The OSCAR PUBLISHING Services
International Journal of Pedagogics

VOLUME Vol.06 Issue01 2026
PAGE NO. 117-122
DOI 10.37547/ijp/Volume06Issue01-26

Motivational Management Strategies For Enhancing Teachers' Innovative Activity In General Education Schools: The Role Of The Deputy Director For Academic Affairs

Egamberdiyev Farxod Botirovich
Senior lecturer at ISFT institute, Uzbekistan

Received: 22 November 2025; **Accepted:** 14 December 2025; **Published:** 19 January 2026

Abstract: Teachers' innovative activity—expressed in the purposeful adoption, adaptation, and creation of new pedagogical solutions—has become a decisive condition for improving learning outcomes, sustaining curriculum reforms, and integrating educational technologies in general education schools. However, innovation in teaching is rarely a purely technical matter; it is a motivational phenomenon shaped by how teachers interpret risk, workload, autonomy, professional identity, and the perceived fairness of leadership decisions. This article analyzes motivational management strategies that can strengthen teachers' innovative activity at the school level, with particular attention to the role of the Deputy Director for Academic Affairs (often responsible for teaching and learning, curriculum coordination, instructional supervision, and professional development). Using an integrative conceptual approach grounded in contemporary motivation theory and educational change research, the paper argues that motivational management is most effective when it aligns three domains: autonomy-supportive leadership practices, capacity-building structures that reduce the "implementation burden," and recognition-and-feedback systems that strengthen teachers' efficacy and professional meaning. The discussion differentiates between short-cycle motivational tactics that trigger initial experimentation and long-cycle strategies that sustain innovation as a stable feature of school culture. The analysis demonstrates that the Deputy Director's impact is strongest when motivational mechanisms are embedded into instructional routines—lesson study, formative observation, collaborative planning, and evidence-informed reflection—rather than treated as add-on incentives. The article concludes with an interpretive model of motivational governance for innovation that emphasizes trust, psychological safety, disciplined follow-through, and ethically grounded accountability, positioning the Deputy Director as a mediator between policy demands and teachers' lived professional realities.

Keywords: Teacher innovation; motivational management; deputy director for academic affairs; instructional leadership; self-determination theory; professional development; change management; school culture; teacher efficacy; recognition and feedback.

Introduction: Innovation in general education schools is frequently discussed as a matter of introducing new curricula, digital platforms, assessment tools, or inclusive teaching methods. In practice, innovations succeed or fail largely through teachers' daily decisions: whether they experiment with a new instructional routine, persist through early failures, revise materials, collaborate with colleagues, and integrate feedback into subsequent cycles of teaching. These decisions are not merely rational responses to policy directives; they reflect motivational states shaped by perceived autonomy, competence, fairness, belonging, professional identity, and the emotional costs of change. When teachers experience innovation as externally imposed, poorly supported, or disproportionately risky, the most common outcome is compliance without genuine pedagogical transformation—surface implementation that does not alter the underlying logic of classroom practice.

Within school-level governance, the Deputy Director for Academic Affairs occupies a pivotal position. While principals often carry formal authority and external

accountability, the Deputy Director typically orchestrates the instructional "middle layer" of school life: timetabling and curriculum alignment, lesson observation and instructional coaching, coordination of methodological work, organization of professional development, and monitoring of learning progress. This role situates the Deputy Director at the intersection of two pressures that teachers experience acutely. The first is the pressure to innovate under constraints of time and workload. The second is the pressure to demonstrate measurable results, often before teachers have developed proficiency with the new practices. Motivational management, understood as the deliberate design of conditions that stimulate and sustain teachers' internal and external drivers for innovation, therefore becomes one of the Deputy Director's most consequential responsibilities.

The concept of teachers' innovative activity in this article refers to a continuum that includes adoption of validated practices, adaptation to local classroom realities, and generation of new methods through reflective inquiry. It involves cognitive work (learning and problem-solving), emotional work (tolerating uncertainty and vulnerability), and social work (negotiating norms and expectations with colleagues). Teacher innovation is often described as dependent on individual disposition, but research and practice consistently indicate that innovative behavior in schools is strongly conditioned by organizational climate, leadership practices, and the availability of structured learning opportunities. As a result, motivational management is not an optional leadership "style" but a functional requirement for turning policy intentions into classroom-level realities.

Motivation theory helps explain why the same innovation can be embraced enthusiastically in one school and resisted in another. Self-determination theory proposes that sustained, high-quality motivation emerges when individuals experience autonomy, competence, and relatedness, implying that motivational management should not be reduced to rewards, but should be embedded in how work is structured and how professional relationships are governed. Expectancy theory similarly suggests that effort increases when teachers perceive a credible link between effort and improvement, and between improvement and valued outcomes such as professional respect, reduced stress, enhanced student engagement, or stronger learning evidence. These theoretical perspectives align closely with educational change scholarship, which repeatedly shows that reforms become authentic in classrooms only when schools create coherent capacity-building conditions and stable leadership routines.

