

MANAGEMENT AND LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATION

Prof. Yuldashev Maksud Abdullaevich
*Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs of the
Tashkent State University of Economics.*

Abstract

Management is about helping people singly or in groups to get things done to meet predefined purposes. These purposes may be generated by a group of people with which a manager is working or be identified by the organization in which people work and managers supervise. Such a definition makes visible two different ideologies of management: that of the manager or leader as servant of the group, an ancient tradition that has many religious antecedents, and that of the manager as representative of institutional authority and so as an agent of control. While the former may be visible in collegially run and professionally staffed organizations such as general medical practices, the latter is most commonly seen in hierarchically organized business and industry. What seems to distinguish the former from the latter is that in the former, the purposes and practices of work are predominantly derived from expert knowledge. This is used to meet best the needs of the clients whom the organization serves through a face-to-face relationship with them. In the latter, the major concern is with making a profit from distant customers, although this will also require a high-quality product or service to be created and delivered.

Annotatsiya

Menejment odamlarga yakka tartibda yoki guruhlarda oldindan belgilangan maqsadlarga erishish uchun ishlarni bajarishda yordam berishdan iborat. Ushbu maqsadlar menejer ishlayotgan odamlar guruhi tomonidan ishlab chiqilishi yoki odamlar ishlaydigan va menejerlar nazorat qiladigan tashkilot tomonidan aniqlanishi mumkin. Bunday ta'rif menejmentning ikki xil mafkurasini yaqqol ko'rsatadi: boshqaruvchi yoki rahbarning guruhning xizmatkori mafkurasini, bu ko'plab diniy an'analariga ega bo'lgan qadimiy an'ana va boshqaruvchi institutsional hokimiyat vakili va shuning uchun uning agenti sifatida. boshqaruv. Birinchisi umumiy tibbiy amaliyotlar kabi kollegial va professional xodimlar bilan ta'minlangan tashkilotlarda ko'rinishi mumkin bo'lsa-da, ikkinchisi ko'pincha ierarxik tarzda tashkil etilgan biznes va sanoatda kuzatiladi. Birinchisini ikkinchisidan ajratib turadigan narsa shundaki, birinchisida ishning maqsadi va amaliyoti asosan mutaxassis bilimlaridan kelib chiqadi. Bu tashkilot ular bilan yuzma-yuz munosabatlar orqali xizmat ko'rsatadigan mijozlarning eng yaxshi ehtiyojlarini qondirish uchun ishlatiladi. Ikkinchisida, asosiy tashvish uzoq mijozlardan daromad olishdir, ammo buning uchun yuqori sifatli mahsulot yoki xizmatni yaratish va etkazib berish ham talab qilinadi.

Keywords: *Education, management, knowledge management, corporate culture, people, process, technology,*

Ключевые слова: *образование, менеджмент, управление знаниями, корпоративная культура, люди, процесс, технологии, социально-экономический профиль.*

Kalit so'zlar: *Ta'lim, menejment, bilimlarni boshqarish, korporativ madaniyat, odamlar, jarayon, texnologiya, ijtimoiy-iqtisodiy profil*

Introduction

Management is the process of assisting individuals or organizations in completing tasks in order to achieve predetermined goals. These goals may be developed by the team of individuals a manager is working with or recognized by the company where employees are employed and managers are in charge of overseeing them. Such a definition reveals two distinct management ideologies: one that sees the manager or leader as the servant of the group, an old custom with deep religious roots, and another that sees the manager as a representative of institutional authority and hence as a control agent. The latter is more frequently observed in hierarchically organized business and industry, whereas the former may be discernible in collegially run and professionally staffed organizations like general medical clinics. It appears that because the former's goals and methods of operation are mostly drawn from specialist knowledge, the former can be distinguished from the latter. Using this, the organization can better serve its clients by meeting their needs on a face-to-face basis. In the latter, the main priority is turning a profit from far-off clients, even when this calls for producing and providing a high-quality good or service. To justify their activities to students and other individuals with an interest in education, teachers and their leaders or managers in education rely on their pedagogical expertise, which is made up of their subject knowledge and their expertise in education practice. However, in the UK of the 1990s, organizations outside of a school, such as the federal, state, and municipal governments, or foundation organizations for independent schools, mainly define the purposes of schools. The Education Reform Act of 1988 required state schools to at least break even financially since the implementation of LMS, and head teachers or principals are supposed to implement this mandate. As a result, there may be conflict between the authority of teachers, which is founded on their technical knowledge, and their desire to act in particular ways, and the bureaucratic power of a head teacher and other leaders, which they utilize to support a school in fulfilling the mandates placed upon it.[1:62]

