. Leithwood and D. Jantzi adapted this approach to schools and substantiated its impact on school improvement. A second model is instructional leadership, in which the principal places teaching quality, pedagogy, and student outcomes at the centre of practice. In a 2008 meta-analysis, V. Robinson and colleagues found that instructional leadership has a substantially stronger effect on student outcomes than transformational leadership. The practical implication is clear: what determines school results is not eloquent rhetoric but the leader's contribution to the quality of teaching.

A third approach is distributed leadership. As J. Spillane emphasizes, leadership is not a property of a single person but emerges in the interaction among the leader, teachers, and the situation. A. Harris's research shows that change is more sustainable in institutions where authority is reasonably shared among team members. A modern educational organization is so complex that it cannot realistically be carried on one person's shoulders.

2. Structure of an Education Leader's Leadership Capacity

The notion of "capacity" includes not only what a leader can do at present, but also what can be achieved through development. From this perspective, leadership capacity should be viewed as a system of interrelated components. Drawing on literature analysis and practical observation, we consider it appropriate to distinguish four components.

The first is the cognitive–strategic component. It is defined by the leader's ability to analyse the institutional environment, formulate long-term goals and a development programme, and make evidence-informed decisions. Assessing education quality, interpreting statistical indicators, and drawing conclusions from them also belong here. The second is the personal–ethical component: integrity, fairness, readiness to acknowledge one's own mistakes, and the ability to serve as a model for the team. In education, personal example is especially important because teachers trust what a leader does more than what a leader says.

The third is the socio-communicative component. It includes listening, exchanging ideas, resolving conflicts, and cooperating with parents and the wider community. Problems often arise precisely here: a leader may be right, yet unable to convey the message to the team or may face teacher resistance. The fourth is the change-management component. It denotes the capacity to introduce new ideas, prepare the team for innovation, and turn the organization into a learning culture. M. Fullan stresses that the success of change often depends less on the innovation itself than on how people receive it; therefore a leader must work first of all with people.

Institution type and level must also be considered when developing leadership capacity. The duties of a general secondary school principal differ markedly from those of a university department head or a preschool director. In schools, leaders focus more on instructional quality, parental engagement, and teachers' professional growth; in higher education, research, international cooperation, and academic freedom come to the fore. Yet the core meaning of leadership remains the same: uniting people around shared values and motivating action without excessive command. The proposed components are therefore universal and can be enriched to fit a specific education sector.

Each component may be developed to a different degree, so a one-size-fits-all approach is ineffective. One leader may need stronger strategic thinking; another may need to work on communication culture. This creates a need for prior diagnosis of capacity. On the basis of diagnostic results an individual development roadmap is drawn up, and subsequent mechanisms are activated accordingly.

At the diagnostic stage various tools may be used: a leader's self-assessment questionnaire, feedback from colleagues and staff, practical case tasks, and analysis of the institution's development plan. Crucially, the process must serve development rather than control; otherwise leaders will try to give "correct" answers and the real picture will remain hidden. For diagnostics to be trustworthy, results should be discussed openly with the leader and used as the basis for the next development plan.

3. Management Mechanisms for Developing Leadership Capacity

By "mechanism" we mean a set of interrelated tools, rules, and processes aimed at forming capacity. Analysis shows that an isolated measure—for example, a one-off professional development course—does not yield lasting results. Studying leadership's impact on student achievement, K. Leithwood and colleagues ranked it second among school-based factors after teachers' classroom practice; research led by C. Day found strong leadership in nearly all successful schools. Effort invested in developing leaders therefore returns directly as education quality. Mechanisms must consequently work as a system. A five-mechanism model is proposed below (Table 1).

Table 1. Management mechanisms for developing leadership capacity

Mechanism	Core content	Expected outcome
Normative–institutional	Qualification requirements; boundaries of authority and responsibility; attestation procedures	Clear requirements for leadership posts that encompass leadership competencies
Selection and talent pool	Competency-based selection; reserve of promising staff	A steady flow of candidates ready for appointment
Professional development	Learning modules, mentoring, professional communities	Sustainable growth of practical management skills
Motivational–evaluative	Multi-criteria assessment, 360-degree feedback, incentives	Leader behaviour oriented toward results
Organizational culture	Distributed leadership; a climate of trust and openness	Emergence of new leaders within the institution

The normative–institutional mechanism creates the legal and organizational foundation for leadership development. It defines qualification requirements for leadership posts, boundaries of authority and responsibility, and attestation procedures. The key point is that requirements must also cover leadership skills. If documents mention only seniority and formal education, the system will prepare leaders accordingly. The move toward more autonomous governance expands a leader's authority while also increasing accountability for results; therefore the balance of authority and responsibility must be clearly defined.

