Ilmiy tadqiqotlar va ularning yechimlari jurnali
Aoka guvohnoma № 323759 ISSN: 3060-4818

“FROM TEACHER TO LEADER: ORGANIZATIONAL AND PEDAGOGICAL CONDITIONS FOR DEVELOPING THE MANAGEMENT COMPETENCY OF SCHOOL LEADERS.”

Ruzimurodova Nigora Oybek qizi
The Shaykhantohur Specialized School
under the System of Agency of Specialized
Educational Institutions, Tashkent, Uzbekistan
nigora.oybekovna@mail.ru
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23274100

Annotation: School leaders in Uzbekistan carry more managerial responsibility than ever, yet most enter the role with a teacher's preparation rather than a manager's. This article examines the organizational and pedagogical conditions for developing the management competency of general secondary school leaders. Drawing on international research and the national normative framework, the author proposes a five-component structure of this competency: strategic, human resource, resource-financial, communicative and digital. The paper argues that the weakest link in the current system is the absence of continuity between attestation results and individual development routes.

Keywords: educational management, management competency, school leader, professional development, competency model, distributed leadership, school autonomy.

“ ОТ ПЕДАГОГА К РУКОВОДИТЕЛЮ: ОРГАНИЗАЦИОННО-ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКИЕ УСЛОВИЯ РАЗВИТИЯ УПРАВЛЕНЧЕСКОЙ КОМПЕТЕНТНОСТИ РУКОВОДИТЕЛЕЙ ШКОЛ”

Аннотация: На руководителей школ в Узбекистане возлагается всё больше управленческой ответственности, однако большинство из них приходит на эту должность с подготовкой педагога, а не менеджера. В статье рассматриваются организационно-педагогические условия развития управленческой компетентности руководителей общеобразовательных учреждений. На основе анализа международных исследований и национальной нормативной базы автор предлагает пятикомпонентную структуру данной компетентности: стратегический, кадровый, ресурсно-финансовый, коммуникативный и цифровой компоненты. Делается вывод, что наиболее слабым звеном действующей системы является отсутствие преемственности между результатами аттестации и индивидуальными маршрутами развития.

Ключевые слова: управление образованием, управленческая компетентность, руководитель школы, профессиональное развитие, модель компетентности, распределённое лидерство, автономия образовательного учреждения.

Ilmiy tadqiqotlar va ularning yechimlari jurnali
Aoka guvohnoma № 323759 ISSN: 3060-4818

“PEDAGOGDAN RAHBARGA: MAKTAB RAHBARLARINING BOSHQARUV KOMPETENTLIGINI RIVOJLANTIRISHNING TASHKILIY-PEDAGOGIK SHART-SHAROITLARI”

Annotatsiya: O'zbekistonda maktab rahbarlari zimmasiga har qachongidan ko'ra ko'proq boshqaruv mas'uliyati yuklanmoqda, biroq ularning aksariyati bu lavozimga menejer emas, balki pedagog tayyorgarligi bilan keladi. Maqolada umumiy o'rta ta'lim muassasalari rahbarlarining boshqaruv kompetentligini rivojlantirishning tashkiliy-pedagogik shart-sharoitlari tahlil qilinadi. Xalqaro tadqiqotlar va milliy me'yoriy hujjatlar tahlili asosida muallif ushbu kompetentlikning besh komponentli tuzilmasini taklif etadi: strategik, kadrlar, resurs-moliyaviy, kommunikativ va raqamli. Maqolada joriy tizimning eng zaif bo'g'ini attestatsiya natijalari bilan individual rivojlanish yo'nalishlari o'rtasida uzviylik yo'qligi ekani asoslanadi.

Kalit so'zlar: ta'lim menejmenti, boshqaruv kompetentligi, maktab rahbari, kasbiy rivojlanish, kompetentlik modeli, taqsimlangan liderlik, ta'lim muassasasi mustaqilligi.

I. INTRODUCTION

Not long ago the work of a school director could be described in a few lines: carry out the instructions that came from above, keep the timetable intact, and submit the required figures on time. That description no longer fits. Directors today are expected to write development programs, defend budgets, recruit and retain good teachers, answer to parents who ask harder questions than they used to, and make decisions on the basis of data that did not exist a decade ago. The role has been rewritten; the preparation for it has not.

