Tojiboyeva N.K
Doctoral Student of Tashkent State Pedagogical University.
Uzbekistan

THE SOCIAL NEED FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF MANAGERIAL AND LEADERSHIP SKILLS AMONG FUTURE TEACHERS.

Abstract. This article aims at justifying the social need for future leadership and leadership skills, and describes the classification, tariffs, leadership, and methods of developing leadership and managerial skills in students. Foreign experiences were studied and partial examples were given.

Keywords: Leader, manager, management culture, creative potential, technology, management, politics, phenomenon, dominance, economy.

Organizations are increasingly recognizing that to be competitive they must invest in leadership and management development. Over the last decade, organizations and their leaders have experienced major changes in the workplace, including rapid technological change, increased globalization, changing organization structures and major changes in the dynamics of careers. Leaders and managers are considered a highly influential group in terms of creating high-performance organizations. Organizational capability at a management level in an organization is considered essential to improve competitiveness and ensure future growth. Organizations taking a proactive and systematic approach to management and leadership development generally produce more leadership talent, and best-practice firms are characterized by the intensity and quality of their management and leadership development inter-venations. They do as much of the same as other firms but perform it with greater rigor and consistency.

The chapter aims to provide an overview of the leadership and management development process. We begin with a consideration of how leadership and manage-mint development differ from each other. We then focus on the changing context of leadership and management development. We focus on the issue of whether leaders can be developed. The chapter discusses the value of leadership competency models and also considers the different organization-driven and leader-driven approaches that can be used to facilitate leadership and management development. We will con-clued the chapter with a discussion of the issues that should be considered when evaluating leadership and management development

Management and leadership development: the same or different?

Leadership and management development in organizations can take a number of forms. It may be organization driven and consist of a variety of formal interventions such as coaching, mentoring, formal programmers and feedback-intensive programmers. These activities are directed by organizations and are usually built around competency models (Garavan, Hogan and Cahir-O'Donnell, 2008). However, organizations are recognizing that they must also promote and rely on their managers and leaders to engage in self-directed leadership development (DeRue and Ashford). Furthermore, in difficult economic times, formal programmers are both expensive and time consuming.

Cunningham (1986), for example, identifies three different viewpoints on the relationship between leadership and management. The first position assumes that leadership is one competence among a range required for effective management. A second position, advocated by Bennis and Nanus, suggests that the two concepts are separate but related, whereas a third position sees both concepts to be partially overlapping. There is evidence amongst academics that there is a need to conceptually distinguish leadership from management, often at the expense of the latter. Management as an activity and concept is often viewed as a 'second-class citizen', something that is very transactional in nature. Kotter (1988) has argued that leaders and managers are distinct in their roles and functions. He considers management to be concerned with planning and organizing whereas leadership is concerned with creating, coping with change and helping organizations to adapt in turbulent times. Two other recent contributions have similarly emphasized that the two concepts are different. Boydell, Burgoyne and Pedler (2004) consider management to be about implementation, order, efficiency and effectiveness. They define leadership as concerned with future directions in times of uncertainty, and argue that management may be sufficient in times of stability but is insufficient when organizational conditions are characterized by complexity, unpredictability and rapid change.

It is increasingly recognized that all managers, including first-line supervisors, need at some level to be leaders and to understand the concept of leadership, albeit the higher the organizational level, the more complex leadership becomes and the more it is concerned with broader and long-term aims. In some organizations people may be senior professionals such as doctors or scientists but not defined as managers (at least in terms of the formal organizational hierarchy). It would be naive, however, not to think of them as leaders or potential leaders.

It is therefore not surprising that there are contradictory interpretations of management and leadership development. Wexley and Baldwin (1986) argue that management development remains the most 'ill-defined and variously interpreted' concept in the management literature. HRD has broadened our thinking about the purposes and methods of

management and leadership development. The majority of early definitions focused on the formal dimensions and considered both management and leadership development to be systematic and structured process. Cullen and Turnbull (2005) argue that the majority of definitions view managers as resources and consider that management development is driven by a functional performance rationale. Similarly many of the definitions emphasize management development driven by organizational rather than individual needs.

In practice, the terms management and leadership development are used interchangeably and they both represent a set of processes that organizations and individuals use to enhance effectiveness in a variety of management and leadership roles. Increasingly the distinction between the two sets of terms has become blurred, with 'management development' being associated with the UK and Ireland, while in the United States, 'leadership development' is preferred.

Management and leadership competency models

Many organizations now use competency or behavioral frameworks to develop managers and leaders. They are extremely popular in multinational organizations; however, they are not without problems and are often viewed as a one size fits all strategy.