At the same time, motivational management in schools must be ethically grounded. Teachers' motivation can be manipulated through pressure, fear, competitive ranking, or symbolic rewards that disguise inequitable workloads. Such strategies may increase short-term compliance but often damage trust, professional commitment, and the collective willingness to take pedagogical risks. The Deputy Director's task is therefore not to "extract" innovation from teachers, but to cultivate an environment where innovation is experienced as professionally meaningful, feasible within constraints, and supported by fair and transparent management procedures.

This article presents a structured interpretation of motivational management strategies suitable for the Deputy Director for Academic Affairs in general education settings. The argument is developed around the idea that motivation for innovation is shaped by three interdependent domains. The first domain concerns autonomy-supportive leadership: the degree to which teachers experience choice, voice, and respect for professional judgment. The second domain concerns competence-building capacity: the extent to which teachers are supported to learn, practice, and refine innovations without unsustainable personal costs. The third domain concerns recognition and feedback: the credibility of evaluative and appreciative signals that communicate what the school values and how progress will be acknowledged.

The aim of this article is to analyze and interpret motivational management strategies that enhance teachers' innovative activity in general education schools, focusing on how the Deputy Director for Academic Affairs can design and govern school-level conditions that stimulate initiation of innovation and sustain it as a stable professional practice.

This study is conceptual and integrative. The materials consist of established and contemporary research traditions on motivation in organizations, teacher

professional learning, and educational change processes, alongside major analytical frameworks in school leadership. The paper draws on self-determination theory to interpret how autonomy, competence, and relatedness shape teachers' quality of motivation; on expectancy theory to explain how perceived effort-to-outcome pathways influence sustained engagement; on self-efficacy theory to clarify why confidence in one's capacity to succeed matters under uncertainty; and on educational change literature to situate innovation as a process that requires sequencing, feedback loops, and institutionalization.

Methodologically, the article employs theoretical synthesis combined with role-based interpretation. The synthesis identifies mechanisms repeatedly associated with teacher innovation and persistence: autonomy-supportive leadership, competence development through job-embedded learning, self-efficacy reinforcement through mastery experiences, psychological safety for experimentation, and fairness in workload and recognition. Role-based interpretation then maps these mechanisms onto the typical functional responsibilities of the Deputy Director for Academic Affairs, treating the role as an instructional governance position rather than an administrative-only function. The analysis emphasizes coherence, interpreting motivational strategies not as isolated interventions, but as mutually reinforcing routines that shape teacher experience over time.

Because the study is not an empirical case report, it does not present original quantitative findings. The "results" are presented as an interpretive model supported by theoretical congruence and by practical plausibility within common school organizational constraints. The intent is to provide an actionable conceptual framework that can guide empirical research design and inform school-level managerial practice.

Teachers' innovative activity in schools can be interpreted as a repeated choice under uncertainty. Innovation asks teachers to invest time and emotional energy before outcomes are guaranteed, to tolerate temporary inefficiency while learning new routines, and to expose their practice to scrutiny through observation, student data, or peer discussion. In such conditions, motivation is not simply a stable personal trait. It is a dynamic state influenced by how the school organizes risk, time, feedback, and professional status. The Deputy Director for Academic Affairs shapes these organizational variables directly through instructional supervision practices, professional development design, coordination of methodological work, and the everyday governance of academic expectations.

A central interpretive conclusion is that motivational management for innovation begins with the quality of teachers' perceived autonomy. Autonomy in a school does not mean absence of standards or avoidance of accountability. It means teachers experience innovation as something they can meaningfully shape: they can make informed choices among methods, adapt innovations to their students, and participate in defining what "good implementation" looks like at early stages. When teachers perceive their leadership as controlling, they often comply strategically while minimizing risk. When leadership is autonomy-supportive, teachers are more likely to internalize innovation goals and treat change as professional growth rather than external pressure.

For the Deputy Director, autonomy support is enacted through the design of routine instructional governance. Observation and feedback are particularly influential. If observation is framed as policing, teachers will associate innovation with vulnerability and punishment. If observation is framed as a learning partnership, teachers can treat innovative lessons as prototypes rather than performances. In practice, this requires the Deputy Director to communicate developmental intent clearly, to focus feedback on a limited set of high-leverage instructional elements, and to engage teachers in dialogue about why a method worked or did not work for their students. Autonomy is also strengthened when teachers can propose alternative pathways toward shared learning objectives, rather than being required to replicate a single prescribed technique regardless of context.

