

**A. Izdik¹, A. Bulatbayeva^{1*},
R.N. Bisenbayeva², G. Tulenova²**

¹Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

²Atyrau University named after Kh. Dosmukhamedov, Atyrau, Kazakhstan

*e-mail: a.bulatbaeva@yandex.ru

COMPARATIVE ASPECTS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PEDAGOGICAL MANAGEMENT MODELS IN GENERAL EDUCATION SCHOOLS, GYMNASIUMS AND LYCEUMS

The article presents the results of the analysis of various models of pedagogical management in general education schools, gymnasiums and lyceums in terms of comparison and identification. The need to organize effective pedagogical management in educational institutions is becoming more relevant due to the increasing requirements for the quality of modern education. In this regard, the authors of the article set a goal to identify the features of the models of pedagogical management of schools, gymnasiums, lyceums and substantiate their improvement in practice. During the study, the similarities and differences of management models in schools, gymnasiums and lyceums were comprehensively considered, and their impact on the quality of education and the effectiveness of students and teachers was assessed. As research methods, an expert survey was conducted and some modern methods of pedagogical management were considered. The article presents recommendations and approaches aimed at increasing the effectiveness of management models used in various educational institutions. The authors show ways to develop and improve pedagogical management at the school, gymnasium and lyceum levels, identify the main areas of increasing the impact and effectiveness of the management system on the learning process.

The results of the study can serve as an aid to specialists in the field of education, including heads of educational institutions and teachers, in the effective use of management models in order to improve the learning process. The information presented in the article can serve as a basis for the future improvement of pedagogical management in the field of education.

Key words: Pedagogical management, general education schools, gymnasiums, lyceums, management models, comparative research, educational management.

**A.A. Іздік¹, А.А. Булатбаева^{1*},
Р.Н. Бисенбаева², Г.А. Туленова²**

¹Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан

²Х. Досмұхамедов атындағы Атырау Университеті, Атырау, Қазақстан

*email: a.bulatbaeva@yandex.ru

Жалпы білім беретін мектептердегі, гимназиялар мен лицейлердегі педагогикалық менеджмент модельдерін жүзеге асырудың салыстырмалы аспектісі

Мақалада жалпы білім беретін мектептер, гимназиялар және лицейлердегі педагогикалық менеджменттің түрлі модельдерін салыстырмалы-сәйкестендіру аспектісінде талдау нәтижелері ұсынылған. Білім беру мекемелерінде тиімді педагогикалық менеджментті ұйымдастыру қажеттілігі қазіргі заманғы білім сапасына қойылатын талаптардың артуына байланысты өзекті болуда. Осыған байланысты мақала авторлары мектептердің, гимназиялардың, лицейлердің педагогикалық басқару модельдерінің ерекшеліктерін анықтау және оларды практикалық іс-әрекетте жетілдіруді негіздеуді мақсат етіп қойды. Зерттеу барысында мектептердегі, гимназиялар мен лицейлердегі менеджмент модельдерінің ұқсастықтары мен айырмашылықтары жан-жақты қарастырылған, сондай-ақ олардың білім сапасына және оқушылар мен педагогтардың нәтижелілігіне ықпалы бағаланған. Зерттеу әдістері ретінде сараптамалық сауалнама алынып педагогикалық менеджменттің кейбір заманауи әдістерін қолдану қарастырылды. Мақалада әртүрлі білім беру мекемелерінде қолданылатын менеджмент модельдерінің тиімділігін арттыруға бағытталған ұсыныстар мен тәсілдер ұсынылған. Авторлар мектеп, гимназия және лицей деңгейлерінде педагогикалық менеджментті дамыту және оны жетілдіру жолдарын көрсетіп, басқару жүйесінің оқыту үдерісіне ықпалы мен тиімділігін арттырудың негізгі

нәтижелері білім беру саласындағы мамандарға, оның ішінде білім мекемелері басшылары мен педагогтарға, оқу үдерісін жақсарту мақсатында менеджмент модельдерін тиімді пайдалануға көмекші құрал бола алады. Мақалада ұсынылған мәліметтер білім беру саласындағы педагогикалық менеджменттің алдағы уақытта жетілдірілуі үшін негіз бола алады.

Түйін сөздер: Педагогикалық менеджмент, жалпы білім беретін мектептер, гимназиялар, лицейлер, менеджмент модельдері, салыстырмалы зерттеу, білім беру менеджменті.

А.А. Издик¹, А.А. Булатбаева^{1*},
Р.Н. Бисенбаева², Г.А. Туленова²

¹Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан

²Атырауский университет имени Х. Досмухамедова, Атырау, Казахстан

*e-mail: a.bulatbaeva@yandex.ru

Сравнительный аспект реализации моделей педагогического менеджмента в общеобразовательных школах, гимназиях и лицеях

