

## **The Impact of Teachers' Behavioral Styles on the Effectiveness of the Educational Process**

**Dilafruz Rustamboevna Turaeva**

Associate Professor, Department of Pedagogy and Psychology  
Kimyo International University in Tashkent

**Abstract:** This article presents an empirical analysis of various behavioral styles manifested in pedagogical activity — specifically, the "controlling", "demanding", "dominant", "chaotic", "responsibility-avoiding", and "expectant" styles. It examines their characteristics, expression within the educational process, and gender-based differences among teachers. The research findings indicate certain tendencies in the behavioral styles of male and female educators in Uzbekistan's education system. For example, control and demanding approaches are more pronounced among male teachers, while empathy and cooperative approaches are more distinctly observed among female teachers. Additionally, all styles characterized as authoritarian, indifferent, or chaotic showed low levels of manifestation, which highlights a general focus among educators on systematization, responsibility, and active leadership in the learning process. The article also discusses the concept of education quality and its key evaluation criteria: students' level of knowledge, teacher performance, material-technical resources, and the degree of social partnership. Overall, the research outcomes contribute to a deeper understanding of behavioral styles in pedagogy and provide scientific insights that support the improvement of education quality.

**Keywords:** pedagogical behavior styles, control-based style, demandingness, dominance, expectant style, avoidance of responsibility, chaotic behavior, gender differences, teacher activity, quality of education, pedagogical communication

### **Introduction**

In the context of contemporary globalized and competitive societies, the primary goal of the education system is to develop a well-rounded individual capable of independent thinking and successful social adaptation. A crucial factor in achieving this objective is the teacher. The quality of education depends not only on textbooks or technological tools but also significantly on the professional competence and personal qualities of the educator. Worldwide, improving the quality of education is regarded as an important social task. Rapid and often unpredictable advancements in science and technology increasingly underscore the vital role of education in shaping human behavior.

The quality of education is determined not only by institutional and methodological resources of the educational system but also significantly depends on the nature of interpersonal interactions between teachers and students. According to Goal 4 of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals—"Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all"—priority tasks include ensuring equal access, transparency, and the effectiveness of educational processes. Within this paradigm, the human factor, particularly the socio-psychological nature of pedagogical relationships, plays a central role, as it directly

influences students' motivation, the learning environment, and educational outcomes.

Educational quality is also assessed by the extent to which students acquire knowledge, skills, and competencies that align with established national educational standards and curricula, as well as their practical applicability.

This category encompasses the quality level of the activities of all participants in the educational process — students, teachers, and educational institutions. The assessment of education quality is carried out on the basis of a range of scientific and practical criteria. In particular, the level of students' knowledge and performance is determined by the depth, coherence, and ability to independently apply the acquired knowledge, skills, and competencies; the effectiveness of teachers' work is reflected in their methodological expertise, innovative approaches, and ability to foster students' motivation and creative thinking; the educational environment and material-technical base include the infrastructure of the educational institution, the conditions for organizing learning, and the availability of educational technologies and resources; social partnership and parental involvement reflect the level of interaction between the school, family, and social institutions, as well as the active participation of parents in the educational process, which constitutes an important indicator of education quality. Continuous monitoring and analysis of these criteria contribute to the objective evaluation and improvement of the quality of the educational process.

A brief analysis of scientific research on the topic:

The issues of teachers' behavioral styles, their interaction with students, and the specifics of pedagogical communication in the educational process are currently among the priority areas of scientific research in the fields of social psychology and pedagogy. Leading scientific and educational centers worldwide are actively engaged in studying this subject. In particular, fundamental research is being conducted at such prestigious institutions as the University of Oxford, the University of Cambridge, and University College London (United Kingdom); Arizona State University (USA); Leiden University and Radboud University (Netherlands); the University of Luxembourg; the Catholic University of Leuven (Belgium); the University of Hong Kong; and the Chinese Family Research Center at the Hong Kong Institute.

In Russia, in-depth studies are also being carried out at Moscow Pedagogical State University, as well as at Ural, Amur, and Ivanovo State Universities, where the focus is placed on exploring teachers' personal qualities, their role in the educational environment, mechanisms of pedagogical influence, and the individual characteristics of pedagogical interaction.

