GENDER MECHANISMS FOR DEVELOPING YOUTH LEADERSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Assoc. Prof. Guldana Seidaliyeva, PhD
Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University
Faculty of World Languages, Department of Foreign Languages
Republic of Kazakhstan

Abstract. The article examines institutional, pedagogical, socio-psychological, and communicative factors that shape student leadership development in higher education through a gender-responsive lens. Leadership is treated not merely as holding an elected position, but as the capacity to initiate action, participate in collective decision-making, share responsibility, and influence social change. Legal documents, international reports, and research on leadership and gender were examined through content analysis, comparative analysis, and pedagogical modelling. The study proposes six interconnected mechanisms: regulatory and institutional governance, curricular and pedagogical integration, balanced participation and representation, mentoring and sponsorship, a safe socio-psychological environment, and sex-disaggregated monitoring. The model does not prescribe mechanical allocation of leadership posts; it identifies and reduces hidden barriers in access to opportunities, resources, voice, and outcomes. An implementation cycle and performance indicators are offered for designing gender-responsive leadership development programmes in universities.

Keywords. higher education, youth leadership, gender-responsive approach, equal opportunity, leadership identity, mentoring, participation, gender audit, institutional mechanism.

Аннотация. В статье анализируются институциональные, педагогические, социально-психологические и коммуникативные факторы развития лидерства студенческой молодежи с учетом гендерного подхода. На основе контент-анализа, сравнительного анализа и педагогического моделирования разработана система из шести механизмов: нормативно-институционального регулирования, учебно-педагогической интеграции,

участия и представительства, наставничества и спонсорской поддержки, психологической безопасности и гендерно-дезагрегированного мониторинга. Предложены алгоритм внедрения и показатели результативности.
Ключевые слова. высшее образование, молодежное лидерство, гендерный подход, равные возможности, наставничество, участие, гендерный аудит.
Annotatsiya. Maqolada OTMlarda talaba-yoshlar liderligini genderga sezgir rivojlantirishga ta’sir qiluvchi institutsional, pedagogik va ijtimoiy-psixologik omillar tahlil qilingan. Kontent-tahlil, qiyosiy tahlil va pedagogik modellashtirish asosida oltita o‘zaro bog‘liq mexanizm, joriy etish algoritmi va monitoring ko‘rsatkichlari taklif etilgan.
Kalit so‘zlar. oliy ta’lim, yoshlar liderligi, gender yondashuvi, teng imkoniyat, mentorlik, ishtirok, gender auditi.

Introduction

A higher education institution prepares young people for professional activity while also developing teamwork, initiative, negotiation, accountability, and civic responsibility. These competencies are not confined to formal posts such as student council chair or group representative. Students acquire leadership experience as project managers, research-club coordinators, volunteer organizers, peer mentors, and active participants who propose solutions. Youth leadership development should therefore be understood as a systemic task linking teaching, student development, and institutional governance.

Adding a gender perspective does not place women and men in opposition. It asks whether students of different genders have comparable access to leadership opportunities, resources, networks, platforms, and recognition. Are selection criteria transparent? Who makes strategic decisions in group work, and who performs invisible coordination? Whose idea is accepted more quickly, and whose mistake is judged more severely? Gender mechanisms are evidence-based means of answering these questions and removing unjustified disparities.

Uzbekistan’s Law “On State Youth Policy” prohibits direct or indirect restriction of young people’s rights and freedoms on grounds including sex [1]. Article 26 of the Law on Guarantees of Equal Rights and Opportunities for Women and Men provides for equal opportunity in education and research, inclusion of gender issues in educational programmes, and monitoring under the principle of non-discrimination [2]. The Law “On

Education" guarantees an equal right to education regardless of sex [3]. The national Concept for the Development of Higher Education until 2030 calls for systematic study of student opinion and development of students' intellectual and civic potential [4]. Together, these provisions support the integration of gender criteria into university leadership programmes.

The aim of the article is to systematize gender-responsive mechanisms for developing youth leadership in higher education, model their interaction, and propose practical indicators for evaluation. The object of study is the formation of leadership experience among university students; the subject is the set of institutional and pedagogical mechanisms grounded in equal opportunity and non-discrimination.