Confusion exists concerning the differences in meaning between the words 'com-patience' and 'competency'. 'Competence' can be defined as the minimum acceptable standard of performance and relates to the aspects of the job that have to performed efficiently. 'Competency' refers to what leaders and managers need to bring to their roles to perform effectively. It denotes ability and capability and addresses the behavioral repertoire underpinning excellent performance: that is, what managers actually demonstrate in performing their role.

Cheng, Dainty and Moore identify 12 competencies that distinguish superior from average managers:

● Achievement orientation: The manager's concern for working towards a particular standard of excellence.

● Initiative: Taking proactive actions to avert problems in order to enhance job results and avoid problems.

● Information seeking: An underlying curiosity or desire to know more about things, people, or issues.

Focus on clients' needs: Focusing efforts on discovering and meeting their clients' requirements, coupled with a desire to help or serve others.

● Impact and influence: The intention to persuade, convince, influence or impress others in order to support their agenda, or the desire to have a specific impact or effect on others.

● Defectiveness/assertiveness: Intentions to ensure that subordinates comply with their wishes. Directive behavior has a theme or tone of 'telling people what to do'. The tone ranges from firm and directive to demanding.

● Teamwork and cooperation: The genuine intention to work collaboratively with others as opposed to separately or competitively.

● Team leadership: The intention to take a role as leader of a team or other group. Although it implies a desire to lead others and so can be manifested in the form of formal authority and responsibility, effective team leadership also requires the leader to know when not to act authoritatively if they are to extract the best out of the team.

● Analytical thinking: The ability to understand a situation by breaking it apart into smaller pieces, or tracing the implications of a situation in a step-by-step causal way.

● Conceptual thinking: Understanding a situation or problem by putting the pieces together, seeing the large picture. This includes identifying patterns or connections between situations that are not obviously related, and identifying key or underlying issues in complex situations.

● Self-control: The ability to keep emotions under control and to restrain negative actions when tempted, when faced with opposition or hostility from others, or when working under conditions of stress.

● Flexibility: The ability to adapt to and work effectively with a variety of situations, individuals, or groups.

Competency modelling has become widespread. The models describe the particular competencies that are needed by individuals to effectively perform their work. Organizations like them because they provide a consistent framework for integrating human capital management systems and can help align employee actions with common strategic organizational goals, and facilitate performance improvement through a competency-based development process. Competency models are based on the idea that every position requires the job incumbent to possess certain competencies in order to perform at his or her highest level.

Competency-based management and leadership development typically involves the following key activities:

● Identification of the core competencies needed for high-level performance in a specific position;

● Assessment of the extent to which a particular job incumbent possesses those core competencies;

● Creation of specific developmental opportunities to match the requirements of the competency

Competency models, while popular in organizations, are again adopted much as an act of faith rather than on the basis of their actual contribution to business performance. There is relatively little research that demonstrates a link between bottom-line business performance and competency-based approaches to management and leadership development. They do not necessarily lead to greater transfer of learning and enhanced leader effectiveness.

Increasingly managers are expected to take responsibility for their development; however, organizations also have responsibilities in this respect, and use a variety of development strategies to develop their managers. These organizational-driven strategies include: multi-source feedback, formal in-house

programmers, coaching, mentoring, acceleration centers and a variety of planned job assignments. Self-directed methods include: reflection, observation, questioning and learning from mistakes.

The evaluation of management and leadership development is a difficult task. Traditional evaluation models prove difficult to apply to development activities that are more intangible, less clearly defined and lacking in clear learning objectives.

REFERENCES
1. Kotter, JP (1988) The Leadership Factor, Free Press, New YorkLave, J and Wenger, EC (1991) Situated Learning: Legitimate peripheral participation, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

2. Margerison, C (1991) Making Management Development Work, McGraw Hill, Maidenhead McCall, MW Jnr and Hollenbeck, GP (2007) Getting leader development right: competence not competencies, In The Practice of Leadership: Developing the next generation of leaders, ed JA Conger and R Riggio, pp 87–106, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco

3. New, GE (1996) Reflections: a three-tier model of organizational competencies, Journal of Managerial Psychology, 11 (8), pp 44–51

4. Nonaka, I and Takeuchi, H (1995) The Knowledge-Creating Company, Oxford University Press, New York

5. Polanyi, M (1966) The Tacit Dimension, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London

6. Wenger, EC, McDermott, R and Snyder, WM (2002) Cultivating Communities of Practice, Harvard Business School Press, Boston

7. Wenger, EC and Snyder, WM (2000) Communities of practice: the organizational frontier, Harvard Business Review, January–February, pp 139–45