In Uzbekistan, substantial scientific potential has also been accumulated in this field. Representatives of the Uzbek scientific school — M.G. Davletshin<sup>1</sup>, Э. Е. Goziev<sup>2</sup>, G.B. Shoumarov<sup>3</sup>, V.M. Karimova<sup>4</sup> и B.M. Umarov<sup>5</sup> — have made a significant contribution to the study of teacher motivation, personal qualities, and the psychological aspects of pedagogical interaction. Their works highlight the importance of an empathetic approach, collaboration, and psychologically resilient forms of communication between teacher and student.

Moreover, such researchers as B V.A. Tokareva<sup>6</sup>, R.Z. Gaynutdinov<sup>7</sup>, Z.T. Nishonova<sup>8</sup>, Sh.R.

---

<sup>1</sup> Давлетшин М.Г. Замонавий мактаб ўқитувчисининг психологияси. – Тошкент: Ўзбекистон, 1999. – 30 б.;

<sup>2</sup> Фозиев Э.Г. Психологические основы развитие самоуправления учебной деятельностью у школьников и студентов. Автореф. дис. док. псих. наук. – Т., 1991. – 38 с.

<sup>3</sup> ШОУМАРОВ Ғ. Б., ҚОДИРОВ У. Д. СОВРЕМЕННОЕ ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ (УЗБЕКИСТАН) //СОВРЕМЕННОЕ ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ (УЗБЕКИСТАН) Учредители: Общество с ограниченной ответственностью " Центр инновационных технологий". – №. 3. – С. 3-9.

<sup>4</sup> Каримова В. М. Ижтимоий психология //Т.: Fan va texnologiya. – 2012. – Т. 172.

<sup>5</sup> Умаров Б. М. Социально-психологическая и религиозная анализ деятельности управления //вестник интегративной психологии. – 2021 Выпуск 23, С. 323.

<sup>6</sup> Токарева Н. А. Педагогические условия формирования готовности будущего педагога к творчеству в профессиональной деятельности : дис. – Астрахань : автореф. дис.... канд. пед. наук, 2009.

<sup>7</sup> Гайнутдинов Р. З., Зайнуллин А. М. Преподавание спортивной психологии в процессе профессиональной подготовки в условиях двухуровневого образования //АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ ФИЗИЧЕСКОЙ КУЛЬТУРЫ, СПОРТА И ТУРИЗМА. – 2017. – С. 55-59.

<sup>8</sup> Нишоновна З. Т. Мустақил ижодий фикрлашни ривожлантиришнинг психологик асослари //Психология фанлари доктори илмий даражасини олиш учун ёзилган диссертация. Низомий номидаги ТДПУ. – 2005. – Т. 2005. – С. 391.

Baratov , A.I. Rasulov<sup>9</sup>, E.Z. Usmonova, Sh.A. Eshmatov<sup>10</sup>, **A. Jabborov<sup>11</sup>**, **B.N. Sirliyev<sup>12</sup>**, Sh.Kh. Abdullaeva<sup>13</sup>, D.A. Sobirova<sup>14</sup>, D.R. Turaeva<sup>15</sup> и О.Е. Khayitov<sup>16</sup> have examined issues related to teacher training, the competence-based approach, pedagogical diagnostics, teachers' social intelligence, and the effectiveness of collaborative activities in the educational process.

However, the topic of gender-specific characteristics of behavioral styles in pedagogical activity and their impact on the quality of education requires more in-depth and comprehensive examination. In the context of the modernization of the education system and the growing importance of the human factor, the identification of psychologically resilient and effective models of pedagogical interaction is of particular relevance. In this regard, ongoing research represents considerable scientific and practical interest.