Literature Review

Contemporary scholarship conceptualizes leadership not as an innate property of an exceptional individual, but as a capacity developed through relationships, experience, reflection, and social influence. Komives and colleagues show that students' leadership identity may progress from seeing leadership as the task of a position-holder toward understanding it as a collaborative process [13]. Dugan, Komives, and Segar identify participation in student organizations, collective activity, and socially responsible experience as important environments for leadership capacity [16]. University leadership development should therefore reach beyond selecting already-visible students and provide a broader population with practical roles and structured reflection.

Research on gender and leadership shows that formal equality does not automatically eliminate stereotypes. According to Eagly and Karau's role congruity theory, culturally dominant images of a decisive, dominant, independent leader may be perceived as inconsistent with communal expectations applied to women. A woman's leadership potential may consequently be underrated, or the same behaviour may be interpreted differently in women and men [9]. Tremmel and Wahl similarly find that agentic attributes remain prominent in images of the "typical leader," while explicit and implicit measures reveal stereotypes differently [19]. Selection should therefore use pre-announced behavioural criteria instead of impressions such as "seemed active" or "looked like a leader."

The evidence does not support a simple biological superiority of either women or men in leadership effectiveness. Paustian-Underdahl, Walker, and Woehr found no overall difference in perceived leadership effectiveness when contexts were combined, although self-ratings and other-ratings varied with contextual moderators [11]. Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, and van Engen reported modest average differences in some transformational and contingent-reward behaviours, but such findings cannot justify assigning a fixed style to all women or all men [10]. Pedagogically, strategic thinking, cooperation, assertiveness, empathy, and responsibility should be cultivated in every student without attaching them to gender.

Leadership development depends on more than course content. DeRue and Wellman show that developmental challenge, learning orientation, and feedback availability work together in converting experience into leadership capability [14]. Ely, Ibarra, and Kolb argue that a gender-aware programme should connect leadership identity, hidden gender dynamics in organizations, and a safe space for experimentation [12]. A systematic review of mentoring in higher education highlights academic, career, psychological, and social-support functions [15]. Training alone is therefore not a mechanism; training, real authority, mentoring, resources, feedback, and fair evaluation must form a coherent system.

International evidence confirms the institutional character of the issue. UNESCO's 2025 Gender Report states that women account for roughly 30 percent of higher-education leaders worldwide [8]. UNESCO IESALC notes that women's increased participation in higher education does not automatically translate into equality in leadership, research publication, working conditions, or decision-making [7]. Uzbekistan's Strategy for Achieving Gender Equality until 2030 sets broader participation in education and social life as a long-term objective [5], and the national programme adopted for 2025 continues its implementation [6].

Research Methodology

The study is theoretical and model-building. First, Uzbekistan's legal and policy documents on youth, education, and gender equality were analysed. Second, research on leadership identity, gender stereotypes, leadership effectiveness, experiential learning, mentoring, and psychological safety was compared. Third, the extracted requirements were grouped along the logical chain "access—participation—authority—outcome—

sustainability." Fourth, institutional mechanisms and monitoring indicators applicable at university level were developed through pedagogical modelling.

Three levels were selected as units of analysis: the individual student's leadership identity and competence; interactions within groups and student organizations; and institutional rules, resource allocation, and governance practices. A gender mechanism is defined as an interconnected set of norms, processes, pedagogical instruments, support resources, and control indicators that promotes equal opportunity across these levels. This definition prevents the concept from being reduced to one event or a programme directed only at women.

Results and Discussion

Gender barriers to youth leadership development

Six groups of barriers were identified. First, institutional barriers include closed nomination procedures, informal networks, vague criteria, and repeated selection of the same highly visible students. Second, pedagogical barriers arise when group assignments routinely place male students in presentation and decision roles and female students in minute-taking, decoration, or coordination roles. Although the formal workload may appear equal, visible leadership experience and recognition are distributed unequally.

Third, socio-psychological barriers emerge when assertiveness is interpreted as leadership in one group but as aggression in another. Fourth, scheduling, mobility, and family obligations may restrict participation when activities end late, safe transport is unavailable, or constant in-person attendance is required. Fifth, unequal access to mentors, sponsors, and professional networks affects who receives complex assignments and public visibility. Sixth, digital participation may expose students to cyberbullying, sexist insults, and reputational risk.

Gender analysis should not be restricted to obstacles affecting women. Norms urging male students to remain constantly strong, avoid seeking help, and reject emotional support or care roles can also limit collaborative leadership. The proposed mechanisms therefore identify specific barriers through evidence; they do not assign benefits automatically on the basis of sex.