Research methodology

The scientific significance of the article is that until now the essence of the concept of management is about interacting with people in certain situations. The settings of values, local and national legislation, resources, markets (quality assurance and consumer or client choice), technology (what may or may not be generated or produced), and communities may all be categorized under this heading. There is interaction between these many situations. For instance, school leaders and managers must work with a variety of internal and external constituencies to meet the needs of present and future students, different local social groups, and communities, as well as the requirements of local and federal regulations. They must also work within the constraints of the available resources and staff. These settings also have a significant impact on how schools make internal decisions.[2;12]

According to Glatter (1997), understandings of internal school administration procedures have neglected this connection for far too long. For instance, the academic performance of a school's pupils and the school's connections with kids and parents will both be significantly impacted by the school's placement in a neighborhood with a certain socioeconomic profile [3;56](Willis, 1977, for example). This in turn prompts concerns about the proper social and educational principles to establish and uphold in an educational institution. Some of these concentrate on concerns of fairness and

opportunity equality. A curriculum that is tailored to accommodate the requirements of a wide range of pupils helps to carry them out in part.

For instance, since the late 1980s, schools and LEAs in England and Wales have been under increasing pressure to better integrate students with SEN into the general public school system. The Education Act of 1993 and the 1994 Code of Practice on the Identification and Assessment of Special Educational Needs (DfES, 1994), according to Millward and Skidmore (1998), have improved the focus on and opportunities for ethical and inclusive practice toward all children. Education officers showed strong support for the Code of Practice in their survey of 99 LEAs in England and Wales because it established a clearly defined structure and process of student need assessment to direct the work of schools and LEAs in managing inclusive education. Prior to 1994 such clarity had not, they argued, existed as an overall system. The internal management of schools and colleges is significantly influenced by the policy environment in which they function.[4;25] Bell (1996) made an effort to build a model to illustrate the dynamics of this. For instance, the Education Reform Act of 1988's implementation of LMS in England and Wales resulted in significant changes to the interactions between LEAs and schools (Maclure, 1989). It hindered LEAs' capacity to support all students equitably in all of their schools and institutions, among other factors, not least because such a huge part of LEA revenue had to be allocated to schools. On the other hand, this gave schools the freedom to choose the best way to apply the curriculum to fulfill the requirements of the kids in their community depending on available resources.[5;63]

In turn, this raises questions about another key area of the context for management decisions: the use of resources. These are essentially questions of opportunity cost, i.e. of opportunities forgone if a certain line of action is pursued. For example, allocating resources to one group of pupils must, necessarily, mean depriving others of those resources, at least for the time being, and the impact of that deprivation on pupils' personal, social and educational development has to be weighed by teachers in their pedagogical decision-making.[6;58] Although LEA officers may welcome the 1994 *Code of Practice* (Millward and Skidmore, 1998), anecdotally teachers in many schools complain about the time and effort it requires to implement it. Some wonder if teachers before 1994 did not make equally accurate judgements of need and much more quickly on the basis of their professional experience.

As well as being empowered by central government policy, schools are also subject to central control by government. In 2009 a process of quadrennial review by inspection teams was implemented for all schools in England and Wales. These are supervised by OFSTED to hold schools to account for the quality of work they carry out with their pupils. This is intended to guarantee to parents and the state that schools are giving good value for the money spent on them. [7;18] As Thomas (1996) points out, these inspections are carried out according to explicit criteria which define whether or not school practice is effective at classroom and whole school level. To do this, inspectors scrutinize the schemes of work that teachers create, observe teachers at work in the classrooms and collect evidence from parents about their views of a school. The inspectors then produce a report to a school's governors and ask them to draw up an action plan to meet any weaknesses they have discovered. Head teachers are left to help staff to cope with the stress and worry they suffer through the inspection process.