At present, many researchers adhere to K. Lewin's classification: A.A. Bodalev<sup>17</sup>, M.V. Gamezo<sup>18</sup>, G.M. Andreeva<sup>19</sup>, S.A. Maskalyanova<sup>20</sup>, L.I. Gabdullina<sup>21</sup>, A.A. Andreev and others N.F. Maslova<sup>22</sup> have transformed this triad into a dyad, presenting it in the form of authoritarian and democratic styles. Scholars such as A.I. Shcherbakov and A.V. Mudrik expanded the proposed triad by examining the degree of a teacher's attentiveness to various aspects of their professional activity, down to the smallest details.

Scientific novelty of the article. For the first time, a comprehensive gender analysis of behavioral styles in pedagogical situations has been conducted, within which empirical evidence has been provided for differences in approaches between female and male teachers. The study identified specific gender-related manifestations of the controlling behavioral style and its components — the “demanding” and “dominant” styles. It was established that women tend to demonstrate greater emotional support and democratic communication, whereas men exhibit more pronounced tendencies toward control, discipline, and dominance. The recorded extremely low prevalence of the “chaotic,” “expectant,” and “avoidance of responsibility” styles confirms that teachers in Uzbekistan generally avoid managerial passivity, disorganization, and irresponsibility in the educational process.

Gender differences in teachers' behavioral styles are scientifically substantiated in terms of pedagogical consciousness, socialization experience, individual style of influence, and gender-conditioned role aspirations. The study demonstrates that, in line with contemporary pedagogical trends, there is a shift away from authoritarian and repressive approaches toward democratic and cooperative forms of pedagogical interaction.

---

<sup>9</sup> Расулов А.И. Ўқитувчи шахсининг тарбиячи сифатида ўқувчилар билан ўзаро муносабат даражалари. Психол. фанл. номзод. дис. – Тошкент, - 2001.- 177 б

<sup>10</sup> Эшметов Ш.А. Устоз-шогирд муносабатларининг ижтимоий-психологик феноменлари. Психол. фан номзод. дис., Тошкент: М.Улугбек номидаги Ўзбекистон Миллий ун-ти. 2005. - 147 б

<sup>11</sup> Жабборов А.М. «Педагогик психологиянинг этник асослари» Т.: Зарқалам 2006 й - 48 б

<sup>12</sup> Сирлиев Б.Н. Ўрта махсус касб-хунар ўқув юртлари усталари касбий камолотининг психологик жиҳатлари.: психол.фан.номз. дис...: -Тошкент: ЎЗМУ, 2000.- 129 б

<sup>13</sup> Абдуллаева Ш. Х. Исследование эмоциональной устойчивости учителей общеобразовательной школы //Развитие человека в современном мире. – 2015. – С. 138-143.

<sup>14</sup> Сабирова Д. А. Методы исследования социального интеллекта учителя //Психология XXI столетия. – 2017. – С. 345-349.;

<sup>15</sup> Д.Р.Тураева. Педагог кадрлар фаолияти услубининг психологик хусусиятлари. (Матн) Монография/ Д.Р. Тураева. -Т.: “Mashhur-press”, 2019-188 б.

<sup>16</sup> Хайитов О. Э. Моделирование психологической компетентности руководителя: концептуальный эмпирический анализ //Academic research in educational sciences. – 2020. – №. 3. – С. 526-540.

<sup>17</sup> Бодалев А. А. Специфика социально-психологического подхода к пониманию личности // Психология личности в трудах отечественных психологов. - СПб.: Питер, 2000. - С.336-344.

<sup>18</sup> Гамезо М.В., Петрова Е.А., Орлова Л.М. Возрастная и педагогическая психология: Учеб. пособие для студентов всех специальностей педагогических вузов. — М.: Педагогическое общество России, 2003. — 512 с.

<sup>19</sup> Андреева Г.М., Богомолова Н.Н., Петровская Л.А. Зарубежная социальная психология XX столетия: Теоретические подходы: Учеб. пособие для вузов. -- М.: Аспект Пресс, 2002. - 287 с.

<sup>20</sup> Маскалянова С.А. Формирование профессионального имиджа будущего социального педагога: Дис. ... канд. психол. наук. – Елец: ЕГУ им.И.А.Бунина. 2005. – 168 с

<sup>21</sup> Габдулина Л. И. Стиль педагогического общения и его ценностно-смысловые и когнитивные детерминанты //Дисс. на соиск. уч. ст. канд. психол. наук. Ростов-на-Дону. – 1999.