In most cases a school director is an experienced teacher who was promoted because she taught well and was trusted. Teaching skill and management skill overlap, but they are not the same thing. A teacher who has never built a budget, never mediated a conflict between two colleagues who outrank her in age and experience, and never had to explain a decline in results to a district commission is, in managerial terms, a beginner — however senior she may be as a pedagogue. The assumption behind our current practice is that experience will eventually supply what preparation did not. That assumption is rarely examined.

It deserves examination, because the research evidence on school leadership is unusually consistent. Leithwood, Harris and Hopkins, revisiting two decades of studies, concluded that school leadership has a significant effect on the organizational features that shape the quality of teaching and learning, and that while this effect is moderate in size, it is vital to the success of most school improvement efforts. Leadership, in other words, seldom reaches students directly; it reaches them through everything the leader arranges around the classroom. Robinson, Lloyd and Rowe put a sharper point on this in their meta-analysis, finding that the leadership dimension with the strongest average effect on student outcomes was promoting and participating in teacher learning and development. If both findings hold, then the managerial preparation of school leaders is not an administrative side-issue but a question of educational quality.

The policy framework in Uzbekistan has moved in this direction. The "Uzbekistan — 2030" Strategy, approved by Presidential Decree PF-158 of 11 September 2023, sets the creation of an education system meeting international standards as a national priority. Presidential Resolution PQ-231

of 21 June 2024 restructured the system of continuous professional development for preschool and school staff and established the Abdulla Avloni National Institute of Pedagogical Skills at its center, with managerial training courses and school-management platforms among its functions. The institutional machinery exists. What is less clear is whether it produces managerially competent leaders or mainly certificates of attendance. That is the gap this article addresses. Two questions remain insufficiently answered in the national research literature: what exactly constitutes the management competency of a school leader under conditions of growing institutional autonomy, and what conditions must be in place for that competency to develop rather than to accumulate by accident. Accordingly, the aim of this article is to clarify the structure of the management competency of a general secondary school leader and to identify the organizational and pedagogical conditions required for its development within the continuous professional development system. The article first defines the concept and proposes a component structure, then examines comparative evidence on how such competency is developed elsewhere, and finally formulates the conditions and discusses their limitations.

II. LITERARY REVIEW AND METHODOLOGY

The research on school leadership is often summarized as a single accumulating consensus. Read closely, it is not: scholars disagree about which kind of leadership matters most, about whether leadership should be located in one person at all, and about whether leadership practice can be generalized across contexts. These disagreements are worth stating openly, because a competency model built on an assumed consensus rests on a weak foundation.

The skills tradition in general management supplies the starting point. Katz (1955) distinguished technical, human and conceptual skills, arguing that the higher a manager rises the less the technical component matters and the more the conceptual one does — a claim that explains a familiar problem in our schools, where the promotion criterion is technical excellence in teaching while the job demands the capacity to see the school as a system. Mumford, Zaccaro, Harding, Jacobs and Fleishman (2000) refined this tradition by reframing leadership capacity as the ability to solve complex, ill-defined organizational problems rather than as a set of fixed traits. If that reframing is accepted, training built on delivering correct answers is training in the wrong thing.

The first disagreement concerns what leaders should concentrate on. Robinson, Lloyd and Rowe (2008), comparing leadership types across 27 published studies, found the average effect of instructional leadership on student outcomes to be three to four times that of transformational leadership, with the strongest effect of the five dimensions they derived coming from promoting and participating in teacher learning and development. Taken alone, this points towards a narrow prescription. Day, Gu and Sammons (2016) dispute the framing, arguing from a three-year mixed-methods national study that the two leadership types are too often dichotomized, and showing that successful principals combine them, varying the proportions across phases of their school's development. What distinguished effective leaders in their data was not style but the accuracy of their diagnosis of what the school needed at that moment. The divergence is partly methodological, since meta-analysis reports averages while longitudinal case study observes the same leader changing approach as conditions change. The practical consequences differ sharply: the first position implies a focused curriculum, the second a curriculum built around diagnostic judgement with styles held as a repertoire. This article follows Day et al. (2016)

while accepting the weighting of Robinson et al. (2008) — teacher development should dominate the repertoire without exhausting it.