A second interpretive result concerns competence-building and teacher self-efficacy. Teachers innovate when they believe they can learn the new practice and that learning will translate into better student experiences and outcomes. This belief is strengthened by structured opportunities for mastery, coaching, and reflection. In school settings, the Deputy Director influences mastery opportunities by organizing job-

embedded learning structures that reduce the cognitive and logistical costs of innovation. When teachers are asked to innovate without support, they must simultaneously design, implement, assess, and troubleshoot alone, which often leads to overload. Motivational management therefore includes capacity design: protected time for collaborative planning, accessible instructional materials that can be adapted rather than invented from zero, and coaching routines that help teachers interpret classroom evidence and refine their methods across multiple cycles.

This competence-building logic also addresses a common source of resistance: the implementation burden. Teachers may accept the educational value of an innovation but perceive its demands as incompatible with time constraints and documentation requirements. If an innovation increases workload substantially without offering compensatory support, the school creates a hidden disincentive. The Deputy Director mitigates this by simplifying administrative tasks connected to innovation, coordinating shared resources, and sequencing initiatives so teachers can focus on one priority deeply rather than many priorities superficially.

A third result follows from expectancy theory: sustained effort depends on credible pathways linking effort, improved practice, and valued outcomes. In schools, valued outcomes are frequently non-monetary. Teachers want evidence that innovation makes their work more effective, that it reduces recurring classroom problems, that it improves student engagement or understanding, and that leadership recognizes professional growth. The Deputy Director strengthens expectancy pathways by making progress visible and by legitimizing early indicators that capture developmental gains. Many innovations do not immediately increase high-stakes exam results, but they may increase student participation, improve the quality of student work, or reduce behavioral disruptions. When the Deputy Director treats such indicators as meaningful milestones and connects them to a longer learning trajectory, teachers are more likely to persist through the early “messy” phase of implementation.

A fourth result concerns recognition, feedback credibility, and fairness. Motivation for innovation is undermined when recognition appears arbitrary, when teachers suspect favoritism, or when the burdens of innovation are concentrated on a small group of enthusiastic staff without fair compensation or workload redistribution. Recognition practices therefore must be transparent, evidence-based, and aligned with professional standards. This does not require elaborate ceremonies; it requires precise communication that links recognition to concrete contributions such as designing lesson materials, supporting colleagues, demonstrating thoughtful adaptation for diverse learners, or documenting learning evidence. Fairness is equally important. If early adopters are routinely tasked with extra mentoring, demonstration lessons, and committee work, innovation becomes a pathway to burnout. Ethical motivational management requires the Deputy Director to distribute responsibilities, rotate leadership opportunities, and acknowledge additional efforts through reduced load, time allowances, or other meaningful institutional supports.

A fifth result is the role of psychological safety in innovation. Innovation entails error and uncertainty; early implementation often exposes gaps in knowledge and vulnerabilities in classroom management. Teachers will not take these risks if they expect blame, ridicule, or punitive evaluation. Psychological safety does not mean the absence of standards; it means the presence of a disciplined learning culture where problems can be named honestly and treated as shared objects of improvement. The Deputy Director creates psychological safety by distinguishing formative learning cycles from summative evaluation, by using feedback language that targets practices rather than personal worth, and by normalizing reflective conversations about what did not work and why. When psychological safety is absent, schools tend to produce performative innovation: teachers stage “innovative” lessons under observation but revert to familiar routines afterward, which erodes trust and produces disillusionment with reform.

A sixth result concerns coherence and the long-cycle governance of change. Educational innovations fail not only due to low motivation but also due to fragmented leadership signals and unstable priorities. When schools initiate multiple innovations simultaneously, teachers experience initiative fatigue and learn that it is safer to wait out reforms than to invest deeply.

Motivational management therefore includes strategic sequencing and coherence. The Deputy Director contributes to coherence by integrating innovation goals into existing academic routines—curriculum planning cycles, methodological work, observation schedules, and professional development plans—so innovation becomes part of "how we do instruction here" rather than an add-on project. Coherence also requires stability over time. Teachers internalize goals when they see consistent leadership attention, predictable feedback processes, and follow-through that maintains priorities long enough for competence to develop.

A seventh result is that diffusion and social influence within teacher communities are central to motivational dynamics. Teachers often trust colleagues' practical judgments more than leadership rhetoric, especially when innovations affect classroom realities. The Deputy Director can leverage these social dynamics ethically by supporting teacher-led demonstration lessons, organizing collaborative inquiry around shared student learning problems, and creating opportunities for peer observation that is structured, respectful, and focused on learning rather than competition. Peer learning increases perceived feasibility and reduces the psychological cost of experimentation because teachers can see how a method works in a familiar context. However, diffusion can also produce status hierarchies that stigmatize slower adopters. The Deputy Director's motivational governance should therefore preserve dignity: supporting differentiated entry points, recognizing diverse forms of progress, and preventing a culture where innovation becomes a marker of superiority rather than a collective professional responsibility.