<sup>22</sup> Маслова В. Управление персоналом. Толковый словарь. – Litres, 2022.

**Research Aim.** The primary aim of the present study is to examine teachers' behavioral styles in pedagogical situations — in particular, such models as “controlling,” “chaotic,” “avoidance of responsibility,” and “expectant” — from a gender perspective, with the goal of identifying individual and gender-specific characteristics manifested in teachers' professional activities. The research is focused on assessing the impact of these styles on the educational process and providing a scientific rationale for effective models of pedagogical interaction within the context of the modern educational environment.

### **Methodology.**

In the course of the scientific analysis of the impact of socio-psychological interaction between teacher and student on the quality of education, both motivating and demotivating approaches of teachers toward students were examined. To collect empirical data, the psychodiagnostic method “Situations at School” was employed, enabling the identification of various pedagogical behavior styles manifested in the learning process. The purpose of the method is to determine how teachers respond to typical pedagogical situations arising during a lesson, as well as to identify motivational (supportive) and demotivational (suppressive) behavioral styles that influence students' learning motivation.

The questionnaire was originally developed by N. Elterman<sup>23</sup> and colleagues, with the Russian version adapted by T.O. Gordeeva and O.A. Sychev in 2021, and in the present study further adapted into the Uzbek language. The method allows the collection of data on the main styles — autonomy-supportive, structuring, controlling, and chaotic (inconsistent) — as well as on the subscales: engaging style, adaptive style, guiding style, explanatory style, demanding style, dominant style, avoidance of responsibility style, and expectant (passively observing) style.

This methodology was used to empirically measure teachers' response styles to classroom pedagogical situations. A statistical analysis was also conducted to examine differences between motivational and demotivational approaches, as well as the factors influencing the choice of behavioral style (experience, age, gender, type of educational institution). The impact of these styles on intrinsic learning motivation, students' engagement, and their psychological well-being was evaluated on the basis of the empirical data obtained.

The findings of the study highlight the significance of developing effective pedagogical communication, a positive psychological climate, and a learner-centered approach within the educational process.

**Research Object.** The study involved 483 teachers from various regions of Uzbekistan who participated voluntarily and openly (non-anonymously). Among them, 349 were women (72.25%) and 134 were men (27.75%). The participants' teaching experience ranged from 1 to 40 years, ensuring the inclusion of representatives from different age groups and educational institutions.

**Results of the Empirical Study.** Within the framework of the research, the “Situations at School” methodology was applied, aimed at examining the psychological aspects of teachers' professional activity in general education schools. Using this method, the behavioral styles demonstrated by teachers in various typical classroom situations, their responses to these situations, and the pedagogical decisions they made were analyzed. The methodology simulates different socio-psychological conditions that a teacher may encounter in the real educational process and invites participants to assess the situation and indicate the actions they would take.

This approach made it possible to conduct a substantive and stylistic analysis of teachers' professional approaches to solving educational tasks.

**Table 1**

#### **Gender differences in teachers' behavioral styles**

№	Name of Scale / Subscale	Overall M (n = 483)	Women M (n = 349)	Men M (n = 134)
1	Autonomy Support	5,48	5,70	5,26
1.1	Engaging Style	5,20	5,40	5,00

<sup>23</sup> Aelterman N., Vansteenkiste M., Haerens L., Soenens B., Fontaine J.R., Reeve J. Toward an integrative and fine-grained insight in motivating and demotivating teaching styles: The merits of a circumplex approach // *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 2019. Vol. 111 (3). P. 497—521. DOI:10.1037/edu0000293



1.2	Adaptive Style	5,68	5,95	5,40
2	Systematic Approach	5,70	5,60	5,80
2.1	Guiding Style	5,95	5,90	6,00
2.2	Explanatory Style	5,50	5,70	5,30
3	Controlling Style	3,40	3,10	3,70
3.1	Demanding Style	3,60	3,30	3,90
3.2	Dominant Style	3,10	2,80	3,40
4	Non-systematic (Chaotic) Style	2,30	2,10	2,50
4.1	Avoidance of Responsibility Style	2,00	1,90	2,10
4.2	Expectant (Passive) Style	2,70	2,50	2,90