The second disagreement concerns whose competency is at issue. Leithwood, Harris and Hopkins (2020) maintain that leadership influence is greater when it is widely distributed, adding that some patterns of distribution are more effective than others. Spillane (2006) goes further, holding that leadership practice is stretched across people, tools and situations rather than residing in an individual office-holder. Taken strictly, Spillane's position unsettles the premise of any individual competency model. Leithwood et al. (2020) stop short of this: if some patterns work better than others, someone must choose the pattern, and in a school that someone is the director. Where responsibility has been handed out without structure, the result is usually diffusion rather than distribution. It follows that the capacity to distribute work intelligently is itself part of individual managerial competency, which is how it is treated in the model proposed below.

The third disagreement cuts across both. Hallinger and Heck (1998) established that the principal's contribution to school effectiveness is real but largely indirect, mediated by the organizational conditions of the school. Hallinger (2018) later argued that although a generic repertoire of practices exists, these must be adapted to the institutional, community, socio-cultural, political and economic contexts in which a school works, and that prevailing research methods relegate context effects to the shadows. This challenges any universalist reading of meta-analytic findings: if effect sizes are averages across systems differing widely in autonomy and resourcing, transplanting a ranked list of practices is an act of faith rather than evidence-based policy. Bush (2020) reinforces the caution, since leadership and management are not interchangeable concepts and systems weight them differently — a distinction that matters acutely where directors must maintain operations and drive change at once. Against this, Pont, Nusche and Moorman (2008) found in the OECD's comparative review that systems which improved school leadership did so through recognizably similar moves: clarifying the role, distributing rather than concentrating it, and treating development as a continuum from pre-appointment preparation through induction into in-service learning. The tension is resolvable if architecture is separated from content. What travels is the architecture — the continuum, the role definition, the diagnostic apparatus; what does not is which practices a particular director in a particular school should prioritise.

Three conclusions follow from these disputes rather than from any single source. A competency model should weight teacher development heavily, after Robinson et al. (2008), while being organized around diagnostic judgement rather than a prescribed style, after Day et al. (2016). It should treat the ability to distribute leadership as a component of individual competency, taking Spillane's (2006) insight seriously without abandoning the individual as the unit of development. And it should borrow architecture from comparative evidence (Pont et al., 2008) while building content against national constraints, as Hallinger (2018) requires. What this literature does not supply is such a model fitted to the institutional conditions of Uzbekistan, where the leadership role is expanding, autonomy is growing unevenly, and the professional development system has only recently been restructured under Presidential Resolution PQ-231 of 21 June 2024. That is the gap this article addresses.

III. RESULTS

3.1 Management competency: a working definition

Analysis of the literature reviewed above, read against the functions actually assigned to school directors under the national normative framework, yields the following definition. The management competency of a school leader is the integrated capacity to perform the strategic, human resource, resource and communicative functions of school governance, grounded in professional knowledge, managerial skill and professional values, and demonstrated through the quality of decisions taken under real institutional constraints.

Two elements of this definition carry weight. The first is integrated: competency is not the arithmetic sum of courses attended, which is why certificate counts are a poor proxy for it. The second is under real constraints, which follows from Mumford et al. (2000) — if leadership capacity is the ability to resolve ill-defined problems, then it can only be observed where the problem is genuinely ill-defined. A director who reasons well through a seminar case and freezes during an actual staffing crisis possesses knowledge, not competency.

3.2 The component structure

Five components emerge when the leadership dimensions identified empirically by Robinson et al. (2008) and the practice repertoire described by Leithwood et al. (2020) are mapped onto the functional responsibilities of directors in our system.

