

**MECHANISMS FOR THE EFFECTIVE ORGANIZATION OF SOCIAL
PARTNERSHIP IN PRESCHOOL EDUCATION ORGANIZATIONS: THEORETICAL
FOUNDATIONS AND A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

Gulrukhsor N. Sharipova

*Associate Professor, Department of Preschool Education Management
Institute for Retraining and Professional Development of Directors and Specialists of
Preschool Education Organizations, Uzbekistan*

ABSTRACT:

ARTICLE INFO:

Received: 09.10.2026

Revised: 10.10.2026

Accepted: 11.10.2026

KEY WORDS:

*social partnership;
preschool education
organization; early
childhood development;
stakeholders; parent
engagement;
management
mechanisms;
collaboration.*

The article examines the theoretical and organizational foundations of social partnership in preschool education organizations and substantiates a system of mechanisms that make such partnership effective and sustainable. Drawing on ecological, social-capital, stakeholder and collaborative-governance approaches, and on an analysis of the national legal framework of Uzbekistan, the study defines social partnership in preschool education as a purposeful, institutionalized and mutually beneficial interaction between a preschool organization and families, public authorities, community institutions, schools, health services, business and civil-society organizations, aimed at improving the quality of early childhood development. Six interrelated mechanisms are proposed: normative-legal, organizational-managerial, pedagogical-content, resource, motivational-communicative, and monitoring-evaluative. The conditions and risks of their implementation are discussed. The findings may be used by directors of preschool organizations, methodologists and institutions engaged in the professional development of preschool managers.

1. Introduction

Early childhood is recognized in contemporary science as the period in which the foundations of cognition, emotional regulation, health and social competence are laid. Evidence from neuroscience and developmental psychology indicates that the quality of early experiences, which are shaped by families, caregivers and the wider environment, has lasting consequences for learning and well-being throughout life [1]. Economic analyses add that investment in the early years yields higher returns than later remedial interventions, especially for children growing up in disadvantaged circumstances [2]. It follows that a preschool education organization cannot be regarded as an isolated service provider: the results it achieves depend on how well it is connected with the settings in which the child lives, plays and learns.

In Uzbekistan this understanding has been reflected in a large-scale reform of the preschool system. The Law "On Preschool Education and Upbringing" [3] and Presidential Decree No. PP-4312 of 8 May 2019 [4] set out the goals of expanding access, improving quality, diversifying the forms of provision and involving the non-state sector and parents in the development of preschool education. The expansion of coverage, however, has created a new managerial task: how to turn a growing network of preschool organizations into quality-oriented institutions that work with families and communities systematically rather than episodically.

International research on school, family and community connections shows that such links are associated with better attendance, stronger social-emotional outcomes and academic progress, but that the effect depends on the quality and intentionality of the partnership rather than on the number of joint events [5]. In everyday practice, preschool managers often reduce social partnership to occasional parent meetings, holiday concerts and formal agreements signed with neighboring organizations. Such formalism produces a paper network of partners without real change in the child's experience. The underlying problem is the lack of a coherent set of management mechanisms that would make partnership planned, resourced, measurable and self-renewing.

The aim of the article is to substantiate a system of mechanisms for the effective organization of social partnership in preschool education organizations. To achieve this aim the following tasks are addressed: (1) to clarify the content of the concept of social partnership in the preschool context; (2) to identify the theoretical approaches that explain how partnership works; (3) to analyze the normative-policy context of Uzbekistan; (4) to propose and describe the mechanisms of effective partnership; and (5) to identify the conditions and risks of their implementation.

2. Theoretical Foundations

2.1. The concept of social partnership in preschool education

The term "social partnership" originated in the sphere of labor relations, where it denotes a system of interaction between employers, employees and the state. In education it has acquired a



broader meaning and refers to a type of interaction in which an educational organization and external actors voluntarily pool resources, share responsibility and pursue common goals that none of them could achieve alone. In this article, social partnership in a preschool education organization is understood as a purposeful, institutionalized and mutually beneficial interaction of the organization with families, public authorities, local community institutions, schools, health and social services, business and civil-society organizations, aimed at creating conditions for the full development of every child.

