

MANAGEMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION TO PROMOTE GOOD LEARNING**Isaqulova Bakhtigul Khojamovna**

National Research University "Tashkent Institute of Irrigation and Agricultural
Mechanization Engineers",
Teacher of the English language department

Abstract:The thesis is devoted to the study of the problem of assessing the quality of higher education. Its reasons are associated both with the ambiguity of understanding the concept of quality and with the variability of the meaning of the concept of higher education, primarily its ambiguous connection with obtaining high-quality professional education. The analysis methodology includes both reliance on the provisions of modern economic theory and the results of social psychology and appraisal theory, thereby acquiring a largely interdisciplinary character. Based on the mentioned provisions and approaches, it is shown that the concept of quality has at least four meanings, and the concept of higher education - three, while the current regulatory documents do not fully reflect them.

Keywords:Quality management, quality of higher education, higher education services, trust good, assessment of higher education.

INTRODUCTION:Decisions made by people and influencing both themselves and other people are based on the knowledge, ideas and beliefs that decision makers (DMs) possess. This knowledge, ideas and beliefs can be both true and false, both scientific and unscientific, but they determine what courses of action people choose. Of course, knowledge and beliefs do not remain unchanged: decision makers learn, and often not only from their own mistakes, they communicate with each other and see the actions of others, including the consequences of these actions.

MATERIALS AND METHODS:Understanding each other in the course of communication presupposes the coincidence (or at least similarity) of the meanings of the words used, and yet very often under the same word people understand different things, associate different meanings and meanings with the same words. In the process of direct (horizontal) communication, people have the opportunity to ask the interlocutor what he understands by this or that word, and this leads (more precisely, can lead) to a consensus on the meaning and a clear understanding of the meaning of what was said. In the process of one-way (vertical, indirect) communication, the recipient of the message does not have the opportunity to ask the sender what he means by this or that word. Accordingly, the recipient can only interpret the content of the perceived words, try to reconstruct their meaning from the context, or "simply" understand them as he is used to, as he always understood these words before perceiving this message.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:Vertical downward communication is a typical form of information transfer in organizations, when DMs extend their decisions to subordinates, expecting their implementation. However, if the decisions are of a qualitative nature, i.e. describe in words what and how subordinates should do, the problem of consensus on the meanings of words can become an important obstacle to the implementation of such decisions. Thus, in relation to norms of law that are of a verbal nature, there is a special area in jurisprudence that studies the problems of interpretation of law.

The prevalence of the technique of creating strategic ambiguity in the sphere of public administration (at least within the executive branch) is significantly lower, and if used, it is usually only during the period of significant changes. After all, the multi-level hierarchical structure of the relevant organizations in the absence of clear criteria for the success of activities does not at all encourage managers at different levels to encourage initiatives and experiments

among subordinates. However, in fact, strategic ambiguity may well be unintentionally created in the processes of interaction between the legislative and executive branches, where the former makes policy decisions, while the latter is called upon to implement them [2].

For political decisions of a strategic nature, ensuring unambiguous understanding of them by grassroots performers is especially difficult. Here, between the subject of decisions and the immediate executors, there are a large number of hierarchy levels, at each of which there are managers who are deprived of the opportunity to directly clarify with the subject of the decision (politician) what he meant by this or that word in his speech, message, decree, etc. "Intermediate" managers are forced to interpret, reconstruct, or "simply" out of habit understand the meaning of the statements of the subject of the decision. The likelihood of an error in such situations increases significantly, especially since the feedback through the created actual results of the implementation of a political strategic decision can drag on for many years, so that the subject of the decision himself may forget what he had in mind. The likelihood of misunderstanding and error also increases if the words used in a strategic message initially have many different meanings and meanings and do not have an unambiguous strictly scientific, much less operational definition.

WHAT IS QUALITY?

L. Harvey and D. Green, in an article in 1993, without reference to which almost no English-language work on the issue of assessing the quality of higher education can do, noted that the term "quality" means different things for different subjects. They identified five main approaches to understanding it, within which there are variations. Firstly, quality is interpreted as a distinctive feature (quality as exceptional), which can consist of both superiority of the highest standards and (in a weaker version) compliance with them. Secondly, it can be understood as quality as perfection or consistency, consisting in the absence of defects. Thirdly, quality is often interpreted as compliance with goals (quality as fitness for purpose), with options - compliance with the goals of the consumer or his overall satisfaction, the understanding of his mission by the manufacturer, the interpretation of his tasks by the appraiser.

WHAT IS HIGHER EDUCATION?

It is customary to distinguish three main meanings of the concept "higher education". Firstly, this is a certain cognitive state of an individual, the totality of his knowledge and skills of thinking and acting, corresponding to a certain standard (formal or informal) accepted in a particular country. Secondly, this is the learning process, as a result of which the individual develops the mentioned body of knowledge and skills [4]. Thirdly, it is a system of individuals, organizations and their interactions, through which processes are carried out that produce the mentioned cognitive states of the individuals included in it.

DIVERSITY OF ASSESSMENTS OF THE QUALITY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The above provisions make it possible to characterize the main parameters of the set of assessments of the quality of higher education that, in principle, can exist. The formation of any of them includes the following blocks: subject of assessment, object of assessment, subject of assessment and basis for assessment. Moreover, each of the listed blocks contains several possible options in which it can exist. Subject of assessment. This role can be (and is) played by all individuals who are in one way or another interested in higher education (stakeholders): (1) students, (2) their parents, (3) teachers, (4) heads of educational organizations, (5) employers, (6) employees of educational system management bodies. Sometimes, however, the subjects of assessment are interpreted more narrowly: "Education authorities, teachers, students - everyone wants to improve the quality of education. But each of these categories has its own idea of quality, depending on personal views and beliefs".

CONCLUSION: Thus, the analysis shows that the optimism towards quality management of higher education on the part of government officials and many researchers, demonstrated in our

country, does not have too many grounds. A number of approaches implemented in the official system for assessing this quality are in fact without foundation, and the causal ambiguity created by regulatory documents and generating search activity among researchers does not lead to the necessary changes in formal rules. As a consequence, the growth in the quality of higher education, which is necessary for the successful development and growth of the Russian economy, if it occurs, is by no means on the scale that is necessary for the successful solution of these problems.

REFERENCES:

1. Voplenko N.N. (2018). Types and acts of official interpretation of law // Leningrad Legal Journal. No. 2. pp. 29–54.
2. Gallyamov R., Kuznetsova Y. (2017). The quality of higher education in the views of its actors: the evolution of leading trends in the Russian region (theoretical analysis of the problem) // Economics and management: scientific and practical journal. No. 3 (137). pp. 51–56.
3. Deming E. (2017). Way out of the crisis. M.: Alpina Business Books.
4. Ivin A. A. (2010). Modern axiology: some current problems // Philosophical Journal. No. 1 (4). pp. 66–78. Ignatiev V.P., Varlamova L.F., Stepanov P.A. (2016). Involving students in assessing the quality of education // Hew high-tech technologies. No. 12-1. pp. 141–145.
5. Dobrynina E. (2016). I wish I could eat dry crust: Why weak universities are still thriving and what professions do modern youth choose // Rossiyskaya Gazeta. Feder. issue No. 81(6949). 14th of April.