The research findings made it possible to conduct a comparative analysis of the prevalence of pedagogical behavioral styles from a gender perspective. The autonomy-supportive style — that is, an approach aimed at taking into account students' individual needs and interests, fostering their independence, intrinsic motivation, and providing them with choice — was found to be strongly expressed among women ( $M = 5.70$ ), whereas among men it appeared at a moderate level ( $M = 5.26$ ).

The engaging style, characterized by the active involvement of students in the learning process, open dialogue, and encouragement of participation, was also more pronounced among women ( $M = 5.40$ ) than men, in whom it was observed at a moderate level ( $M = 5.00$ ). The adaptive (flexible) style — involving the organization of learning in accordance with the student's pace and needs — was recorded at a high level among female teachers ( $M = 5.95$ ), while among male teachers it was observed at a moderate level ( $M = 5.40$ ).

Thus, the “Autonomy Support” style and its subcomponents — “Engaging” and “Adaptive” — are more strongly expressed among female teachers. This indicates their greater inclination toward empathetic interaction and the effective use of an individualized approach.

The “Systematic” behavioral style was found to be at a high level in both genders: women —  $M = 5.60$ , men —  $M = 5.80$ . This reflects teachers' commitment to organizing the educational process in a structured, purposeful, and planned manner. The “Guiding” behavioral style was also highly expressed in both genders (women —  $M = 5.90$ , men —  $M = 6.00$ ), indicating a strong presence of leadership qualities, the ability to resolve problem situations, and the implementation of reflective practices.

In addition, gender differences were observed in the “Explanatory” behavioral style: women demonstrated this style distinctly ( $M = 5.70$ ), while men expressed it at a moderate level ( $M = 5.30$ ). This suggests that female teachers place greater emphasis on didactic clarity and individualized interaction.

**Table 2**

**Mean Scores on the Scales/Subscales of Teachers' Behavioral Styles (by Gender)**

№	Name of Scale / Subscale	Women		Men		t-value	p-value
		(M±SD)		(M±SD)			
1	Autonomy Support	5.70	0.75	5.26	0.91	2.31	0.023*
2	Systematic Style	5.60	0.85	5.80	0.81	−0.94	0.35
3	Controlling Style	3.10	1.05	3.70	1.13	−2.42	0.018*
4	Non-systematic (Chaotic) Style	2.10	0.90	2.50	1.00	−1.73	0.087

**Note:** \* — statistically significant differences at  $p < 0.05$

In conclusion, it should be noted that the research findings reflect gender-conditioned individual psychological characteristics and pedagogical preferences. Female teachers tend to demonstrate greater empathy and employ an individualized approach, while male teachers more often prioritize systematic organization and a guiding style. These differences are recognized as important factors shaping pedagogical behavior in the educational process. The controlling behavioral style represents a model in which the teacher limits students' autonomy, imposes strict requirements, and actively promotes their own position. This style is characterized by elements of control,

pressure, and dominance in pedagogical interaction.

According to the results of the study, this style is expressed at a low level in both women ( $M = 3.10$ ) and men ( $M = 3.70$ ). This indicates a decline in the role of authoritarian approaches in contemporary pedagogy and a growing emphasis on cooperation and democratic communication. The slightly higher score among men reflects their greater inclination toward maintaining discipline and adherence to rules.

The “Demanding” style, as a subscale of controlling behavior, is characterized by strict enforcement of classroom discipline, directiveness, and the expectation of unconditional compliance. Among women, this indicator was recorded at a below-average level ( $M = 3.30$ ), while among men it was at an average level ( $M = 3.90$ ). These differences point to a more pronounced tendency among male teachers to ensure order and strict control, whereas female teachers tend to prefer softer forms of pedagogical influence based on collaboration.