Several features distinguish partnership from related phenomena. First, it is based on voluntariness and mutual benefit: each party receives something it values. Second, it presupposes shared goals formulated around the interests of the child. Third, it involves a distribution of responsibility and decision-making rather than a one-way transfer of services. Fourth, it is regular and institutionalized, which means that it does not depend on the personal sympathies of individual employees. Finally, it is transparent: partners know what is expected from them and how results are evaluated. By contrast, sponsorship, one-time assistance or the informing of parents about decisions already made are forms of cooperation that lack at least some of these features.

2.2. Approaches explaining the work of partnership

The first group of approaches concerns the relationship between the settings of child development. Epstein's theory of overlapping spheres of influence holds that the family, the educational institution and the community influence the child simultaneously, and that their influence is stronger when the actors deliberately create common practices and shared messages [6]. The same author describes six types of involvement: parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home, participation in decision-making and collaboration with the community. This typology is useful for managers because it turns a general idea of "working with families" into a set of distinguishable practices that can be planned and assessed. A complementary perspective is offered by Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory, in which development is a function of the interaction between the child and a nested set of environments [7]. For preschool management the key notion is the mesosystem, that is, the links between the settings in which the child participates. The quality of the link between home and kindergarten is, in this view, a developmental factor in its own right.

The second group of approaches explains why partnership creates value. The concept of social capital, developed by Coleman, emphasizes that relations of trust, shared norms and information channels among adults around the child are a resource that supports educational outcomes [8]. Putnam's distinction between bonding and bridging social capital is also relevant: bonding ties unite similar people, for example parents of the same group, while bridging ties connect different groups and institutions, and it is the latter that give a preschool organization access to resources



that it does not possess [9]. In managerial terms, partnership is a deliberate investment in the social capital of the organization and its community.

The third group of approaches concerns the management of relations with multiple actors. Stakeholder theory, proposed by Freeman, treats an organization as a center of a network of groups that can affect, or are affected by, its activity [10]. Mitchell, Agle and Wood showed that stakeholders can be differentiated by their power, the legitimacy of their claims and the urgency of their demands, which provides a practical basis for prioritizing partners [11]. The literature on collaborative governance adds a process perspective. According to Ansell and Gash, successful collaboration depends on the starting conditions, facilitative leadership, institutional design and a cyclical collaborative process that includes face-to-face dialogue, trust building, commitment to the process, shared understanding and the achievement of intermediate outcomes [12].

Finally, the cultural-historical approach of Vygotsky reminds us that development is socially mediated: the child acquires new ways of acting and thinking in joint activity with adults and more experienced peers [13]. If the adults surrounding the child pursue inconsistent aims or apply contradictory requirements, the developmental effect of joint activity is weakened. This gives partnership a pedagogical rationale that goes beyond administrative convenience. At the system level, the notion of a competent system in early childhood education and care, proposed by Urban and colleagues, stresses that quality depends on the interplay of individual competences, team practice, institutional conditions, inter-institutional collaboration and supportive governance [14]. Sanders, studying school-community partnerships, stresses that such work is more effective when it is integrated into the institution's improvement planning and supported by a designated coordinator rather than left to occasional initiatives [15].

Taken together, these approaches yield three methodological principles for the present study. The principle of ecological consistency requires that the practices of the preschool organization, the family and the community be aligned around the child. The principle of reciprocity requires that every partnership create identifiable benefits for all parties. The principle of systemic organization requires that partnership be supported by management mechanisms rather than by individual enthusiasm.

3. Materials and Methods

The study is analytical and conceptual in nature. It relied on the following methods: a structured analysis of scholarly literature on school-family-community partnerships, stakeholder management and collaborative governance; an analysis of the principal normative legal acts regulating preschool education in the Republic of Uzbekistan; comparative synthesis of theoretical approaches in order to identify common mechanisms; and conceptual modeling, which was used to arrange the identified mechanisms into a coherent framework. The professional experience of working with directors and methodologists of preschool organizations in the system



of continuing professional development served as an empirical background for formulating the mechanisms, although the article does not report the results of a separate survey.