A model of gender-responsive leadership mechanisms

In the proposed model, leadership outcomes result from the combined influence of opportunity, experience, support, a safe environment, and fair recognition—not ability alone. If one mechanism fails, the effect of others weakens. A student may complete leadership training yet gain no experience without open selection and real authority; a selected student may struggle without mentoring and feedback; and systemic disparities remain invisible when results are not disaggregated.

Table 1. Gender mechanisms for youth leadership development in universities

Mechanism	Core task	University instruments	Observable outcome
Regulatory and institutional	Embed equal opportunity in internal rules.	Open calls; behavioural criteria; conflict-of-interest controls; gender review; responsible coordinator.	Transparent nomination and selection; lower risk of indirect discrimination.
Curricular and pedagogical	Develop leadership competence through learning.	Problem projects; debate; service-learning; rotating roles; reflective journals; peer assessment.	Every student practises decision, presentation, negotiation, and coordination roles.
Participation and representation	Balance voice and authority in governance and projects.	Open applications; funnel analysis; rotating chair/secretary roles; small grants.	Unexplained gaps in nomination, selection, and resource access decrease.

Mechanism	Core task	University instruments	Observable outcome
Mentoring and sponsorship	Expand access to experience, networks, and visibility.	Mentor matching; alumni network; project sponsor; shadowing; gender guidance for mentors.	Confidence, professional networks, and access to challenging assignments grow.
Socio-psychological safety	Enable voice and learning from mistakes in a respectful environment.	Dialogue rules; bias awareness; confidential reporting; cyberbullying response; flexible scheduling.	Students ask questions, dissent, seek help, and test initiatives without undue fear.
Monitoring and analysis	Measure disparities in access, process, and outcomes.	Sex-disaggregated data; annual gender audit; focus groups; 360-degree feedback; public report.	Decisions rely on evidence; problems and corrective action can be tracked.

The regulatory and institutional mechanism begins with internal rules. Terms such as “active,” “worthy,” or “a good fit” should be replaced by observable criteria: problem analysis, planning, task allocation, evidence-based argument, stakeholder listening, and responsibility for time and resources. Applications should be publicly announced, assessors should use a common rubric, and the final decision should be recorded with a short justification.

The curricular and pedagogical mechanism moves leadership from a single lecture into routine learning. Roles in group projects should change across the semester: a student who coordinates one assignment may analyse evidence, present, or provide feedback in the next. Assessment should cover not only the final product, but also decision-making, listening, conflict management, and distribution of responsibility. This replaces the narrow belief that the loudest speaker is the leader with a multidimensional competency model.

The participation and representation mechanism does not mechanically divide every body into equal halves. It examines the selection funnel: who saw the announcement, applied, reached the interview, was selected, received project resources, and was recognized at the end? When the point of divergence is known, action becomes precise. Low application rates may require outreach and mentoring; a gap at interview stage may require review of criteria and assessor preparation; early withdrawal may require changes in workload, safety, or support.

Mentoring provides advice, while sponsorship connects a student's potential to visible opportunity. A mentor may discuss a project plan; a sponsor may recommend the student to moderate a conference, join a faculty task force, or meet an external partner. A diverse mentor pool avoids dependence on one influential person. Expectations, frequency of contact, boundaries, and confidentiality should be agreed in writing. Gender-responsive mentoring recognizes different legitimate leadership styles and does not restrict aspiration through stereotypes.

Psychological safety does not require constant agreement or pleasant speech; it means that the interpersonal cost of asking a question, expressing disagreement, making a good-faith mistake, or seeking help is acceptably low. Edmondson's research connects team psychological safety with learning behaviour [18]. In universities, the principle is operationalized through moderated speaking turns, discussion of ideas rather than personalities, rapid responses to abuse and cyberbullying, confidential reporting, and attention to inconvenient schedules and locations.

Implementation Algorithm

The model should be implemented as a cycle rather than a one-off event. Five stages are proposed.