В статье представлены результаты анализа различных моделей педагогического управления в общеобразовательных школах, гимназиях и лицеях в сравнительном аспекте. Необходимость организации эффективного педагогического управления в образовательных учреждениях становится все более актуальной в связи с повышением требований к качеству современного образования. Цель исследования – выявление особенностей моделей педагогического управления школ, гимназий, лицеев и обоснования их совершенствования в практической деятельности. В ходе исследования были изучены сходства и различия моделей управления в школах, гимназиях и лицеях, а также оценено их влияние на качество образования и эффективность работы учащихся и учителей. В качестве методов исследования был проведен экспертный опрос и рассмотрены некоторые современные методы педагогического управления. В статье представлены рекомендации и подходы, направленные на повышение эффективности моделей управления, используемых в различных образовательных учреждениях. Авторы показывают пути развития и совершенствования педагогического менеджмента на уровне школы, гимназии и лицея, выявляют основные направления повышения воздействия и эффективности системы управления на образовательный процесс. Результаты исследования могут служить инструментом для специалистов в сфере образования, включая руководителей образовательных учреждений и преподавателей, по эффективному использованию моделей управления для совершенствования процесса обучения. Представленная в статье информация может послужить основой для дальнейшего совершенствования педагогического менеджмента в сфере образования.

Ключевые слова: Педагогический менеджмент, общеобразовательные школы, гимназии, лицеи, модели управления, сравнительное исследование, образовательный менеджмент.

Introduction

The education system of the Republic of Kazakhstan has undergone rapid changes in recent years, and its modernization is recognized as an important component of the socio-economic and cultural development of the country. Educational institutions in the country require the introduction of innovative management technologies in order to ensure high-quality education and upbringing in accordance with the requirements of the new era. In this context, the creation and development of an effective management system for educational institutions, including comprehensive schools, gymnasiums and lyceums, has become an important issue. Pedagogical management plays a special role in this process, as it is one of the main tools that increases the effectiveness of educational work and improves the quality of education.

Pedagogical management is a complex system that includes the effective management of the overall work of an educational organization, including the educational, educational-cognitive and self-educational processes. It is aimed at optimizing the interaction between teachers and students, creating an environment based on creativity and innovation. Modern pedagogical management requires educational organizations not only to increase efficiency, but also to form a creative atmosphere within the team, introduce innovations and optimally organize educational activities.

The article considers the issue of studying pedagogical management models in general education schools, gymnasiums and lyceums. Taking into account the specifics of these educational organizations, the aim is to analyze their pedagogical management systems using the comparative-identification method. The study of pedagogical

management models used in educational institutions of different levels allows us to determine their effectiveness and advantages, and also helps to show ways to improve these models.

Gymnasiums and lyceums have their own peculiarities in organizing and managing the educational process. They use special programs and methods aimed at a high level of education and the development of students' creative potential. And in general education schools, the main priority is to maintain general educational standards and create favorable conditions for students to learn. These differences cause a variety of methods and approaches used in pedagogical management of educational organizations. Therefore, the choice of an effective model of pedagogical management depends on the type of educational institution, its goals and objectives.

Comparison and identification of various models of pedagogical management allows us to identify effective management approaches in the field of

education and apply them in practice. The correct choice of management models that correspond to the specifics of educational institutions determines their development strategy, creates conditions for the development of students' creative and intellectual abilities, and also contributes to improving the quality of teaching.

Research methods and materials

Comparative and identification of pedagogical management models in general education schools, gymnasiums and lyceums. In this regard, an expert survey was conducted among teachers of secondary school No. 165, gymnasium No. 226, and school-lyceum No. 266 in the village of Aiteke bi, Kazaly district, Kyzylorda region. 5 teachers from each institution. The sample population of respondents was 15 teachers, participated in the expert survey. The number of samples was calculated using the formula (Victor Yocco, 2017):

$$N = \frac{(3 \text{ people per segment} \times \text{Unexplored rate} \times \text{Number of segments})}{\text{The researcher's experience}} + \text{Resources}$$

Where, the Unexplored Ratio can be from 1 to 3, where 1 – the study is associated with an existing product; 2 – research when creating a new product; 3 is a summary without reference to the manufactured product. The experience of the researcher can be evaluated from 1 to 2, where 1 is the lack of experience, and 0.1 is added for every 5 years of experience. Resources are budget and timing. In our case, study segments 3 (comprehensive school, gymnasium and lyceum), the non-study rate is 2, the researcher's experience is 1.2 years. There was no budget, 3 months, which made it possible to define resources as 0. Then, according to the formula, our sample will be 15.

$$N = \frac{(3 \times 2 \times 3)}{1,2} + 0$$

Although this formula is more applicable for high-quality marketing research methods, but in general we believe that it can be applied to organize research in the field of pedagogical management. The expert survey is of the nature of a qualitative study. This determines the choice of this formula for counting and justifying the number of our samples.

The expert survey included questions on three groups of the organization of pedagogical management: educational opportunities and difficulties (organization of the learning process, use of technology and control); about the specifics of the upbringing process; cognitive and self-learning strategies of the teacher in daily practice. The survey began with introductory questions regarding specialization in the academic subject, teaching experience and level of education. Then the expert survey continues with questions to determine the specifics of pedagogical management.

Literature review

In the works of Kazakh scientists, pedagogical management is a set of principles, methods, organizational forms and psychological approaches aimed at increasing the effectiveness of management of the educational process. From the position of pedagogical management, the activities of managers and teachers of the educational process ensure the resolution of the constant conflicts between formalism and creativity in influencing the student in each management (Ayagan, 2018).