According to Gray and Wilcox (1995), added-value measures for schools provide parents with a more accurate picture of the true influence of teachers' practices on

students' learning than the central government league tables, which were introduced in 1992 and compare schools' individual raw exam results. These measurements of added value use student previous performance as a benchmark for comparing current performance. Social variables have a long history of heavily influencing such performances.

Managing with people

People at schools and colleges can be divided into three primary groups: students, teaching or academic staff (including senior employees who may perform little teaching), and support personnel (such as secretaries, bursars, technicians, and cleaners). According to this interpretation of students, they are considered members of an educational organization that contribute to its social construction and processes. This point of view is in line with the conclusions reached by scholars like Ruddock and Wallace (1995) about the influence students have on and their comprehension of school procedures. A market-oriented or comprehensive quality model of education, in contrast, sees students as internal consumers, either directly or indirectly through their parents (West-Burnham, 1992). Employers may be thought of as a school's external clients. According to Gray (1991), it is troublesome where the border is drawn between people who are in a school's community and those outside it. For example, many parents identify closely with a school, at least so long as their children attend it.[8;35]

The complexity comes from the fact that individuals working in educational organizations fill a variety of roles both within and outside of schools. These various jobs communicate with one another. For instance, students of a school are both the individuals that a school serves and whose changing needs schools and colleges must alter, as well as members of that community who work to form and develop it. Staff members fill a variety of tasks as well. [9;96] One example is the teacher who serves as a subject leader, form tutor, and school governor. Furthermore, despite some of them only being employed on part-time contracts, a lot of support personnel identify themselves fairly strongly with a school or institution (Busher and Saran, 1995). People's responses to the expectations of leaders and managers will depend on how they build their professional identities. For instance, even if it is what external circumstances like the Education Reform Act of 1988 urge, teachers whose self-identities emphasize their work with children are unlikely to be very enthusiastic about the idea of becoming more involved in managing the school as an organization. Numerous authors, including Hoyle and John (1995) and Strain (1995), draw attention to how, from the late 1980s in the UK, the character of teaching as a profession has altered to place a higher focus on working with clearly defined responsibilities and accountabilities in organizational structures. However, those educators who saw themselves as "extended professionals" Such enhanced engagement may be welcomed by those who embrace a holistic perspective on organizational and educational processes (Hughes, 1973).

Therefore, in order to properly manage individuals, one must comprehend how they perceive themselves and their actions inside a school. This is a personal or subjective view on educational organizations, according to Bush (1986). Therefore, for managers, such organizational viewpoints complement their knowledge of organizational structures and the organizational cultures that individuals construct to support their chosen working methods.

Managing the culture

People don't operate alone. Even though there might be no other adults there when

instructors enter a classroom to educate, there are frequently many other individuals present pupils with whom they will create specific working methods. The formation of a certain "ethos" or culture will be a part of that process. Twelve different working styles were identified by Galton et al. (1980) in elementary school classes. [10;65]

Teachers foster a culture of collaboration with other employees in departments and across the whole school or college. Telford (1996) and Lodge (1998) emphasize how crucial it is for leaders to control organizational cultures in a way that fosters an environment that is conducive to change and advancement.

In charge of the culture

In fact, Stoll and Fink (1998) highlight how certain schools struggle to adapt due to the culture that develops there. According to Hoy et al. (1991), organizations must have healthy cultures or climates for individuals to work well together. From their study, Blaze and Blaze (1994) infer that this includes the idea that individuals desire to perform to the greatest of their abilities at work, the opposite of the X theory made prominent by McGregor (1960).