The dominant behavioral style is aimed at emphasizing the teacher’s authority, demonstrating personal superiority, and maintaining order through emotional pressure. Among female teachers, this style is manifested at a very low level ( $M = 2.80$ ), while among male teachers it is somewhat more pronounced ( $M = 3.40$ ). This indicates a greater tendency among men toward control and the use of personal influence in pedagogical practice. Overall, despite gender differences in the degree of expression of the controlling behavioral style, it is observed at a low level in both genders. This confirms the predominance of democratic and cooperative approaches in the modern educational environment. Men tend to focus more on structure and order, while women emphasize emotional support and the creation of a free atmosphere. These differences reflect the specificity of gender-based pedagogical roles and mechanisms of influence, which is of significant importance for improving the quality of education.

The non-systematic (chaotic) behavioral style is characterized by a reduced role of the teacher in the educational process, a lack of structured support, and the absence of purposeful pedagogical guidance. Such an approach can lead to uncertainty, arbitrariness, and irresponsibility among students. According to the research results, this style is expressed at a very low level among both women ( $M = 2.10$ ) and men ( $M = 2.50$ ). This suggests that teachers avoid creating an atmosphere of chaos and strive for a well-managed educational process. The lower score among women may indicate their heightened attention to organization and emotional support in the learning process.

The “responsibility-avoiding” behavioral style is characterized by the teacher’s refusal to exercise control or provide guidance, granting students complete independence without supervision. Such an approach may lead to difficulties in students’ decision-making, a decline in motivation, and a loss of educational focus. Among female teachers, this indicator was 1.90, and among male teachers—2.10, which indicates an extremely low level of its manifestation. These findings suggest that teachers generally strive to take responsibility for the educational process and fulfill a leadership role.

The “expectant” behavioral style is associated with transferring initiative to students and adopting an observational position on the part of the teacher. While in certain cases this approach may encourage the development of independence, the lack of guidance can also provoke passivity and a lack of goal-directed behavior. For women, this indicator was  $M = 2.50$ , and for men— $M = 2.90$ . Although the style is weakly expressed overall, the higher score among men may indicate a greater tendency to delegate initiative to students.

In conclusion, the extremely low levels of expression for styles such as “chaotic,” “expectant,” and “responsibility-avoiding” indicate the absence of indifference or managerial incompetence among the surveyed teachers. The slightly higher scores for these styles among men may reflect their inclination to support students’ independence. Overall, the results confirm that teachers are oriented toward a systematic, responsible, and active leadership style in the educational process.

Based on the presented data, it can be stated that there are gender differences in teachers’ approaches to typical pedagogical situations. In particular, female teachers generally prefer more emotionally expressive and communicative interaction styles that take into account students’ psychological needs (e.g., “autonomy-supportive,” “engaging,” “explaining,” “adaptive,” and “guiding” styles). This tendency is explained by their higher levels of empathy, emotional intelligence, and ability to manage interpersonal relationships.

Male teachers, on the other hand, more often employ structured, disciplinary, and directive styles (e.g., “controlling,” “demanding,” “dominant”), which indicates their inclination toward an authoritarian and structured approach. Passive styles (such as “observing,” “chaotic,” and “responsibility-avoiding”) received generally low scores, although they may be somewhat more pronounced among men. This may be due to the fact that some men perceive themselves as having a secondary role in the education system or possess lower levels of professional motivation.

The obtained data highlight the importance of considering both individual and gender-specific approaches in teacher training. It is advisable to foster greater flexibility, psychological adaptability, and empathy among male teachers, while encouraging female teachers to strengthen their inclination toward structured and decisive pedagogical styles.

**Conclusions.** Based on the conducted study, a number of well-grounded scientific conclusions can be drawn. The empirical analysis of teachers’ behavioral styles from a gender perspective revealed clear differences in the approaches of male and female educators to educational situations. Female teachers predominantly demonstrate an orientation toward emotionally empathic and communicative styles—such as autonomy-supportive, engaging, explaining, and adaptive—which indicates a high level of interpersonal sensitivity and an ability to take into account students’ individual characteristics. Male teachers, in contrast, more frequently employ directive styles—controlling, demanding, dominant—with a pronounced focus on discipline, hierarchy, and formalized management of the educational process.