Therefore, a teacher who has mastered pedagogical management can easily and quickly solve the difficulties encountered in his work. The Psychological and Pedagogical Dictionary defines “Pedagogical management is the art of management, that is, a set of principles, methods, tools and forms of management; a set of principles, methods, organizational forms and technical methods of management aimed at increasing the efficiency of educational and cognitive processes” (Moldagaliev, Madenova, Zharollaeva, Kazhimova, 2011). Pedagogical management is a set of management principles, methods, organizational forms and technological approaches aimed at increasing the efficiency of the education system and the art of managing the pedagogical system: planning, regulation, control, leadership, organization. Pedagogical management is a process of cooperation of people, a way of communicating with people, self-organization, self-development (Kurmanalina, Bakhisheva, Dauletkaliev, Arkhymatayeva, 2018). In this regard, an expert survey conducted among teachers in schools analyzes the indicators of their mastery of pedagogical management skills. Pedagogical management is generally understood as the process of organizing human, material and financial resources to achieve certain goals. Management in pedagogy is management (planning, regulation, control), management of pedagogical production, its organization. This is also a set of methods, forms, and management tools to achieve the intended goal (Simonov, 2009). Modern authors define pedagogical management as a set of principles, methods, organizational forms, and technological approaches aimed at managing the educational process, with the main goal of increasing its effectiveness. From the point of view of pedagogical management, Y.A. Konarzhevsky (2000) proposed the following principles of management:

- Respect and trust for individuals,
- A holistic approach to individuals,
- Collaboration,
- Social justice,
- Individual approach to management,
- Enrichment of teachers’ work,
- Personal motivation,
- Consensus,
- Collective decision-making,
- Goal alignment,
- Horizontal communication,
- Autonomy in management,
- Continuous updating.

Based on the experience of advanced educational systems, it can be seen that in these countries, emphasis is placed on increasing the leadership potential of teachers, their confidence in their professional activities, and professionalism (Schleicher, 2012).

Part of pedagogical management is the self-education of an individual – a necessary condition for professional activity, this is a purposeful cognitive activity controlled by the individual; self-access to systematic knowledge in any field of science, technology, culture, political life (Berkimbaev, Arymbaeva, Boranbaeva, 2016). Pedagogical management is measured by the professional competence of the teacher and the relationship between the educational agents that make up the knowledge society. The competence of a teacher is determined by the set of skills and knowledge he has acquired (Alzamora, 2022). Pedagogical management can be considered as a special area of management, which is characterized by its own specific features and laws. The peculiarity of pedagogical management lies in the difference between the activity of the subject of management, the product of work, the means of labor and the result of the manager’s labor in the educational process. The subject of the work of the manager managing the educational process is the activity of the management subject, the product of his work is information about the educational process. The tool of labor is the word, language. The result of labor is the level of literacy (training), upbringing and development of the object of pedagogical management, that is, students (Chelnokova, Korovina, Agaev, 2015).

Innovative pedagogical management as a process includes the following in its development cycle:

- goal setting,
- modeling a new idea,
- implementation of the conceived idea,
- correction and reflection,
- introduction and dissemination of the idea,
- decline and destruction.

In the conditions of innovative pedagogical management, the process of self-determination of the personality is activated in students and teachers, which affects the nature of people’s relationships (Tereshchenkova, Golchenko, 2013).

The scientific organization and management of pedagogical processes, the introduction of functions and methods aimed at ensuring the quality of the educational process have their own characteristics, which must be taken into account:

- the scientific organization and management of pedagogical processes is aimed at achieving specific goals and involves the use of specific management functions and methods;

- the organization and management of pedagogical processes is a single system;

- the components of the pedagogical process are interconnected and interdependent;

- the effectiveness of pedagogical processes is determined by the increase in the level of mastery of knowledge and skills of the subjects of these processes, that is, the effectiveness of the educational process;

- the effectiveness of pedagogical processes is characterized by the introduction of scientifically based innovations;

- the effectiveness of the educational process depends on the needs and interests of students, the development of their abilities;

- the development of a creative environment in the educational process is a necessary condition for the motivation of students;

- obtaining new and reliable information contributes to the activity of subjects in communication processes;

- it is necessary to create conditions for the use of the creative potential of each subject of the educational process (Turgunov, Kazimov, 2019).

To characterize pedagogical management, it is necessary to distinguish the following structural components:

- subject of pedagogical management (on the one hand, the teacher, on the other – students);

- purposefulness of pedagogical management (the expected result, taking into account the individual needs, goals and motives of the subjects);

- subject-oriented (students' activities);

- effectiveness (the degree of correspondence of the planned, expected and implemented, achieved results);

- direct managerial activity (a legal, consistent change in reality).

In this regard, the following definition can be formulated: pedagogical management is the purposeful activity of pedagogical staff aimed at organizing and creating an effective system for managing the process of teaching, training and personal development of students.

Most authors generally understand pedagogical management as the management of the pedagogical process by the administration of an educational institution, that is, creating conditions for the imple-

mentation of goals and controlling the activity and development of educational processes. Recognizing the leading role of the administration in implementing pedagogical management, it is necessary to take into account the managerial role of teachers, as it is historically grounded and established (Chokan, 2018).