Culture is hard to define, though. It may be broadly characterized as the way people decide to conduct themselves in a given institution or community. Bennett (1995) correctly points out the risks associated with understanding such definitions to imply that an organization's or a department within its culture is unchanging. It evolves as individuals join or depart, as connections between faculty, students, and community members alter. It focuses on the values that are upheld by an organization's practices, such as the level of interpersonal trust, the degree to which people can discuss their differences in an open manner, the degree to which people participate in or are excluded from decision-making (a measure of collegiality), and the degree to which senior staff are accessible to or willing to listen to employees. the degree to which organizational procedures are rule-bound or needs/tasks-driven; and the willingness to listen to other staff members and pupils.

Managing structures and power

The administrative frameworks, departmental hierarchies, meeting schedules, curricular frameworks for how courses are taught, and child groupings are all examples of how schools are organized. Changes in the policy environments of schools and perceptions of the best ways to organize subject information have an impact on and shape these. The educational philosophies, ideals, and whims of top staff members, particularly the head teacher, inside a school, will have a significant impact on the administrative and curriculum practices that teachers and pupils must adjust to. A systems view is a common term for this attention on the organizational structures of a school. [11;58] It investigates how these components interact with one another and how dialogue and coherence are maintained amongst them. It also takes into account how well a school or institution operates in order to achieve its goals. In order to track and promote changes in student performance, it may, for instance, assist senior staff at a school evaluate how well its pastoral care system integrated with its system of maintaining academic records. Such a perspective is less interested in how specific employees and students interact with and comprehend the organizational structures that they operate within.

Conclusion

To understand organizational processes, one might employ a range of typologies or viewpoints on organizations. Hughes (1990) conducted a thorough analysis of a number of these typologies, highlighting the fact that there was no one dominating

paradigm at the time in the field of education administration. He did point out that the prevalent view of schools as organizational systems had been seriously challenged since the mid-1970s by the emphasis on the cultural and interpersonal dimensions of organizations.

This article has utilized one of these typologies to explore in some detail how a school's processes might be defined from the viewpoints of specific individuals, from a cultural lens that focuses on the symbolic connections of people, and from an examination of a school. The fourth viewpoint in this typology is a political one that focuses on how everyone, not just senior employees, utilizes power to attempt to get access to the resources they need to uphold their moral and ethical principles. This viewpoint can also include the actions of students, parents, and other school stakeholders who all have different ideas on education and desire to put those views into practice. If the social or academic needs of some students are not being sufficiently fulfilled, it can also assist leaders and educators in understanding issues of disempowerment and disaffection. Therefore, it is a lens that must be used in conjunction with the other three viewpoints described in this article.

References

1. Bacharach, S. and Lawler, E. (1980) *Power and Politics in Organizations*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
2. Ball, S. (1989) *Micropolitics versus management: towards a sociology of school organisation*, in Walker, S. and Barton, L. (eds) *Politics and the Processes of Schooling*, Open University Press, Milton Keynes.
3. Ball, S. (ed) (1990) *Foucault and Education: Disciplines and Knowledge*, Routledge, London.
4. Bell, L. (1996) *Educational management, some issues of policy and practice*, Inaugural professorial lecture, mimeo, Liverpool John Moores University, 14 February.
5. Bennett, N. (1995) *Managing Professional Teachers: Middle Managers in Primary and Secondary Schools*, Paul Chapman Publishing, London.
6. Blase, J. and Anderson, G. (1995) *The Micropolitics of Educational Leadership*, Cassell, London.
7. Blase, J. and Blase, J. (1994) *Empowering Teachers: What Successful Principals Do*, Corwin, Thousand Oaks, CA.
8. Blase, J. and Blase, J. (1995) *The micropolitical orientation of facilitative school principals and its effects on teachers' sense of empowerment*, paper given at the AERA annual conference, San Francisco.
9. Bolman, L.G. and Deal, T.E. (1991) *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice and Leadership*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
10. Millward, A. and Skidmore, D. (1998) *LEA responses to the management of special education in the light of the Code of Practice*, *Educational Management and Administration*, Vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 57-66.
11. Morgan, G. (1986) *Images of Organizations*, Sage, Beverly Hills, CA.
- Mortimore, P. (1993) *School effectiveness and the management of effective teaching and learning*, *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, Vol. 4, No. 4, pp. 290-310.