LEVELS OF LEADER PSYCHOLOGICAL COMPETENCE

Oybek Eshboyevich Hayitov
Candidate of Psychological Sciences, Associate Professor
Deputy Director for Scientific and Methodological Work, The Centre of Scientifically-Methodical
Providing for Retraining and Professional Development of Specialists in Physical Culture and Sport
UZBEKISTAN
E-mail: oybekhayitovj887na@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This article describes the issue of psychological competence of the middle-level chairman of higher education system in the context of priority psychological qualities and social orientation. Based on empirical analysis, the levels of psychological competence of the head of the faculty of the higher education institution were determined.

Keywords: Leader, manager, higher education institution, middle manager, dean, person questionnaire, factors, competency, competence, psychological competence, levels of competence.

INTRODUCTION

The stabilization of the path of reforms in all areas of the New Uzbekistan, going from national revival to national ascent, the acceleration of the pace of development provided for in the "Strategy of actions for the further development of the Republic of Uzbekistan" [1], forces us to take stock and optimize the effectiveness of modern leadership.

In the context of the renewal of our society, often in everyday communication, we often use the concept of "competence". In particular, the concept of "professional competence" attracts more attention. However, when working with people, the concept of "psychological competence" is sometimes used. In the field of psychology, especially in the field of "Management Psychology", the phenomenon of "psychological competence" has recently been highlighted, in fact, it is broader and more comprehensive than professional competence [2].

LITERATURE REVIEW

The study used the "16-factor personality questionnaire" by R. B. Kettel to study personality [3; 150 p.]. According to the procedure for using a multi-factor personal survey, the head of the middle level of the University (deans and deputies of the faculty, 75 people in total) carefully read the questions (one hundred) and chose one of the appropriate answer options. At the next stage, a factor analysis of the study results was conducted based on a socio-psychological perspective, and twenty different psychological qualities and sixteen types of social orientation positions were identified as priorities. It was found that responses received on a ten-point scale of closely related factors require subject analysis: low, medium, and high.

METHODOLOGY, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study showed that among twenty different psychological qualities, the "E" factor in the third block showed the highest colour index and was noted in the selection of 27.9% of subjects (see Table 1).

Explaining the " E " factor, that is, 27.9 % of middle managers who demonstrate a level of desire for dominance usually demonstrate submissive leadership and flexible leadership to senior managers, giving way to others or subordinates when making management decisions. The orientation of this category of respondents-managers differs from traditional ideas and is aimed at changing behaviour under the influence of others. It is established that the owners of the above indicators are usually submissive, unbiased in the management process, constantly concerned about the correct implementation of the conditions and requirements that are imposed on them and that must be met, and strengthen control to increase vigilance. Consequently, this management style makes it difficult for the leader to adapt to the chosen position, which leads to an inability to defend their views and opinions. As a result, the middle Manager, the Dean of faculty, Deputy deans are insecure in themselves and their abilities, which in turn leads to lower management efficiency. Thus, according to the "subordination – dominance" scale, the head of the secondary level of higher education demonstrates one of the following three levels of psychological competence.

5.3 % of deans and Vice-deans of faculties with a low level of psychological competence on the "E" factor are considered obedient and flexible individuals, usually yielding to the wishes of the teachers / students around them. This category of test takers is more submissive, open-minded, and carefully examines the status of functional tasks and tasks that are set and should be completed. The inability of this category of leaders to adequately defend their views, their lack of confidence in themselves and their abilities usually indicates a high degree of negative impact on their management activities and the process of making managerial decisions.