4. The Normative and Policy Context

The national legal framework creates a favorable context for the development of social partnership. The Law "On Preschool Education and Upbringing" [3] defines the basic principles of the system, the types of preschool organizations, the powers of the founders and the rights and responsibilities of parents and other legal representatives of the child. Presidential Decree No. PP-4312 [4] launched the concept of development of the preschool system, emphasizing the growth of coverage, the improvement of the quality of services and the involvement of the non-state sector. Broader strategic documents, such as the Concept for the Development of the Public Education System until 2030 [16] and the Development Strategy of New Uzbekistan for 2022-2026 [17], place the quality of education and human capital development at the center of state policy and underline the need to engage society in these processes.

Another important element is the legislation on public-private partnership [18], which creates a legal basis for attracting private partners to the social sphere, including the creation and operation of preschool facilities. Besides formal legislation, there is a rich tradition of community interaction in the form of the mahalla, a neighborhood institution that unites residents and has authority in matters of family and child welfare. For a preschool manager the mahalla is a natural partner, one that has both social legitimacy and detailed knowledge of local families.

At the same time, the analysis shows that regulatory documents define the general direction and the rights of the actors, but they largely leave open the question of how partnership should be organized at the level of a particular institution. Who coordinates partnership? How are partners selected? How are obligations documented? How is the effect of partnership assessed? In the absence of institutional answers to these questions, the quality of partnership depends on the personality and experience of the director. This gap between the policy framework and the operational level is the main reason for developing a system of mechanisms.

5. Results: A System of Mechanisms of Effective Social Partnership

On the basis of the theoretical analysis, six interrelated mechanisms are proposed. They are interrelated in the sense that the weakness of one of them reduces the effectiveness of the others. Table 1 summarizes their purposes and key instruments, and the content of each mechanism is described below.



Table 1. Mechanisms of effective social partnership in a preschool education organization

Mechanism	Core purpose	Key instruments
Normative-legal	To give partnership a clear and stable institutional basis	Partnership policy, annual plan, agreements, parent council regulation, child-safety and data-protection rules
Organizational-managerial	To assign responsibility and create a management cycle	Partnership coordinator, partnership council, stakeholder map, cycle of diagnosis, planning, implementation and review
Pedagogical-content	To connect partnership with the educational process	Joint projects, family learning programs, continuity with primary school, shared developmental goals
Resource	To mobilize human, material, information and financial resources	Volunteer bank, shared facilities, public-private projects, resource register
Motivational-communicative	To build trust and sustain participation	Two-way channels, recognition, feedback, transparent reporting, respectful practice
Monitoring-evaluative	To assess results and improve the system	Indicators, surveys, case reviews, annual partnership report

5.1. Normative-legal mechanism

The first mechanism translates the general legal framework into the local documents of the organization. Its core is a short institutional policy of partnership that states the aims, principles, partner categories and distribution of responsibilities. The policy is supplemented by an annual partnership plan integrated into the overall development plan of the organization, and by agreements with partners that specify mutual obligations, the expected results, the term, the order of communication and the rules of exit. The regulation on the parent council, which defines its powers in consulting on the content of activities, the use of resources and the evaluation of quality, ensures that the voice of families is institutionally recognized. Special attention should be given to documents that protect children and families: rules on child safety during joint events and on



the handling of personal data and photographs. The existence of such rules increases the confidence of parents and protects the organization from avoidable risks.