Component	Content	Indicators
Strategic	Goal-setting, development programming, change management	Realism of the development programme; targets achieved
Human resource	Teacher selection, induction, motivation, PD, conflict management, distribution of tasks	Turnover; PD coverage; attestation outcomes; mentoring structure
Resource-financial	Budget, material base, extrabudgetary resources, allocation	Transparency of allocation; alignment with priorities
Communicative	Team building, dialogue with parents and community, external representation	School climate; stakeholder satisfaction
Digital	School information systems, evidence-based decisions	Extent to which data informs decisions

Three features of this structure require comment.

First, the human resource component is deliberately weighted more heavily than the others, and this is an evidence-based choice rather than a preference. Robinson et al. (2008) found promoting and participating in teacher learning and development to produce the strongest average effect on student outcomes of the five dimensions they examined. A model that treats teacher development as one administrative duty among many contradicts the strongest single finding in the field.

Second, the distribution of leadership tasks is placed inside the human resource component rather than treated as a separate paradigm. This is the resolution proposed in Section II to the disagreement between Spillane (2006) and Leithwood et al. (2020): distribution improves outcomes, but since some patterns of distribution work better than others, the capacity to choose and structure the pattern belongs to the individual director and is therefore a competency.

Third, the indicators in the right-hand column are deliberately organizational rather than student-level. This follows Hallinger and Heck (1998), whose review established that the principal's effect on school effectiveness operates indirectly through organizational conditions. Evaluating a director against examination results alone attributes to her an effect the research says she does not have directly.

3.3 The organizational and pedagogical conditions

Five conditions follow from the preceding analysis.

1. Program content built on a competency model rather than a knowledge syllabus. If the five components define the work, they should define both the curriculum and its assessment. Current leadership training is organised largely around legal and administrative content, which is necessary but insufficient: knowing a regulation is not the same as being able to manage the situation the regulation governs.

2. Differentiation by career stage. A candidate in the leadership reserve, a first-year director and a director of fifteen years' standing require substantially different provision — orientation to the role, survival capability with rapid feedback, and strategic renewal respectively. This condition follows directly from the continuum finding of Pont et al. (2008); delivering identical provision to all three wastes the time of at least two.

3. Practice-embedded formats. Case analysis, structured mentoring by an experienced director, and school-to-school internship place the learner inside the conditions where competency is actually exercised.

4. Diagnostic support at entry and exit. Without measurement of management competency before and after a program, neither participant nor institution can establish whether anything changed. An instrument constructed on the five components would serve simultaneously as a learning tool for the individual and an evaluation tool for the system.

5. Continuity between attestation and individual development routes. Attestation currently functions as a checkpoint. If its results instead generated a development route — this director's strategic component is strong, her resource-financial component weak, therefore the next cycle concentrates there — the system would become a loop rather than a sequence of disconnected events.

These conditions are interdependent rather than additive. Condition 5 cannot operate without the diagnostic instrument required by Condition 4, and Condition 4 has nothing to measure without the competency model specified in Condition 1. Implementing any one of them in isolation would produce little.

IV. DISCUSSION

The findings of this study reinforce the idea that the preparation of school leaders is not merely an administrative arrangement but a pedagogical and cultural question. While the institutional machinery for leadership development now exists, its real impact lies in how it reshapes directors' professional identities, their sense of agency, and the habits of decision-making they carry into the school. The discussion around these results highlights both the promise and the inherent difficulties of building competency through a formal system. One of the most significant implications concerns the risk of turning a competency model into a bureaucratic artefact. Scholars such as Hallinger (2018) argue that although a generic repertoire of leadership practices exists, these practices must be adapted to the

institutional, community and socio-cultural contexts in which a school operates, and that research methods focused on average effects tend to push context into the shadows. This position is well founded, and the same danger arguably exists in practice as in research: a framework designed to open a conversation about leadership work can quietly become a checklist completed once a year and filed. A director in a small rural school with eleven teachers and a director in a large urban school with ninety are doing the same job in name only, and any instrument that scores them identically measures compliance rather than competency.