The selection and talent-pool mechanism provides for early identification and preparation of suitable candidates. In advanced education systems, completion of a specialized programme is often required before appointment, and promising teachers are tested in intermediate roles—team leader, subject-method association head—long before a vacancy appears. The essence for us is simple: preparing a leader before appointment is far more effective than training after appointment. At the selection stage, competency-based assessment, practical case tasks, and presentation of a strategic plan reveal a candidate's real potential more fully.

The professional development mechanism is the broadest and combines several forms. First, systematic learning programmes: modules on management, finance, law, and observation and analysis of the teaching process. Second, mentoring and coaching: an experienced leader regularly supports a younger colleague and jointly analyses difficult situations. Third, professional communities among leaders—experience exchange, inter-institutional visits, and peer observation.

According to A. Hargreaves and M. Fullan, the most powerful form of professional development is not solitary study but learning with colleagues—collectively building what they call "professional capital." In practical terms, this mechanism requires reducing the share of theoretical lectures and increasing problem-solving activities focused on real challenges.

The motivational–evaluative mechanism aims to encourage leadership behaviour and to assess results fairly. If appraisal considers only formal indicators—enrolment and mastery rates, submission of documents—the leader will also invest effort only in those indicators. The appraisal system should therefore also include dynamics of student achievement, teachers' professional growth, the psychological climate of the team, and parental and teacher satisfaction. 360-degree assessment—reviewing the leader's work from the perspectives of senior management, peers, and staff—is also effective, especially when its purpose is clearly defined as development rather than punishment. Material and non-material incentives must be linked to concrete results and support the leader's initiative.

The organizational culture mechanism brings all of the above to life. If mistakes are punished and initiative is treated with suspicion, no course will develop leadership capacity. Here the idea of distributed leadership takes practical form: the leader entrusts teachers with project, methodological, or mentoring roles and expands their participation in decisions. New leaders then emerge within the institution, freeing the principal's time for strategic issues. Such a culture does not appear overnight; it forms gradually through the leader's consistent and open actions.

Mentoring deserves separate attention because in practice it often remains formal. Effective mentoring may comprise three stages: initially the mentor helps the new leader understand the institutional environment; in the main stage real decisions are analysed together and the leader is encouraged to act independently; in the final stage the mentor steps back and offers advice only. The mentor must also have leadership experience and be able to analyse that experience; otherwise mentoring merely reproduces old habits.

The limits of the proposed model should also be noted. First, the results of leadership capacity development do not appear immediately: change usually becomes noticeable over several years, so judging by short-term indicators may lead to false conclusions. Second, an institution's internal conditions—including financial capacity, staffing, and regional features—affect how mechanisms work. Third, the leader's personality remains decisive: even the best system cannot turn into a leader someone who does not seek growth. The model's purpose is therefore not to "manufacture" leadership, but to create conditions for development for those who have the desire and ability.

Each mechanism alone has limited impact. For example, an excellent selection system without a development programme will see even strong candidates "burn out" quickly; strong professional development without a weak motivation system will leave newly acquired skills unused. Mechanisms must therefore be introduced sequentially and in alignment, so that each stage's outcome supports the next: diagnosis — selection — development — evaluation — strengthening culture. This is a cyclical process in which evaluation results again inform the renewal of normative requirements and learning programmes.

4. International Experience and Lessons to Be Drawn

The experience of countries that have taken a systemic approach to leadership development shows how mechanisms work in practice. In Singapore, candidates for leadership posts typically progress from teacher to head of department and then to deputy principal, while staff identified as promising

study on a specialized leadership programme at the National Institute of Education. The core idea is that preparation for leadership begins before appointment, proceeds step by step, and is integrated with practice. In England, for many years a national qualification system (NPQH) has standardized leadership competencies and made candidates' preparedness comparable.

The Finnish model emphasizes another aspect: a principal must first hold a teaching qualification and complete additional preparation in educational management, while schools enjoy substantial autonomy and teachers are highly trusted. As a result, the leader develops not as a controller but as a supporter of colleagues' professional work. This experience clearly demonstrates the importance of the organizational culture mechanism: a trust-based climate expands a leader's leadership opportunities.

Direct transfer of foreign experience is not always justified. Every system has formed under its own historical, cultural, and economic conditions; what matters for us is not ready-made templates but the common principles behind them. Across the systems analysed, several similarities stand out: preparation for leadership begins early; theoretical knowledge is combined with practical experience; leader performance is linked to results; and leaders are given both authority and support. Adapting these principles to national conditions is the intended orientation of the proposed model.

Moreover, international research notes that the effectiveness of leadership development programmes is often explained less by content than by how they are organized. Programmes of similar scale and content may produce significant results in one system and almost none in another. The difference usually begins after the programme ends: follow-up of the leader, conditions for applying newly acquired knowledge, and support in cases of setback. This once again confirms the need to view mechanisms not as isolated tools but as a continuous system.