5.2. Organizational-managerial mechanism

The second mechanism defines who is responsible for partnership and how the work is organized over time. Experience of collaborative governance suggests that partnership needs a facilitative leader and a stable procedure [12]. In a preschool organization it is advisable to appoint a partnership coordinator from among the deputy director or senior methodologist, with a clear job description, and to establish a partnership council that includes staff, parents and, where appropriate, representatives of the mahalla, the school and other partners. The first managerial task is stakeholder mapping, in which the manager identifies the actors, analyzes their interests and resources and classifies them by power, legitimacy and urgency [10, 11]. The second task is to establish an annual cycle consisting of four phases: diagnosis of needs and resources, planning, implementation and joint review of results. This cycle makes partnership a managed process.

The organizational mechanism must also take into account the capacity of employees. Hargreaves and Fullan argue that the quality of an educational organization depends on professional capital, which combines individual competence, social capital within the team and the capacity for judgment in decision making [19]. For partnership this means that educators must be prepared for dialogue with parents and external partners, and that responsibility should be shared across the team rather than concentrated in the hands of the director. The idea of communities of practice, developed by Wenger, is helpful here: groups of educators who regularly exchange experience around a common problem learn faster, and partnership with other organizations can be organized as a joint community of practice [20].

5.3. Pedagogical-content mechanism

The third mechanism ensures that partnership improves the educational process rather than remaining an administrative or social activity. Its starting point is the principle of shared developmental goals: families and partners should be familiar with the aims of the educational program and understand how they can contribute. The framework of dual capacity-building proposed by Mapp and Kuttner emphasizes that effective partnership requires developing both the capabilities of staff to work with families and the confidence and knowledge of families to support learning [21]. In practice this means training educators in communication and empathy, and offering parents practical formats such as workshops, demonstration sessions, family reading programs and play-based activities that can be repeated at home.

There is evidence that structured work with parents produces measurable effects. A randomized trial of the Getting Ready intervention reported positive effects of parent engagement on early language and literacy [22]. Research also helps to explain why some parents are more involved than others: parental beliefs about their role, their sense of self-efficacy and the



invitations they receive from the educational institution are important determinants [23]. A meta-analysis of studies on parental involvement found that the strength of association with children's achievement differs between forms of involvement, being stronger for parental expectations and weaker for strict supervision of tasks at home [24]. The practical implication for managers is to favor forms of involvement that strengthen the child's motivation and the quality of parent-child interaction rather than formal control.

The pedagogical mechanism also covers continuity between preschool and primary education. Analytical work by the OECD indicates that transitions are smoother when educational settings cooperate in curriculum, share information about children and prepare both children and parents for the change [25]. A preschool organization can therefore build partnership with neighboring schools through joint events for future first-graders, exchange of methodological experience and agreed approaches to the development of learning-related skills.

5.4. Resource mechanism

The fourth mechanism concerns the mobilization of resources that the organization does not have on its own. These resources are not limited to money. Human resources include the time and expertise of parents, health specialists, local artists, craftspeople and school teachers. Material resources include premises, equipment and outdoor space. Informational resources include expertise and access to networks. The practical tool of this mechanism is a resource register in which the needs of the organization are matched with the potential contributions of partners, together with a volunteer bank of parents and community members willing to participate in defined activities. Where legislation allows, projects based on public-private partnership principles [18] can be used for larger investments. A rule of reciprocity should be maintained: each partner should receive recognition, an opportunity to participate or another form of benefit, so that partnership is not experienced as a one-way request for help.

5.5. Motivational-communicative mechanism

The fifth mechanism maintains the interest of participants and builds trust. Bryk and Schneider have shown that relational trust, which rests on respect, competence, personal regard and integrity, is a core resource for the improvement of educational institutions [26]. Trust cannot be proclaimed; it is created by repeated experience of respectful, honest and predictable interaction. Managerial practices that support it include two-way communication channels (face-to-face meetings, messaging groups, suggestion boxes, open days), prompt and respectful response to questions and complaints, and regular transparent reporting on how contributions of partners have been used. Recognition of partners, through thanks at public events, certificates, presentation of results and joint publications, is an important form of non-material motivation. It is also necessary to consider the obstacles faced by different families: working hours, family responsibilities, differences in educational background and in language skills. Flexible scheduling and diverse formats of



participation, including those that can be carried out at home or online, make partnership more inclusive.