1. Diagnosis. Existing data on student governance, clubs, grants, volunteering, and project leadership are analysed by sex. Anonymous surveys, focus groups, and document review identify stereotypes, safety concerns, scheduling barriers, and differences in access to resources.
2. Design. The institution targets the specific break in the pathway. If few women apply, outreach and mentoring may be strengthened; if an interview gap appears, standardized rubrics and assessor preparation are reviewed; if selected students leave early, workload, climate, and support are examined.
3. Experience and authority. Students work on projects with a small but real budget or decision right. Roles rotate, tasks are developmentally challenging, and mentors and instructors provide regular process feedback.
4. Evaluation and correction. Results are assessed through access, active participation, authority, competence, and project outcomes—not by event counts alone. Quantitative patterns are checked against qualitative accounts of student experience.
5. Institutionalization. Effective practices are incorporated into internal regulations, curricula, tutoring plans, student council procedures, and quality assurance. Responsible units, deadlines, resources, and reporting formats are specified.

Performance Indicators

Gender-responsive monitoring goes beyond counting women and men. Numbers indicate representation, but not who spoke, decided, controlled resources, or converted an idea into an outcome. A dashboard of separate indicators is preferable to a single composite score that could conceal a serious gap in one domain.

Table 2. Monitoring indicators for a gender-responsive leadership programme

Domain	Key indicators	Data source	Frequency
Access	Share who saw the call, applied, and reached interview, by sex.	Registration system and brief survey.	After each selection.

Domain	Key indicators	Data source	Frequency
Participation	Speaking, proposing, moderating, and joining decisions.	Observation sheet, minutes, student survey.	Monthly or by project.
Authority and resources	Project leadership, budget access, external representation, grants, and awards.	Orders, grant register, finance and event records.	Once per semester.
Competence	Change in self-awareness, planning, communication, conflict management, cooperation, and reflection.	Baseline/final rubric and 360-degree feedback.	At programme start/end.
Climate	Psychological safety, stereotypes, mentoring quality, and trust in reporting.	Anonymous survey, focus group, case review.	Each semester.
Outcome and continuity	Completed initiatives, users reached, proposals adopted, and continued leadership.	Project reports, portfolios, follow-up survey.	Annually.

Context must be considered instead of treating exact numerical parity as an automatic target. If a faculty's student population is highly uneven by sex, representation should be analysed in relation to that population. Nevertheless, demographic composition should not excuse persistent inequality in speaking time, decision authority, or resource distribution. When a quantitative gap is detected, qualitative data should be used to investigate its causes before corrective action is selected.

Practical Recommendations for Higher Education Institutions

- Adopt a common competency-based selection form for student councils, youth structures, clubs, and project leaders; publish the procedures for announcement, application, assessment, and recording of results.
- Rotate leadership roles in team projects, debates, service-learning, and problem tasks across all fields; include listening, evidence, task allocation, and reflection in assessment rubrics.
- Create a mentor pool for new leaders and connect mentoring with sponsorship opportunities; provide mentors with brief guidance on avoiding gender stereotypes.
- Establish open access to small grants, rooms, equipment, communication channels, and advice for student initiatives; analyse recipients by sex and other relevant characteristics.
- Schedule meetings and events with attention to safety, transport, health, and family obligations; offer hybrid participation where necessary.
- Create a clear reporting route for sexist abuse, harassment, cyberbullying, and retaliation, with confidentiality and procedural fairness.
- At the end of each semester, review the selection funnel, authority, resources, recognition, and withdrawal by sex; communicate key findings and corrective measures to the university community.
- Consider the interaction of gender with disability, region of origin, language of instruction, financial conditions, and other factors; study the experience of the least represented groups separately.

Discussion

The model addresses two common limitations. The first is measuring leadership solely by formal positions. Representation matters, but it becomes symbolic when a student has no decision authority, project resource, or influence on outcomes. The second is reducing gender work to a separate activity for women. Such programmes may be useful, but their systemic effect is limited if selection rules, evaluation stereotypes, and resource allocation remain unchanged. Acker's theory of gendered organizations likewise explains how inequality may be embedded in seemingly ordinary organizational routines [17].

The model seeks to change the relationship between the student and the environment rather than treating the student as the sole "deficit" to be corrected. If women apply less

often, it may be inaccurate to conclude immediately that they lack confidence. The institution should first check who received the announcement, whether the time and place are feasible, what image previous leaders created, whether the criteria are clear, and whether mentoring is available. Individual competence development remains important, but institutional and individual measures complement rather than replace one another.

Limitations

The proposed mechanisms derive from theoretical analysis and pedagogical modelling. Their effectiveness should be tested across regions, fields of study, and types of higher education institutions. Future studies may jointly measure baseline and final leadership competence, leadership self-identification, the selection funnel, psychological safety, and project outcomes. Qualitative interviews can then explain the causes behind quantitative differences.