Pedagogical management requires from the teacher the knowledge and skills necessary for any leader. The course and results of managerial activity depend primarily on the level of preparation for the tasks to be performed. In addition, we believe that the quality of pedagogical management is the result of the implementation of psychological and pedagogical preparation for the implementation of this type of activity. In this regard, psychological and pedagogical preparation is considered as a separate condition of psychological readiness for effective activity and is characterized as a professional and adaptive potential (Mizherikov, 1998).

The pedagogical management model provides for the implementation of active and independent work of students in the educational process in the following areas:

- the interrelation of individual, collective and frontal work, which provides each student with the opportunity to perform complex independent work;

- development of training sessions in accordance with the "development zone", which requires independent mastery of additional knowledge and skills;

- setting personally significant goals that activate the learning process, this is done by jointly presenting hypotheses on the educational material being studied, developing problems, and introducing their own proposals into the discussion program;

- mastering and consolidating the educational material by each student, performing tasks of a reproductive, constructive, creative nature during control;

- expanding systematic knowledge and skills in the content of independent work: establishing local (intra-subject) and interdisciplinary connections, conducting special complex independent work; changing the interaction between the teacher and students.

Thus, the pedagogical management system ensures effective management of the educational process at the teacher level in a general education institution and implements the following ways to improve the educational process:

- targeted planning and organization of teachers' pedagogical activities;

- ensuring interdisciplinary connections with the developmental direction of learning, taking into account the specifics of the general education institution;

- coordination of the selection of the content of educational material with the organization of independent work of students (Chokan, 2018, p. 89).

According to Article 51 of the Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan “On Education”, entitled “Rights, Duties and Responsibilities of Pedagogical Employees”, a pedagogical employee is responsible for the work of the collegial bodies of the educational organization, primarily the pedagogical council of the school, the scientific council of the higher education institution, etc. Here, the teacher begins to perform management functions in relation to the entire educational institution to a certain extent, which requires their attention and makes demands on their managerial competencies.

T.M. Baimoldaev (2008), considering the principles of school management based on management, highlights the following principles:

- Respect and trust in individuals;
- The principle of cooperation, that is, the transition of management from monologue communication to interaction based on dialogue;
- The principle of collective decision-making based on consensus;
- The principle of teacher participation in school management;
- The principle of horizontal communication, etc.

Thus, most of the principles discussed by the author relate to the involvement of employees and teachers in the processes of managing an educational institution. And this is an important condition for improving the quality of education.

Recognizing the importance of involving teachers in the management of educational organizations as a prospect for the development of pedagogical management in the Kazakhstani education system, it can be concluded that teachers, in their pre-practice tasks, become subjects that include managerial functions related to the educational and educational processes carried out at the educational institution, as well as the cognitive, educational and labor activities of students (Panshina, Aitpaeva, 2012).

Analyzing the theoretical data in the literature, it was determined that in order to increase the effectiveness of pedagogical management in schools, it is necessary to modernize the management system, continuously train pedagogical staff, and introduce innovative methods.

The work of foreign researchers shows their interest in studying the relationship between the goals of educational management (management of educational organizations) and school leadership. Indeed, in reality, different leadership and positioning of schools in the educational services market require different management models. A review of these studies shows that the following models are most common: analytical-rational, pragmatic-rational, political, phenomenological, and interactionist (Cuthbert, 1984); formal, collegial, political, subjective, ambiguous, and cultural (Bush, 2006). More rigidly hierarchical educational organizations often use a formal management model. Research by Bloom, Lemos, Sadun, Reenen (2014) indicates that state-funded but independent educational organizations, even unlike private schools, introduce more effective management models and the leadership role of the director is important here. These authors attribute this trend to two features: the strength of management, i.e. the existence of strict accountability for student performance to an external body, and the degree of school leadership, i.e. the development of a long-term strategy for the school. However, this is a study that examines educational management in general.

The concept of “pedagogical management as an organization and management of interaction with the student body in the classroom” in foreign sources is more considered as class management, and therefore, in the context of our research position, it is closer to us. Class management in foreign sources covers: the involvement of subjects of the educational process, the level of control, the role of the teacher, the presence of rules of conduct. At the same time, the following competencies of the teacher are given: the ability to collaborate, timekeeping of classes and time management of trainees, content management, the ability to involve trainees, etc. (Kausar, 2024). In general, an analysis of foreign sources shows that the following class management models are most common: Kunin’s model: observation, notification and group management; the neo-Skinner model: formation of desired behavior based on rewards; Ginotta’s model: solving problems through reasonable messages (Classroom Management Models, 2024).

If there are practically no works in Kazakhstan comparing class management models with types of schools. Recently, such studies have been appearing abroad. Kausar’s research (2024, p. 88-89) revealed differences between classroom management

in public and private schools, namely in the choice of teaching methods, in strategies for behavioral patterns, and in strategies for working with parents. The work of Nauman A. Abdullah (2020) is consistent with our research, where he compares the management class in private and public schools using the example of learning English by criteria: behavior management, learning strategies, working with parents, planning and support. His research has shown that there is a significant difference in the private sector using more appropriate classroom management strategies compared to public schools. However, there was no difference in other criteria.