Passive behavioral styles (expectant, chaotic, responsibility-avoiding) generally received low ratings among all study participants, reflecting an overall tendency among educators toward active, organized, and responsible involvement in the learning process. Slightly higher scores for these styles among male teachers may point to a potential need for targeted support in enhancing their professional motivation and engagement.

Thus, the findings confirm the existence of gender-specific differences in pedagogical behavioral styles and emphasize the necessity of implementing differentiated approaches in teacher training and professional development. To improve the effectiveness of pedagogical interaction, it is advisable to strengthen qualities related to empathy and interpersonal sensitivity in male teachers, while fostering strategic thinking, structural organization, and confidence in managing the learning process among female teachers.

The obtained data can serve as a theoretical basis for the development of teacher training programs aimed at harmonizing professional behavior and improving the overall quality of education. Based on the empirical findings and scientific conclusions regarding the gender characteristics of pedagogical behavioral styles and their impact on educational quality, the following practical recommendations are proposed:

**Differentiated teacher training.** Teacher education and professional development programs should take into account gender-related differences in behavioral styles. For male teachers, it is advisable to develop skills in empathy, flexibility, active listening, and emotional responsiveness. For female teachers, greater emphasis should be placed on fostering confidence, structuring the learning process, and enhancing strategic leadership capabilities.

**Psychological support and the development of professional self-awareness.** The organization of regular training sessions and supervision programs for educators aimed at reflecting on their interaction styles with students, as well as developing emotional intelligence and stress resilience, is essential. Such initiatives can help prevent burnout and enhance motivation for professional growth.

**Fostering a culture of constructive pedagogical interaction.** It is important to implement approaches oriented toward collaboration between teachers and students, incorporating democratic forms of classroom management, the encouragement of student initiative, and the promotion of learner autonomy.

**Monitoring and diagnosis of pedagogical styles.** The introduction of psycho-pedagogical tools for the regular assessment of teachers’ behavioral styles within educational institutions will enable the timely identification of potential risks (e.g., authoritarianism, chaotic management, avoidance of responsibility) and the correction of such tendencies through tailored consultative programs.

**Enhancing gender sensitivity in school management.** Educational institution administrators are

encouraged to consider gender-specific approaches when forming teaching teams, assigning roles, and distributing responsibilities, in order to create a balanced and inclusive educational environment.

**Development and implementation of methodological guidelines.** It is necessary to create methodological resources for teachers that provide descriptions of various behavioral styles, outline their strengths and weaknesses, and offer recommendations for adapting one's style to diverse educational contexts and student profiles.

These recommendations contribute to the harmonization of teacher–student interactions, the improvement of the professional climate within educational institutions, and, consequently, the enhancement of overall educational quality.