Conclusion

Gender-responsive youth leadership development is not a separate event; it is part of the quality of teaching and governance. Five conclusions follow from the analysis.

1. Restricting leadership to formal office ignores the informal initiative, cooperation, and social influence through which students learn to lead. Universities should use a broader competency-based definition.
2. Gender equality is not ensured by announcing identical rules. Direct and indirect barriers should be examined in nomination, assessment, role allocation, mentoring, resource access, and recognition.
3. An effective system integrates regulatory and institutional governance, curricular pedagogy, participation and representation, mentoring and sponsorship, socio-psychological safety, and monitoring.
4. Evaluation should include real voice, authority, resources, competency growth, project outcomes, and continuity of leadership—not participant numbers alone.
5. Gender mechanisms do not grant an automatic privilege to one sex. They remove evidence-based barriers so that cooperation, assertiveness, empathy, responsibility, and strategic thinking can develop in all students.

References

1. Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. O‘RQ-406 of 14 September 2016, “On State Youth Policy.” https://lex.uz/docs/-3026246
2. Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. O‘RQ-562 of 2 September 2019, “On Guarantees of Equal Rights and Opportunities for Women and Men.” https://lex.uz/docs/-4494849
3. Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. O‘RQ-637 of 23 September 2020, “On Education.” https://lex.uz/docs/-5013007
4. Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PF-5847 of 8 October 2019, approving the Concept for Development of the Higher Education System until 2030. https://lex.uz/docs/-4545884
5. Resolution of the Senate of the Oliy Majlis No. SQ-297-IV of 28 May 2021, approving the Strategy for Achieving Gender Equality in Uzbekistan until 2030. https://lex.uz/docs/-5466673
6. Resolution of the Senate of the Oliy Majlis No. SQ-102-V of 18 March 2025, approving the comprehensive programme for implementing the Gender Equality Strategy in 2025. https://lex.uz/docs/-7482932
7. UNESCO IESALC. Women in Higher Education: Has the Female Advantage Put an End to Gender Inequalities? Paris: UNESCO, 2021. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000377182
8. Global Education Monitoring Report Team. 2025 Gender Report: Women Lead for Learning. Paris: UNESCO, 2025. https://www.unesco.org/gem-report/en/publication/2025-gender-report
9. Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. Psychological Review. 2002;109(3):573–598. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.109.3.573
10. Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & van Engen, M. L. Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. Psychological Bulletin. 2003;129(4):569–591. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.129.4.569

11. Paustian-Underdahl, S. C., Walker, L. S., & Woehr, D. J. Gender and perceptions of leadership effectiveness: A meta-analysis of contextual moderators. Journal of Applied Psychology. 2014;99(6):1129–1145. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036751
12. Ely, R. J., Ibarra, H., & Kolb, D. M. Taking gender into account: Theory and design for women's leadership development programs. Academy of Management Learning & Education. 2011;10(3):474–493. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2010.0046
13. Komives, S. R., Owen, J. E., Longerbeam, S. D., Mainella, F. C., & Osteen, L. Developing a leadership identity: A grounded theory. Journal of College Student Development. 2005;46(6):593–611. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2005.0061
14. DeRue, D. S., & Wellman, N. Developing leaders via experience: The role of developmental challenge, learning orientation, and feedback availability. Journal of Applied Psychology. 2009;94(4):859–875. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015317
15. Crisp, G., Baker, V. L., Griffin, K. A., Lunsford, L. G., & Pifer, M. J. Conceptualizing mentoring in higher education: A systematic literature review. Educational Review. 2023;57:100565. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2023.100565
16. Dugan, J. P., Komives, S. R., & Segar, T. C. College student capacity for socially responsible leadership: Understanding norms and influences of race, gender, and sexual orientation. NASPA Journal. 2008;45(4):475–500. https://doi.org/10.2202/1949-6605.2008
17. Acker, J. Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. Gender & Society. 1990;4(2):139–158. https://doi.org/10.1177/089124390004002002
18. Edmondson, A. Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. Administrative Science Quarterly. 1999;44(2):350–383. https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999
19. Tremmel, M., & Wahl, I. Gender stereotypes in leadership: Analyzing the content and evaluation of stereotypes about typical, male, and female leaders. Frontiers in Psychology. 2023;14:1034258. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1034258