In our view, the pedagogical management model includes the most common technologies preferred by teachers and mechanisms for ensuring the quality of education, maintaining students, and transforming the management cycle. The management model in this article is used as a set of teachers' priorities for factors related to quality

classroom management. The roles performed by teachers determine the dynamics and achievability of management goals.

Results and discussion

Analysis of research results

In the realities of Kazakh practice, private schools are in an advantageous position, unlike public schools, in terms of the number of students in a class, in terms of material and technical equipment, and in terms of freedom to choose educational content. Therefore, our research focused on comparing the results of experts across 3 types of schools.

Next, we present the results of an expert survey, where 5 teachers from secondary schools, gymnasia and lyceums acted as experts. All the experts' answers were systematized by the most common words and key expressions and the arithmetic mean was calculated.

Table 1 – Data on the block: educational opportunities and difficulties (organization of the learning process, use of technology and control).

| Expert survey questions | The most common answers | School | Gymnasium | Lyceum |
|--|------------------------------------|--------|-----------|--------|
| What difficulties do you encounter in planning your learning goals? (You can choose 2-3 answers) | Lack of time | 60% | 60% | 60% |
| | Lack of learning resources | | 20% | 20% |
| | Different levels of students | 40% | 40% | 40% |
| What methods do you use to achieve your learning goals? (You can choose 2-3 answers) | Traditional methods | 20% | 20% | 40% |
| | Interactive methods | 60% | 100% | 80% |
| | Project work | | 20% | 20% |
| | Evaluation criteria | 40% | 20% | 40% |
| How would you rate your learning goal achievement process (1 is low, 5 is very high)? | 3 points | | 20% | |
| | 4 points | 60% | 60% | 40% |
| | 5 points | 40% | 20% | 60% |
| What methods do you use to improve the learning process? | Interactive whiteboard | 20% | 20% | 40% |
| | Additional tutorials and resources | 20% | 60% | 40% |
| | Group work | 60% | 20% | |
| | Subject projects | | | 20% |

Continuation of the table

| Expert survey questions | The most common answers | School | Gymnasium | Lyceum |
|--|--|--------|-----------|--------|
| How do you assess the level of assimilation of educational material by students? | Through periodic tests and observations | 60% | 100% | 40% |
| | Depending on the quality of homework | | | |
| | Based on the activity and participation of students | 40% | | 60% |
| What difficulties arise in your classes? | Maintaining students' attention | 40% | 40% | 40% |
| | Effective interpretation of the material | 20% | 40% | |
| | Lack of methodological tools | 20% | | 60% |
| | Lack of interest in the student, especially in the young age of students | 20% | 20% | |
| In your opinion, how to increase the motivation of students to study? | Assignment of tasks that take into account the interests of the student | 60% | 60% | 100% |
| | Celebrate personal achievements | | 20% | |
| | Introduction of additional incentive measures | 40% | 20% | |
| What are your recommendations to improve the quality of the educational process? | Updating methodological manuals | 20% | 40% | 60% |
| | Effective communication with learners installation | 40% | 40% | 20% |
| | Support for professional development of teachers | 40% | 20% | 20% |

As a result of the expert survey, it was found that there are many similarities between the models of pedagogical management in secondary schools, gymnasiums and lyceums.

In these educational institutions, it is often difficult to plan educational goals due to the lack of time and the different levels of students. It was noted that school, gymnasium and lyceum teachers often prefer to use interactive methods to achieve educational goals. And for this purpose, gymnasium teachers highly rated their results, while school and lyceum teachers gave an average score. The interesting data turned out to be that school teachers do not experience difficulties in providing educational and material equipment. The results of self-assessment of achievement of educational goals are high

in schools and lyceums. Perhaps this shows inflated self-esteem. It is also interesting that group work is used more only at school, while project methods are used only at the lyceum.

To improve the learning process, it was found that school teachers: use interactive boards, gymnasium teachers: additional textbooks and resources, and lyceum teachers: both. While school and lyceum teachers assess the level of students' mastery of the materials based on the active participation of students, gymnasium teachers evaluate them through periodic tests and observations. It was shown that teachers of the three educational institutions often increase students' motivation to learn by giving tasks that take into account the interests of students.

Table 2 – Data on the block: specifics of the upbringing process

| Expert survey questions | The most common answers | School | Gymnasium | Lyceum |
|--|--|--------|-----------|--------|
| What aspects do you consider when defining upbringing goals? | Social development needs of students | 20% | 40% | 60% |
| | School educational policy | 20% | - | 40% |
| | Family and community influence | 40% | 80% | 60% |
| | Social and cultural values | 60% | 80% | 60% |
| What tools and methods do you use to achieve upbringing goals? | Upbringing hours Social projects School events Private conversations with students | 80% | 60% | 80% |
| | Social projects | - | 20% | 40% |
| | School events | 40% | 80% | 60% |
| | Private conversations with students | 40% | 40% | 60% |
| If you evaluate your own results in achieving upbringing goals | 3 points | | | 30% |
| | 4 points | 60% | 20% | 60% |
| | 5 points | 40% | 80% | 20% |
| What is your experience working with parents of students? | I am constantly in touch and work productively | 60% | 100% | 40% |
| | Sometimes I make contact I only work part | 40% | | |
| | I only work part-time | | | |
| | Previously, I did not work with parents | | | 60% |

When determining upbringing goals, it was found that school teachers: pay more attention to social and cultural values, gymnasium teachers: pay more attention to social and cultural values under the influence

of the family and society. And lyceum teachers: try to take into account all aspects of the social development needs of students, the educational policy of the school, the influence of the family and society.