5.6. Monitoring-evaluative mechanism

The sixth mechanism closes the management cycle. Without evaluation, partnership remains a set of events whose effects are unknown. The mechanism includes a system of indicators at three levels: process indicators (the number and regularity of joint activities, the share of families and partners involved, the fulfillment of obligations), quality indicators (satisfaction and trust of parents and partners, the perceived usefulness of activities) and outcome indicators (changes in the educational environment, the developmental dynamics of children, the diversity of mobilized resources). The tools of monitoring include short parent and staff surveys, interviews with partners, the analysis of documentation and case reviews. The results should be summarized in an annual partnership report that is discussed in the partnership council and used to adjust the plan. Inclusion of partners in the evaluation process strengthens their sense of ownership and the legitimacy of the findings.

6. Discussion

The proposed system of mechanisms is based on the idea that effective partnership is the result of purposeful management rather than a spontaneous product of goodwill. The mechanisms are mutually dependent: a normative basis without a coordinator remains declarative; a coordinator without resources and trust cannot ensure participation; activities without evaluation do not lead to learning. This logic corresponds to the conclusions of collaborative governance research that starting conditions, leadership, institutional design and the process of collaboration interact with each other [12].

Several risks should be recognized. The first is formalism, when agreements are signed but not implemented. Counter-measures include specific obligations in agreements, an annual review and the public reporting of results. The second is dependence on individuals: if partnership relies on the personal contacts of the director, it may disappear when staff change, so documentation and distributed responsibility are needed. The third is tokenism in the involvement of parents, where families are invited to listen but not to influence decisions. The functioning of a parent council with real consultative powers is a safeguard against this risk. The fourth is inequality of participation, when the more resourced and educated families participate more actively than others, which can increase rather than reduce disparities. The fifth is the risk of overload: too many partnership activities can distract staff from their main educational work, so selection of partners according to priorities, as suggested by stakeholder analysis [11], is necessary.

The introduction of the mechanisms requires certain conditions. The first is the managerial competence of directors, including skills in strategic planning, communication, project management and the use of data. This points to the particular role of the system of professional



development and retraining of preschool managers, in which partnership management should be included as a distinct module with practical tasks, case analysis and the design of institutional documents. The second is supportive policy at the level of the territory, including the participation of local authorities and the mahalla in coordinating the efforts of institutions. The third is a flexible approach to the contexts of different types of organizations: state, non-state, urban and rural, large and small institutions have different resources and needs. The proposed framework should therefore be adapted rather than copied.

The limitations of the study should also be noted. The article is conceptual, and the mechanisms have not been tested in a controlled experiment. Further research should include pilot implementation in several preschool organizations, the development and validation of indicators, and the analysis of the link between the quality of partnership and the developmental outcomes of children and the satisfaction of families.

7. Conclusion

Social partnership in preschool education is a strategic resource for improving the quality of early childhood development, and its effectiveness depends on whether it is managed as a system. The analysis of ecological, social-capital, stakeholder and collaborative-governance approaches, together with the national policy context, made it possible to define social partnership as a purposeful, institutionalized and mutually beneficial interaction between a preschool organization and its social environment and to propose a system of six mechanisms: normative-legal, organizational-managerial, pedagogical-content, resource, motivational-communicative and monitoring-evaluative.

The practical significance of the framework lies in the fact that it gives directors and methodologists a clear structure for diagnosing the current state of partnership, for planning improvements and for evaluating results. It can be used in programs of professional development of preschool managers and as a basis for institutional self-assessment. The prospects of further research are connected with the empirical verification of the framework, the study of the specific features of partnership in different types of organizations and territories, and the development of digital tools to support communication and monitoring.

References

1. Shonkoff J.P., Phillips D.A. (eds.) From Neurons to Neighborhoods: The Science of Early Childhood Development. – Washington, DC: National Academies Press, 2000. – 588 p.
2. Heckman J.J. Skill formation and the economics of investing in disadvantaged children // Science. – 2006. – Vol. 312, No. 5782. – P. 1900–1902.

3. Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On Preschool Education and Upbringing" No. ZRU-595 of 16 December 2019 // National Database of Legislation of the Republic of Uzbekistan. – URL: <https://lex.uz> (accessed: 07.10.2026).
4. Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PP-4312 of 8 May 2019 "On measures to radically improve the system of preschool education" // National Database of Legislation of the Republic of Uzbekistan. – URL: <https://lex.uz> (accessed: 07.10.2026).
5. Henderson A.T., Mapp K.L. A New Wave of Evidence: The Impact of School, Family, and Community Connections on Student Achievement. – Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 2002. – 232 p.
6. Epstein J.L. School, Family, and Community Partnerships: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools. – 2nd ed. – Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2011. – 584 p.
7. Bronfenbrenner U. The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design. – Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979. – 330 p.
8. Coleman J.S. Social capital in the creation of human capital // American Journal of Sociology. – 1988. – Vol. 94 (Suppl.). – P. S95–S120.
9. Putnam R.D. Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community. – New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000. – 541 p.
10. Freeman R.E. Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach. – Boston: Pitman, 1984. – 276 p.
11. Mitchell R.K., Agle B.R., Wood D.J. Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts // Academy of Management Review. – 1997. – Vol. 22, No. 4. – P. 853–886.
12. Ansell C., Gash A. Collaborative governance in theory and practice // Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory. – 2008. – Vol. 18, No. 4. – P. 543–571.
13. Vygotsky L.S. Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes. – Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978. – 159 p.
14. Urban M., Vandenbroeck M., Van Laere K., Lazzari A., Peeters J. Towards competent systems in early childhood education and care. Implications for policy and practice // European Journal of Education. – 2012. – Vol. 47, No. 4. – P. 508–526.
15. Sanders M.G. Building School-Community Partnerships: Collaboration for Student Success. – Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, 2005.
16. Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PF-5712 of 29 April 2019 "On approval of the Concept for the development of the public education system of the Republic of Uzbekistan until 2030" // National Database of Legislation of the Republic of Uzbekistan. – URL: <https://lex.uz> (accessed: 07.10.2026).

17. Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PF-60 of 28 January 2022 "On the Development Strategy of New Uzbekistan for 2022–2026" // National Database of Legislation of the Republic of Uzbekistan. – URL: <https://lex.uz> (accessed: 07.10.2026).

18. Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On Public-Private Partnership" No. ZRU-537 of 10 May 2019 // National Database of Legislation of the Republic of Uzbekistan. – URL: <https://lex.uz> (accessed: 07.10.2026).

19. Hargreaves A., Fullan M. Professional Capital: Transforming Teaching in Every School. – New York: Teachers College Press, 2012. – 208 p.

20. Wenger E. Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. – 318 p.

21. Mapp K.L., Kuttner P.J. Partners in Education: A Dual Capacity-Building Framework for Family-School Partnerships. – Austin, TX: SEDL; Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 2013.

22. Sheridan S.M., Knoche L.L., Kupzyk K.A., Edwards C.P., Marvin C.A. A randomized trial examining the effects of parent engagement on early language and literacy: The Getting Ready intervention // Journal of School Psychology. – 2011. – Vol. 49, No. 3. – P. 361–383.

23. Hoover-Dempsey K.V., Sandler H.M. Why do parents become involved in their children's education? // Review of Educational Research. – 1997. – Vol. 67, No. 1. – P. 3–42.

24. Fan X., Chen M. Parental involvement and students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis // Educational Psychology Review. – 2001. – Vol. 13, No. 1. – P. 1–22.

25. OECD. Starting Strong V: Transitions from Early Childhood Education and Care to Primary Education. – Paris: OECD Publishing, 2017. – DOI: 10.1787/9789264276253-en.

26. Bryk A.S., Schneider B. Trust in Schools: A Core Resource for Improvement. – New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2002. – 144 p.