5. Problems and Proposals for Implementation in Uzbekistan

A number of positive steps have been taken in preparing leadership personnel in our country's education system: the retraining system for management staff has been improved; open competitions and attestation procedures for leadership posts have begun to be introduced; and attention to studying international experience has increased. At the same time, comparison with the model discussed above shows that work is still needed in several areas.

The first problem is that leader preparation is often limited to short, largely theoretical professional development courses, with insufficient analysis of real management situations, practical projects, or subsequent follow-up. Courses should be redesigned as part of a continuous process and supplemented with mentoring and practical assignments. The second problem is underdeveloped talent-pool systems. In many institutions no staff member is prepared to take over a leadership post, so when a vacancy arises a rapid but unprepared decision is made.

The third problem concerns criteria for evaluating leader performance. Excessive emphasis on formal reporting indicators pushes leaders to "fit the paperwork." Qualitative indicators and team feedback should be included in appraisal and linked to the leader's development plan. The fourth problem relates to organizational culture: traditions of centralized management reduce initiative among team members. In this situation, the leader's own ability to model distributed leadership becomes decisive.

Taking the above into account, the following practical proposals may be advanced: develop a competency profile for leadership posts that clearly reflects leadership components; form a talent

pool through a "future leaders" programme for promising teachers; assign an experienced mentor to newly appointed leaders for at least one year; establish regional and inter-institutional professional communities of leaders; incorporate 360-degree feedback into the appraisal system as a developmental tool; and introduce formal assignment of leadership roles to teachers within institutions (methodological leadership, projects, mentoring).

Additional attention must be paid to the leader's self-development—critical self-assessment and continuous learning. Any externally provided programme fails if it does not rest on the leader's internal need. The highest aim of the mechanisms is therefore to turn the leader into an active subject of his or her professional pathway: knowing strengths and weaknesses, setting development goals independently, and openly discussing results with colleagues. Only such a leader can also convey a learning-organization culture to the team.

It should be stressed that the effectiveness of these proposals depends on their implementation as a complete system. Working on an isolated measure while other mechanisms are missing may not yield satisfactory results. To assess the concrete effectiveness of the proposed model, subsequent research should include experimental trials, surveys of leaders and teachers, and long-term observation.

Conclusion

The analysis shows that developing leadership capacity in educational organizations is an important direction of today's education policy. First, leadership and management do not negate each other; they must be harmonized as two aspects of a leader's work. Second, an education leader's leadership capacity comprises cognitive–strategic, personal–ethical, socio-communicative, and change-management components, and their development requires an individualized approach. Third, managing capacity requires an integrated system of normative–institutional, selection and talent-pool, professional development, motivational–evaluative, and organizational culture mechanisms. Fourth, implementing this system in Uzbekistan requires turning professional development into a continuous process, forming a talent pool, introducing mentoring, and improving appraisal criteria.

In conclusion, the future of an educational organization depends in many respects on how its leaders are formed. Teachers, students, and parents judge a leader primarily not by the post held but by decisions and conduct. Developing leadership capacity is therefore not a cost but a long-term investment in education quality. Future research should empirically test the effectiveness of the model's individual mechanisms and compare them across education sectors and regions.

The theoretical conclusions and recommendations presented in this article may be used by education authorities when designing leadership preparation programmes and by educational institutions when drafting their internal development strategies.

References

1. Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On Education". No. LRU-637, 23 September 2020.
2. Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PF-5712 of 29 April 2019 "On Approval of the Concept for the Development of the Public Education System of the Republic of Uzbekistan until 2030".
3. Bass B. M. Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations. New York: Free Press, 1985.
4. Burns J. M. Leadership. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.

5. Bush T. Theories of Educational Leadership and Management. 4th ed. London: SAGE, 2011.
6. Day C., Sammons P., Leithwood K. et al. 10 Strong Claims about Successful School Leadership. Nottingham: National College for School Leadership, 2010.
7. Fullan M. Leading in a Culture of Change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2001.
8. Hallinger P. Leading educational change: reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership // Cambridge Journal of Education, 2003, 33(3), pp. 329–352.
9. Hargreaves A., Fullan M. Professional Capital: Transforming Teaching in Every School. New York: Teachers College Press, 2012.
10. Kotter J. P. What leaders really do // Harvard Business Review, 2001, 79(11), pp. 85–96.
11. Leithwood K., Jantzi D. Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices // School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 2006, 17(2), pp. 201–227.
12. Leithwood K., Louis K. S., Anderson S., Wahlstrom K. How Leadership Influences Student Learning. New York: The Wallace Foundation, 2004.
13. Robinson V. M. J., Lloyd C. A., Rowe K. J. The impact of leadership on student outcomes: an analysis of the differential effects of leadership types // Educational Administration Quarterly, 2008, 44(5), pp. 635–674.
14. Spillane J. P. Distributed Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006.
15. Northouse P. G. Leadership: Theory and Practice. 8th ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE, 2018.
16. Harris A. Distributed leadership: according to the evidence // Journal of Educational Administration, 2008, 46(2), pp. 172–188.