Table 3 – Data on the block: cognitive strategies and self-learning strategies of the teacher in daily practice

| Expert survey questions | The most common answers | School | Gymnasium | Lyceum |
|--|--|--------|-----------|--------|
| What educational and cognitive resources or support do you need? | Additional methodological manuals | 40% | 20% | 20% |
| | Resources that facilitate student learning materials | 20% | 20% | 40% |
| | Professional development programs for teachers | 40% | 60% | 40% |

Continuation of the table

| Expert survey questions | The most common answers | School | Gymnasium | Lyceum |
|---|---------------------------------------|--------|-----------|--------|
| Evaluate your opinion on the importance of the process of self-education (1- completely disagree, 5-Completely agree) | 3 points | | | 20% |
| | 4 points | 80% | | 40% |
| | 5 points | 20% | 100% | 40% |
| How do you define your goal in self-education? | Personal interests | 20% | 80% | 40% |
| | The need for professional development | 80% | 80% | 60% |
| | Work requirements | 20% | | 60% |
| What difficulties do you encounter in the process of self-education? | Lack of time | 60% | 40% | 20% |
| | Lack of tools | | | 40% |
| | Low motivation | 40% | 40% | 80% |
| | Insufficient quality specialist | 20% | 40% | 20% |

Secondary school teachers determine their goals in self-education based on the need for professional development, gymnasium teachers: taking into account personal interests, and lyceum teachers: in accordance with work requirements. It was found that most teachers rely on online courses and webinars for self-education. It was proved that when choosing methodological tools, school teachers: pay special attention to the novelty of information, gymnasium teachers: to the quality of content, and lyceum teachers: to ease of use.

As a result of the comparative study, it was found that the openness to innovation, focus on teamwork, and high level of communication between students and teachers of the management models used in schools, gymnasiums, and lyceums increase the effectiveness of pedagogical management. We assume that in the future, teachers will continue their creative pursuits and will continue to develop their will to educate themselves.

Conclusion

In conclusion, when considering the comparative models of pedagogical management in schools, gymnasiums and lyceums, it should be noted that

there are no significant differences between them. Despite the fact that they are different educational institutions, their main goal is to provide students with high-quality education, comprehensively develop their creative, social and intellectual abilities. Pedagogical management in implementing this goal is similar, that is, the main components of pedagogical management – the organization of the educational process, monitoring the quality of education and establishing contacts with parents and society – are common to all. In addition, in all three educational institutions, special attention is paid to such processes as the introduction of modern pedagogical technologies and methods, the implementation of innovative projects. These areas are an important part of pedagogical management and contribute to improving the educational results of students in all schools, gymnasiums and lyceums, their comprehensive development. In conclusion, the similarities between the models of pedagogical management in schools, gymnasiums and lyceums outweigh the differences. Each institution is focused on common goals, such as improving the quality of education and creating conditions for the personal development of students, and their management system serves to effectively implement these goals.