Table 1. Levels of psychological competence of the head of the faculty (n = 75; percentage analysis)

Blocks	Factors	Levels of psychological competence			Rank
		1st level	2nd level	3rd level	
Block 3	Factor "E": "subordination – dominance»	5,3	8,0	14,6	1
Block 4	Factor "G": "low normativity of behavior – high normativity of behavior»	4,0	6,7	10,7	2
Block 5	The Factor "N": "shyness – boldness»	5,3	6,7	6,7	3
Block 8	Factor "Q2": "conformism – nonconformism»	2,7	8,0	4,0	4
Block 1	Factor "A": "closeness – sociability»	1,3	2,7	4,0	5
Blocks 2, 6, 7, 9, 10	Factors "C", "L", "O", "Q3", "Q4»	1,3	4,0	4,0	0
Total number		19,9	36,1	44,0	

It cannot be said that 6.7% of faculty leaders with average psychological competence are fully committed to the influence of the surrounding (subordinate) teaching staff / students. The reason is that they believe that their behaviour, that is, leadership activity, is a positive manifestation of the "I-concept" under the influence of their positions. However, in any case, they do not ignore the will of others (subordinates).

According to the results, 10.7% of the total number of respondents on the "E" factor is a highly psychologically competent leader. The real candidates for leadership are deans and deputy deans of this category of faculties. The reason is that this category of respondents is very self-confident, very independent in thinking, strict in management, has applied the rules of their style in the faculty management system and in most cases acts independently. An optimistic attitude in them always shows that they love excellence. Although they are considered prestigious people in higher education, they are usually not fully subordinate to higher-level leaders. Because from a socio-psychological point of view, individual typological features, such as extreme courage, hyperactivity, courage and hard work, are usually formed by the head of the faculty with such a high level of desire for humour (leadership). Compared to other chairmen, this category of middle ones is considered grumpy and often exhibits aggressive situations in management and related decision-making processes.

21.4 % of middle – level chairmen of higher education institutions demonstrate one of the following three levels of psychological competence on the scale "low normativity of behaviour-high normativity of behaviour". 4.0% of managers with a low level of psychological competence on the "G" factor effectively use their time and seek benefits for themselves in any situation. Therefore, in most cases, they shy away from the functional responsibilities of their position. Faculties in this category are less aware of their responsibilities and responsibilities, and their University strategy or faculty development goals are variable. The study shows that this category of leaders of the test almost does not spend effort to fulfil public tasks. In management-related processes, they often pit themselves against a team of teachers. They are also often the subject of vertical disputes, disagreements, disagreements and conflicts in the context of management activities. Because of this, the high level of inadequate opinion of this category of managers about themselves sharply hinders leadership activities, leads to a decrease in the effectiveness of management and the formation of a sense of self-sufficiency in the teaching staff.

Among the personal competencies of 6.7 % of deans and deputy deans with moderate psychological competence according to the "G" factor, such qualities as inattention, irresponsibility, inefficiency (time) in life and work (management) are priority. This situation does not really indicate that the "I-concept" is negative, but rather the leader's inability to control his own behaviour when necessary and lack of determination. However, public (expert) opinion suggests that this category of faculty leaders is positioned as aspiring managers who recognize universal values and adhere to the rules of ethics within their individual relationships with surrounding (subordinate) teachers / students.

Another 10.7 % of respondents are managers with a high level of psychological competence according to the "G"factor. This category of test takers includes conscientious, reliable, with a sense of duty and responsibility, demanding, with a deep sense of responsibility, firm in managerial relationships, full of innovative plans based on creative ideas, do not waste time, and a fun environment (subordinates) as a leader who likes to work in a team honestly and conscientiously. Research shows that teachers / students (subordinates) around them sincerely trust their supervisors and respect them for their integrity and kindness. But because of their reputation in front of the team, they are a little afraid of themselves (techniques) and fall under the influence of internal fear.