Another key dimension emerging from the results is the question of where leadership actually resides. Researchers like Spillane (2006) hold that leadership practice is stretched across people, tools and situations rather than concentrated in a single office-holder, while Leithwood, Harris and Hopkins (2020) maintain that leadership influence is greater when it is widely distributed, though some patterns of distribution prove more effective than others. Taken together, these arguments suggest that developing the director alone is an incomplete strategy, and that the model proposed here might more properly be applied to the whole leadership team — deputies, heads of department, teacher-leaders. Observation of school practice suggests, however, that responsibility handed out without structure produces diffusion rather than distribution: tasks are shared, accountability evaporates, and nobody is quite certain who decides. For this reason, the capacity to distribute work intelligently has been treated here as a component of individual competency rather than as a competing paradigm. This resolves the tension for practical purposes, though it does not dissolve it.

The integration of data into school management invites similar critical reflection. Digital systems now supply directors with evidence about enrolment, attendance, staffing and results that simply did not exist a decade ago, and in principle this transforms management into a more evidence-informed process. Yet the obstacle encountered in practice is rarely access to data; it is interpretation, and the willingness to let evidence overturn an intention already formed. A director who receives a monthly report and files it possesses the technology and not the competency. It should be added, too, that data must never displace professional judgment. Over-reliance on metrics risks reducing a school to a set of measurable outputs and ignoring the relational and ethical dimensions of leadership — qualities as central to running a school well as they are to teaching well. The digital component, therefore, needs the same practice-embedded treatment as the other four: real school data with real decisions attached, rather than software training.

Finally, a limitation should be acknowledged openly. This article proposes a structure and a set of conditions; it does not test them. The components were derived analytically, and their validity as a description of what school leaders actually do in our system remains an empirical question. Answering it would require expert evaluation of the component structure, a questionnaire administered to a representative sample of directors and deputy directors, and ideally a comparison of competency profiles against independent indicators of school functioning such as teacher turnover and attestation outcomes. Until that work is carried out, what is offered here is a framework rather than a finding.

V. CONCLUSION

The preparation of school leaders rests on an assumption that deserves more scrutiny than it receives: that a good teacher, once promoted, will acquire managerial competency through experience alone. The evidence suggests otherwise. Leadership shapes the organisational conditions in which

teaching happens, and the practice with the greatest measured effect on students — leading teacher learning — is the one least likely to be acquired by accident.

Management competency here comprises five components: strategic, human resource, resource-financial, communicative and digital. Its development depends on five conditions: competency-based content, differentiation by career stage, practice-embedded formats, entry and exit diagnostics, and continuity between attestation and individual development routes. The last is the weakest in current practice — a system that measures leaders and a system that develops them stand side by side without speaking to each other.

Two recommendations follow. Professional development institutions should build programs backwards from a competency model and attach a diagnostic instrument to them. Policy should treat attestation results as the input to development rather than its conclusion. What is offered here is a framework rather than a finding; empirical validation with school leaders in practice is the next step.

REFERENCE:

1. Bush, T. (2020). Theories of educational leadership and management (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
2. Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2016). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: How successful school leaders use transformational and instructional strategies to make a difference. Educational Administration Quarterly, 52(2), 221–258. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X15616863
3. Hallinger, P. (2018). Bringing context out of the shadows of leadership. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 46(1), 5–24. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143216670652
4. Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1998). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 1980–1995. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 9(2), 157–191.
5. Katz, R. L. (1955). Skills of an effective administrator. Harvard Business Review, 33(1), 33–42.
6. Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. School Leadership & Management, 40(1), 5–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077
7. Mumford, M. D., Zaccaro, S. J., Harding, F. D., Jacobs, T. O., & Fleishman, E. A. (2000). Leadership skills for a changing world: Solving complex social problems. The Leadership Quarterly, 11(1), 11–35.
8. Pont, B., Nusche, D., & Moorman, H. (2008). Improving school leadership: Volume 1. Policy and practice. OECD Publishing.
9. Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. Educational Administration Quarterly, 44(5), 635–674. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X08321509
10. Spillane, J. P. (2006). Distributed leadership. Jossey-Bass.
11. President of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (2023). On the Strategy "Uzbekistan — 2030" (Decree No. PF-158 of 11 September 2023). https://lex.uz
12. President of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (2024). On additional measures to improve the system of continuous professional development of employees of preschool and school education organizations (Resolution No. PQ-231 of 21 June 2024). https://lex.uz