Әдебиеттер

1. Alzamora, N. I. O., & Obregón, P. I. T. (2022). Pedagogical management and professional competencies of secondary school teachers at UNFV. *IGOVERNANZA*, 5(17), 15–51.
2. Bloom, N., Lemos, R., Sadun, R., & Reenen, J. (2014). Does management matter in schools? https://docs.yandex.kz/docs/view?tm=1741252510&tld=kz&lang=en&name=SchoolManagement_20140501.pdf&text
3. Bush, T. (2006). Theories of educational management (Version 1.1). <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/>
4. Cuthbert, R. (1984). The management process. In *E324 Management in Post Compulsory Education* (Block 3, Part 2). Buckingham: Open University Press.
5. Kausar, F. (2024). Secondary schools' classroom management strategies in district Lahore: A comparative study of public and private sector. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/378735845_Secondary_Schools'_Classroom_Management_Strategies_in_district_Lahore_A_Comparative_Study_of_Public_and_Private_Sector
6. Models of classroom management. (n.d.). Lumen Learning. <https://courses.lumenlearning.com/suny-oneonta-education106/chapter/7-2-models-of-classroom-management-2/> (Accessed 12.12.2024)
7. Nauman, A. A. (2020). Comparative study of classroom management strategies employed by public and private school English language teachers. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, 7(1), 71–86. <https://doi.org/10.22555/joed.v7i1.2642>
8. Pont, B., Istance, D., & Zapata, J. (2012). Preparing teachers and developing school leaders for the 21st century: Lessons from around the world. OECD Publishing.
9. Turgunov, S. T. L., & Kazimov, J. S. (2019). Organization and management of pedagogical processes in secondary schools on a scientific basis. *European Journal of Research and Reflection in Educational Sciences*, 7(12), 85–92.
10. Yocco, V. (2017). Filling up your tank, or how to justify user research sample size and data.
11. Аяган, Е. С. (2018). Білім берудегі менеджмент пәні бойынша дәрістер курсы. Қарағанды.
12. Баймолдаев, Т. М., Безруков, В. И., Исаков, И. А., & Соловова, Н. А. (2008). Педагогический менеджмент и управление развитием образования. Алматы.
13. Беркимбаев, К. М., Арымбаева, К. М., & Боранбаева, А. Р. (2016). Жоғары оқу орындарында болашақ мұғалімдердің өздігінен білім алу үрдісінің мәні мен құрылымы. *ҚазҰУ Хабаршысы. Педагогикалық ғылымдар сериясы*, 2(48), 46–52.
14. Конаржевский, Ю. А. (2000). Менеджмент и внутришкольное управление. Москва: Педагогический поиск.
15. Курманалина, Ш. Х., Бахшиева, С. М., Дәулеткалиева, Н. Н., & Архыматаева, Н. Ж. (2018). Педагогикалық менеджмент: оқу құралы. Астана.
16. Мижериков, В. А. (1998). Психолого-педагогический словарь для учителей и руководителей общеобразовательных учреждений. Ростов н/Д: Феникс.
17. Молдағалиев, Б. А., и др. (2011). Психологиялық-педагогикалық сөздік (2-ші басылым). Алматы: Арыс.
18. Панышина, Т. В., & Айтпаева, Ж. Ж. (2012). Педагогикалық менеджмент. Алматы.
19. Симонов, В. П. (1999). Педагогический менеджмент: 50 ноу-хау в управлении педагогическими системами (3-е изд.). Москва: Российское педагогическое агентство.
20. Терещенкова, Е. В., & Гольченко, Ю. В. (2013). Инновационный педагогический менеджмент: сущность, особенности и условия реализации в образовательном учреждении. *Научно-методический электронный журнал «Концепт»*, 3, 3206–3210. <http://e-koncept.ru/2013/53647.htm>
21. Челнокова, Е. А., Коровина, Е. А., & Агаев, Н. Ф. (2015). Педагогический менеджмент как вид управленческой деятельности педагога. *Современные наукоемкие технологии*, (12, часть 1), 165–168.
22. Чокан, В. Э. (2018). Проектирование модели педагогического менеджмента в условиях образовательной организации. Екатеринбург.

References

- Alzamora, N. I. O., & Obregón, P. I. T. (2022). Pedagogical management and professional competencies of secondary school teachers at UNFV. *IGOVERNANZA*, 5(17), 15–51.
- Ayagan, E. S. (2018). Bilim berudegi menedzhment pani boiynsha darister kursy [Course of lectures on the subject of educational management]. Karaganda. (in Kazakh)
- Baimoldayev, T. M., Bezrukov, V. I., Isakov, I. A., & Solovova, N. A. (2008). Pedagogikalyq menedzhment zhane bilim berudi damytudy basqaru [Pedagogical management and development of education management]. Almaty. (in Kazakh)
- Berkinbaev, K. M., Arymbaeva, K. M., & Boranbaeva, A. R. (2016). Zhogary oku oryndarynda bolashaq mugalimderdin ozdiginen bilim alu urdisinin mani men qurylymy [The meaning and structure of the self-education process of future teachers in higher education institutions]. *QazUU Khabarshysy. Pedagogikalyq gylymdar seriiasy*, 2(48), 46–52. (in Kazakh)
- Bloom, N., Lemos, R., Sadun, R., & Reenen, J. (2014). Does management matter in schools? https://docs.yandex.kz/docs/view?tm=1741252510&tld=kz&lang=en&name=SchoolManagement_20140501.pdf&text
- Bush, T. (2006). Theories of educational management (Version 1.1). <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/>