## References

1. Aelterman N., Vansteenkiste M., Haerens L., Soenens B., Fontaine J.R., Reeve J. Toward an integrative and fine-grained insight in motivating and demotivating teaching styles: The merits of a circumplex approach // *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 2019. Vol. 111 (3). P. 497—521. DOI:10.1037/edu0000293
2. Абдуллаева Ш. Х. Исследование эмоциональной устойчивости учителей общеобразовательной школы // *Развитие человека в современном мире*. – 2015. – С. 138-143.
3. Андреева Г.М., Богомолова Н.Н., Петровская Л.А. Зарубежная социальная психология XX столетия: Теоретические подходы: Учеб. пособие для вузов. -- М.: Аспект Пресс, 2002. - 287 с.
4. Баратов Ш. Р. Актуальные и перспективные направления развития психологической службы в системе образования // *вестник интегративной психологии*. – Т. 20.
5. Бодалев А. А. Специфика социально-психологического подхода к пониманию личности // *Психология личности в трудах отечественных психологов*. - СПб.: Питер, 2000. - С.336-344.
6. Габдулина Л. И. Стил педагогического общения и его ценностно-смысловые и когнитивные детерминанты // *Дисс. на соиск. уч. ст. канд. психол. наук*. Ростов-на-Дону. – 1999.
7. Гайнутдинов Р. З., Зайнуллин А. М. Преподавание спортивной психологии в процессе профессиональной подготовки в условиях двухуровневого образования // *АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ ФИЗИЧЕСКОЙ КУЛЬТУРЫ, СПОРТА И ТУРИЗМА*. – 2017. – С. 55-59.
8. Гамезо М.В., Петрова Е.А., Орлова Л.М. Возрастная и педагогическая психология: Учеб. пособие для студентов всех специальностей педагогических вузов. — М.: Педагогическое общество России, 2003. — 512 с.
9. Ғозиев Э.Г. Психологические основы развитие самоуправления учебной деятельностью у школьников и студентов. Автореф. дис. док. псих. наук. – Т., 1991. - 38 с.
10. Гордеева Т.О., Сычев О.А. Диагностика мотивирующего и демотивирующего стилей учителей: методика «Ситуации в школе» *Психологическая наука и образование*. 2021. Т. 26. № 1
11. Давлетшин М.Г. Замонавий мактаб ўқитувчисининг психологияси. - Тошкент: Ўзбекистон, 1999. - 30 б.;
12. Жабборов А.М. «Педагогик психологиянинг этник асослари» Т.: Заркалам 2006 й - 48 б
13. Каримова В. М. Ижтимоий психология //Т.: Fan va texnologiya. – 2012. – Т. 172.
14. Маскалянова С.А. Формирование профессионального имиджа будущего социального



- педагога: Дис. ... канд. психол.наук. – Елец: ЕГУ им.И.А.Бунина. 2005. – 168 с
15. Маслова В. Управление персоналом. Толковый словарь. – Litres, 2022.
  16. Нишонов З. Т. Мустақил ижодий фикрлашни ривожлантиришининг психологик асослари //Психология фанлари доктори илмий даражасини олиш учун ёзилган диссертация. Низомий номидаги ТДПУ. – 2005. – Т. 2005. – С. 391.
  17. Расулов А.И. Ўқитувчи шахсининг тарбиячи сифатида ўқувчилар билан ўзаро муносабат даражалари. Психол. фанл. номзод.дис. – Тошкент, - 2001.- 177 б
  18. Сабирова Д. А. Методы исследования социального интеллекта учителя //Психология XXI столетия. – 2017. – С. 345-349.;
  19. Сирлиев Б.Н. Ўрта махсус касб-хунар ўқув юртлари усталари касбий камолотининг психологик жиҳатлари.: психол.фан.номз. дис...: -Тошкент: ЎзМУ, 2000.- 129 б
  20. Токарева Н. А. Педагогические условия формирования готовности будущего педагога к творчеству в профессиональной деятельности : дис. – Астрахань : автореф. дис.... канд. пед. наук, 2009.
  21. Тураева Д.Р. Педагог кадрлар фаолияти услубининг психологик хусусиятлари. (Матн) Монография/ Д.Р. Тураева. -Т.: “Mashhur-press”, 2019-188 б.
  22. Умаров Б. М. Социально-психологическая и религиозная анализ деятельности управления //вестник интегративной психологии. – 2021 Выпуск 23, С. 323.
  23. Хайитов О. Э. Моделирование психологической компетентности руководителя: концептуальный эмпирический анализ //Academic research in educational sciences. – 2020. – №. 3. – С. 526-540.
  24. Шоумаров Ғ. Б. Ўзбекистон олий таълими муассасаларида педагогика ва психология фанларини ўқитилишига оид муаммо ва ечимлар //Central Asian Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies (CARJIS). – 2022. – №. Special Issue 1. – С. 5-12.
  25. Щербаков А. И. Совершенствование системы психолого-педагогического образования будущего учителя //Вопросы психологии. – 1981. – Т. 1. – №. 81. – С. 13-21.
  26. Эшметов Ш.А. Устоз-шогирд муносабатларининг ижтимоий-психологик феноменлари. Психол. фан номз... дис., Тошкент: М.Улуғбек номидаги Ўзбекистон Миллий ун-ти. 2005. - 147 б.