According to an empirical analysis, 18.7 % of middle managers demonstrated the following three levels of psychological competence on the timidity – courage scale. 5.3 % of the subjects had a low level of psychological competence on the"H" factor. Respondents in this category

are distinguished from other line managers by their shyness, shyness, lack of self-confidence, and lack of courage in managerial activities. Permanent exclusion from self-management processes means that this category of faculty leaders is not happy with themselves. Because they are hypersensitive to the effects of the nervous system, they respond strongly to any risk factor associated with management processes. They especially do not like to work with subordinates, they are not easy in life and speak slowly. The "I-concept" in the psyche of such a leadership faculty, which has a low level of social stability, is often negative, which in turn has a very negative impact on the management activities of not only the University, but also its social status in society.

Moderate psychological competence on the "H" factor was found in 6.7 % of the subjects. In our opinion, the indicator of social stability of this category of leaders is the most optimal result for managing the pedagogical process. This is due to the fact that they can interact freely with their subordinates, easily overcome obstacles and difficulties in the context of the "leader-employee" dyad, and are not lost in the event of unforeseen circumstances related to the management process.

A high level of psychological competence was also noted in 6.7 % of respondents on the"H" factor. This category of respondents feels completely free in management activities. They are not considered less careful when making decisions related to management processes. They like to test new teaching materials created by the faculty team based on their research and development experience. The study shows that the ability of a leader in managing universities at the level of the teaching staff, the lack of fear of risk when making decisions do not justify themselves.

According to the socio-psychological analysis of the empirical study, 8% of the test leader's subjects had a tendency to the "conformism – nonconformism" scale, which allowed them to interpret the following three levels of psychological competence. 1.3 % of the total number of respondents are considered psychologically competent managers with a low level of factor "A" and not flexible in the system in terms of socio-psychological assessment. The middle Manager of this category of higher education is very cold and indifferent to the surrounding realities. They are more interested in working with documents than people, teachers, or students. One of the prevailing psychological qualities in his personality is secrecy, he prefers to work alone, avoiding compromises, views and judgments related to management activities and decision – making processes. At the same time, sometimes this leader shows stubbornness, anger and dislike for others (subordinates). It turned out that such a middle-level leader is insensitive to social needs, especially to his subordinates, and uses authoritarian management in his work.

The study showed that another 2.7% of respondents were moderately psychologically competent managers, they were willing to cooperate with each member of their subordinate team on the "A"factor. It is noteworthy that this category of leaders is less likely to find themselves in situations of intense anger or joy (internal excitement, passion) in management activities. We believe that while their ability to control their behaviour shows that they are compassionate and sincere toward others, they are embodied in the employees ' imaginations as demanding leaders.

It was found that a subject with a psychologically competent management process with a high 4.0% level had a high propensity to communicate. The results of factor "A" show that they usually make quick decisions in management situations. Regardless of the positive psychological environment that is a priority in the team, the mood often changes during the

day. This situation is especially reflected in the attention, compassion and enthusiasm of this category of leaders for students and young scientists. In our opinion, such a good-natured Dean of the University suffers most from this feature. For example, this can be seen in the process of quantitative checks performed by senior joint management.

CONCLUSIONS

First, we can say that competence is a standard that helps a leader evaluate his or her performance against the actions that he or she performed best. The reason is that such an assessment, in turn, leads to a positive change in the activities of higher education institutions (economic entities) in General in the context of changes. In the end, the winners are universities, the community, and individuals or leaders.

Secondly, psychological competence is an integral structure of personal traits and properties (competencies) of a leader, as well as professional qualities and features (competence) that are reflected in professional management activities.

REFERENCES

1. *On the strategy of actions for further development of the Republic of Uzbekistan* (4947). (2017). Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan. https://lex.uz/pdfs/3107042
2. Eshboevich, H. O. (2020). Modeling The Psychological Competence Of Higher Education Leaders (In The Example Of Mid-Level Management Staff). *The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations, 2*(08), 55-61.
3. Rasulov, A. I. (2010). *Psychodiagnostics: Educational and Methodological Guide*. Mumtozso'z.
4. Хайитов, О. Э. (2019). Психологическая компетентность в контексте профессиональной деятельности (теоретический аспект). *Вопросынауки и образования*, (29), 78.