- Chelnokova, E. A., Korovina, E. A., & Agaev, N. F. (2015). Pedagogicheskii menedzhment kak vid upravlencheskoi deiatel'nosti pedagoga [Pedagogical management as a type of teacher's managerial activity]. *Sovremennye naukoemkie tekhnologii*, (12, part 1), 165–168. (in Russian)
- Chokan, V. E. (2018). Proektirovanie modeli pedagogicheskogo menedzhmenta v usloviakh obrazovatelnoi organizatsii [Designing a model of pedagogical management in an educational organization]. Ekaterinburg. (in Russian)
- Cuthbert, R. (1984). The management process. In *E324 Management in Post Compulsory Education (Block 3, Part 2)*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Kausar, F. (2024). Secondary schools' classroom management strategies in district Lahore: A comparative study of public and private sector. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/378735845_Secondary_Schools'_Classroom_Management_Strategies_in_district_Lahore_A_Comparative_Study_of_Public_and_Private_Sector
- Konarzhevskii, Yu. A. (2000). Menedzhment i vnutrishkolnoe upravlenie [Management and in-school administration]. Moskva: Pedagogicheskii poisk. (in Russian)
- Kurmanalina, Sh. Kh., Bakhisheva, S. M., Dauletaliyeva, N. N., & Arkhymatayeva, N. Zh. (2018). Pedagogikalyq menedzhment: oku quraly [Pedagogical management: A textbook]. Astana. (in Kazakh)
- Mizherikov, V. A. (1998). Psikhologo-pedagogicheskii sozdar' dlia uchitelei i rukovoditelei obshcheobrazovatelnykh uchrezhdenii [Psychological and pedagogical dictionary for teachers and administrators of general education institutions]. Rostov n/D: Feniks. (in Russian)
- Models of classroom management. (n.d.). Lumen Learning. <https://courses.lumenlearning.com/suny-oneonta-education106/chapter/7-2-models-of-classroom-management-2/> (Accessed 12.12.2024)
- Moldagaliyev, B. A., et al. (2011). Psikhologiyalyq-pedagogikalyq sozdik (2-shi basylym) [Psychological-pedagogical dictionary (2nd ed.)]. Almaty: Arys. (in Kazakh)
- Nauman, A. A. (2020). Comparative study of classroom management strategies employed by public and private school English language teachers. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, 7(1), 71–86. <https://doi.org/10.22555/joed.v7i1.2642>
- Panshina, T. V., & Aitpaeva, Zh. Zh. (2012). Pedagogikalyq menedzhment [Pedagogical management]. Almaty. (in Kazakh)
- Pont, B., Istance, D., & Zapata, J. (2012). Preparing teachers and developing school leaders for the 21st century: Lessons from around the world. OECD Publishing.
- Simonov, V. P. (1999). Pedagogicheskii menedzhment: 50 nou-khau v upravlenii pedagogicheskimi sistemami (3-e izd.) [Pedagogical management: 50 know-how techniques in managing pedagogical systems (3rd ed.)]. Moskva: Rossiiskoe pedagogicheskoe agentstvo. (in Russian)
- Tereshchenkova, E. V., & Golchenko, Yu. V. (2013). Innovatsionnyi pedagogicheskii menedzhment: sushchnost, osobennosti i usloviia realizatsii v obrazovatel'nom uchrezhdenii [Innovative pedagogical management: Essence, features and conditions of implementation in an educational institution]. *Nauchno-metodicheskii elektronnyi zhurnal "Kontsept"*, 3, 3206–3210. <http://e-koncept.ru/2013/53647.htm> (in Russian)
- Turgunov, S. T. L., & Kazimov, J. S. (2019). Organization and management of pedagogical processes in secondary schools on a scientific basis. *European Journal of Research and Reflection in Educational Sciences*, 7(12), 85–92.
- Yocco, V. (2017). Filling up your tank, or how to justify user research sample size and data.

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

Іздік Ақерке Ақырзақызы - Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, педагогика және білім беру менеджменті кафедрасының магистранты (Алматы қ., Қазақстан, e-mail: izdik_kaznu@mail.ru)

Бұлатбаева Айгүль Абдимажитовна (корреспондент автор)– педагогика ғылымдарының докторы, әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, педагогика және білім беру менеджменті кафедрасының қауымдастырылған профессоры (доцент) (Алматы қ., Қазақстан, e-mail: a.bulatbaeva@yandex.ru)

Бисенбаева Рита Нурлановна- Х.Досмұхамедов атындағы Атырау Университеті (Атырау қ., Қазақстан, e-mail: bn_rita@mail.ru)

Туленова Гульзада Амангельдиевна-Х.Досмұхамедов атындағы Атырау Университеті (Атырау қ., Қазақстан, e-mail: Gulzada_tulenova@mail.ru)

Сведения об авторах:

Издик Акерке Акмырзақызы – магистрант кафедры педагогики и образовательного менеджмента Казахского национального университета имени аль-Фараби (Алматы, Казахстан, e-mail: izdik_kaznu@mail.ru)

Бұлатбаева Айгүль Абдимажитовна (корреспондентный автор) – доктор педагогических наук, ассоциированный профессор(доцент) кафедры педагогики и образовательного менеджмента Казахского национального университета имени аль-Фараби (Алматы, Казахстан, e-mail: a.bulatbaeva@yandex.ru)

Бисенбаева Рита Нурлановна – Атырауский университет имени Х. Досмұхамедова (Атырау, Казахстан, e-mail: bn_rita@mail.ru)

Туленова Гульзада Амангельдиевна – Атырауский университет имени Х. Досмұхамедова (Атырау, Казахстан, e-mail: HYPERLINK "mailto:Gulzada_tulenova@mail.ru"Gulzada_tulenova@mail.ru)

Information about authors:

Izdik Akerke Akmyrzakzy (corresponding author) - master's student of the Department of Pedagogy and Educational Management, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University (Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: izdik_kaznu@mail.ru)

Bulatbayeva Aigul Abdimazhitovna - Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Pedagogy and Educational Management, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University (Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: a.bulatbaeva@yandex.ru)

Bisenbayeva Rita Nurlanovna - Kh. Dosmuhamedov Atyrau University (Atyrau, Kazakhstan, e-mail: bn_rita@mail.ru)

Tulenova Gulzada Amangeldievna - Kh. Dosmuhamedov Atyrau University (Atyrau, Kazakhstan, e-mail: Gulzada HYPERLINK "mailto:_tulenova@mail.ru" _tulenova@mail.ru)

Received 25.11.2024

Accepted 20.06.2025