These mechanisms converge into an integrated model of motivational governance for teacher innovation in which the Deputy Director's strategy operates across time and across managerial functions. In the initiation phase, motivation is strengthened by meaning-making and safe entry points. Teachers need a clear professional rationale grounded in student learning needs rather than policy slogans, and they need an entry design that reduces perceived risk through pilot implementation, coaching, and focused feedback. In the consolidation phase, motivation is sustained by competence-building and visible progress. The Deputy Director's routines should help teachers interpret evidence of improvement, refine practices, and develop self-efficacy through mastery experiences. In the institutionalization phase, motivation becomes cultural: innovation is expected and supported because collaborative learning structures, recognition practices, and accountability norms have become part of the school's stable operating system.

Within this model, the Deputy Director for Academic Affairs functions as a mediator. The Deputy Director translates external reform expectations into feasible instructional practices and mediates between accountability requirements and teachers' developmental needs. This mediation requires professional credibility, consistency, and ethical discipline. Teachers are more likely to accept motivational management when they believe the Deputy Director understands classroom realities and can provide pedagogically meaningful support. Conversely, when leadership relies mainly on administrative directives and inspection, teachers often respond with compliance behaviors that minimize risk rather than with authentic instructional transformation.

A final implication is that motivational management does not compete with accountability; it enables meaningful accountability. If accountability is reduced to outcomes alone, schools often generate defensive behaviors and data-oriented superficiality. Motivational governance, by contrast, strengthens process accountability: shared instructional standards, transparent learning objectives, evidence-informed reflection, and improvement cycles that make learning visible. When the Deputy Director establishes process accountability with fairness and autonomy support, teachers' innovation becomes both more authentic and more sustainable, and school improvement becomes less dependent on individual enthusiasm and more dependent on institutional learning capacity.

Teachers' innovative activity in general education schools is fundamentally a motivationally mediated professional practice shaped by autonomy, competence, social belonging, and perceived fairness under conditions of uncertainty and risk. The Deputy Director for Academic Affairs has a distinctive capacity to influence these conditions because the role typically governs the instructional routines where motivation is

either strengthened or undermined: lesson observation and feedback, professional development design, curriculum coordination, and the everyday management of academic expectations. This article has shown that effective motivational management for innovation is achieved through coherent integration of autonomy-supportive leadership, capacity-building structures that reduce implementation burden, and credible recognition-and-feedback systems grounded in transparent criteria and ethical workload distribution. Sustained innovation depends not on episodic incentives but on stable professional learning routines that make progress visible, normalize disciplined experimentation, and protect psychological safety while maintaining instructional standards. When the Deputy Director acts as a mediator between policy demands and teachers' lived professional realities, motivational management becomes a practical mechanism for transforming innovation from a temporary campaign into an enduring feature of school culture.

REFERENCES

1. Deci E. L., Ryan R. M. The "What" and "Why" of Goal Pursuits: Human Needs and the Self-Determination of Behavior // Psychological Inquiry. 2000. Vol. 11, No. 4. P. 227–268.
2. Vroom V. H. Work and Motivation. New York: Wiley, 1964. 331 p.
3. Herzberg F., Mausner B., Snyderman B.-C. The Motivation to Work. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1959. 157 p.
4. Bandura A. Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control. New York: W. H. Freeman, 1997. 604 p.
5. Rogers E. M. Diffusion of Innovations. 5th ed. New York: Free Press, 2003. 576 p.
6. Fullan M. The New Meaning of Educational Change. 4th ed. New York: Teachers College Press, 2007. 338 p.
7. Hall G. E., Hord S. M. Implementing Change: Patterns, Principles, and Potholes. 4th ed. Boston: Pearson, 2015. 352 p.
8. Kotter J. P. Leading Change. Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1996. 187 p.
9. Spillane J. P. Distributed Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006. 144 p.
10. Guskey T. R. Professional Development and Teacher Change // Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice. 2002. Vol. 8, No. 3/4. P. 381–391.
11. Thurlings M., Evers A. T., Vermeulen M. Toward a Model of Explaining Teachers' Innovative Behavior: A Literature Review // Review of Educational Research. 2015. Vol. 85, No. 3. P. 430–471.
12. OECD. TALIS 2018 Results (Volume I): Teachers and School Leaders as Lifelong Learners. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2019. 258 p.