

LEGAL FOUNDATIONS FOR CREATING A COMFORTABLE ENVIRONMENT IN SCHOOLS AND MECHANISMS FOR THEIR PRACTICAL IMPLEMENTATION

<https://doi.org/10.2689/zenodo.1879461358>

Turgunova Shohista Muhammadjonovna

Independent Researcher, Namangan State University

Abstract

This article analyzes the legal foundations for creating a comfortable school environment and the institutional factors influencing their practical implementation. The research was based on normative legal analysis, comparative methods, and document examination. The results demonstrate that legal guarantees, internal regulations, and preventive mechanisms work in coordination to ensure a sustainable comfortable environment.

Keywords

Comfortable environment, educational institution, legal guarantees, children's rights, school regulations, safe education, prevention.

Introduction. The school environment occupies a central position in modern pedagogy and educational management research as one of the key factors determining educational quality, psychological well-being, and socialization outcomes. A comfortable environment refers not only to material and technical conditions but to a complex institutional space where children's dignity and worth are respected, where violence, discrimination, and humiliation are prevented, and where the safety of the educational process is ensured through fair organizational procedures. In this sense, the creation of a comfortable environment extends beyond pedagogical technologies and is directly connected with legal regulation, accountability mechanisms, and management culture. Against the backdrop of educational system modernization in Uzbekistan, strengthening child rights protection, and new approaches to assessing educational quality, the legal substantiation of a comfortable school environment has become an urgent scientific problem [1; 2].

The scientific problem of the topic lies in the fact that requirements for a comfortable environment in legal documents are typically scattered across various normative layers: constitutional guarantees, sectoral legislation, departmental norms, and local documents of educational institutions. In practice, when

coherence between these layers is insufficient, responsibility for ensuring a comfortable environment is not clearly allocated, preventive mechanisms may become formalized, or pedagogical disciplinary measures may not fully comply with legal standards. While existing research frequently addresses psychological and pedagogical interpretations of school climate and safe educational environments, systematic analyses of the legal foundations, legal quality of local acts, and institutional design of implementation mechanisms remain relatively limited [3; 4]. Furthermore, the issue of alignment between international legal standards and national law is often considered at a declarative level, with problems at the translation stage into school internal regulations not sufficiently explored [5].

The purpose of this article is to systematically analyze the legal foundations for creating a comfortable environment in schools, identify mechanisms for implementing normative requirements at the institutional level, and develop legal-methodological conclusions for local documents and practical procedures. To achieve this goal, the following tasks were completed: first, to identify the legal categories of a comfortable environment and their place in the hierarchy of sources; second, to analyze how legal requirements are concretized through local normative documents of educational institutions; third, to highlight the legal design of accountability and prevention mechanisms; fourth, to substantiate practical recommendations based on comparative analysis with international approaches.

Methods. The research methodology was based on normative legal analysis and comparative approaches. In normative legal analysis, the content of constitutional guarantees, education legislation, norms on child rights protection, and documents regulating internal order in educational institutions was interpreted. This approach allowed viewing elements such as the state's positive obligations to ensure a comfortable environment, powers of educational organizations, and responsibilities of pedagogical staff as a unified legal system [1; 6]. The comparative method served to identify alignments and differences by comparing international legal standards and certain foreign practical approaches to managing 'school safety' and 'school climate' instruments with national regulation [5; 7].

Document examination was selected as the empirical component. This involved analyzing typical structures and legal quality indicators of local normative documents encountered at the school level, specifically school regulations, internal order rules, student conduct codes, complaint review procedures, disciplinary action application procedures, and prevention programs. The reason for selecting this method is that normative requirements for a comfortable environment are implemented in practice precisely through local acts,

that is, general norms are converted into specific school procedures. The analytical-systematic approach helped interpret the connection between legal guarantees, management decisions, and pedagogical practice as a conceptual model. The research also employed logical-methodological interpretation methods, legal term clarification, and identification of normative conflicts [3; 8].

Results. The analysis results showed that the legal foundations of a comfortable environment consist of three interconnected levels: the level of general legal guarantees, the level of sectoral regulation, and the level of local norms of the educational institution. At the general level, principles such as inviolability of personal dignity, right to education, safe environment, and protection from discrimination serve as the 'basic legal minimum standard' for ensuring a comfortable environment. These standards must be applied directly in relationships within the school, legally substantiating a zero-tolerance approach to any violence or humiliation in teacher-student, student-student, and school-administration relationships [1; 2]. As a result, the concept of 'comfortable environment' is shaped not only as a pedagogical value but as a legally protected interest.

At the sectoral level, educational norms serve to establish ensuring a comfortable environment as an integral condition of educational quality. The key finding here is that the duties of an educational institution are not limited to providing knowledge but include ensuring the safety of the student's life and health, respecting personal inviolability, and guaranteeing that pedagogical measures are fair and proportionate [6; 7]. Additionally, the child rights approach presents the educational process not as a 'service' but as a social institution requiring legal protection; this implies that schools bear legal responsibility not only for curriculum delivery but also for the organizational climate in which learning occurs. Consequently, ensuring a comfortable environment becomes part of institutional duties, requiring appropriate resources, procedures, and accountability.

The second result concerns local normative acts. Analysis showed that school regulations, codes of conduct, complaint procedures, and disciplinary protocols directly shape the operational model of a comfortable environment. The legal quality of these documents determines how general norms are translated into specific rights and obligations. When local acts clearly define procedural guarantees (hearing rights, appeal mechanisms, proportionality of measures), the legal foundation for a comfortable environment becomes institutionally 'executable.' Conversely, when procedures are described vaguely or accountability is not delineated, gaps arise between normative requirements and practical

application [3; 8]. For instance, if school regulations state 'maintaining discipline' without specifying permissible and prohibited methods or appeal procedures for disciplinary decisions, teachers may interpret measures arbitrarily, potentially violating student dignity. This finding underscores that a comfortable environment's legal basis is effective not through the mere existence of norms but through their proceduralization and connection to accountability mechanisms.

The third result derived from comparison with international standards: while principles such as child-centered approach, non-discrimination, safety, and participation rights are recognized in the national legal framework, methodological differences exist in their translation into school internal documents. Specifically, international approaches to improving school climate are often aligned with legal guarantees alongside institutional monitoring, risk assessment, anonymous complaint channels, and restorative practice elements [5; 9]. In national practice, monitoring and assessment may be limited to organizational reports, necessitating linking comfortable environment indicators with legal accountability. As a result, while legal foundations for ensuring a comfortable environment may be sufficient, mechanisms for 'measuring' and connecting them to 'accountability' require a more precise model at the local level [7; 9].

Discussion. The obtained results indicate that legally ensuring a comfortable school environment is not merely a 'collection of legal texts' but an institutional system for implementing normative requirements. This approach methodologically aligns with Russian and international scholarly literature interpreting educational institution safety as an 'organizational-legal regime,' meaning the sustainability of safety and comfort depends on procedural clarity and defined accountability contours [8; 9]. However, as noted in the results, in the national context the legal quality of local normative documents often remains dependent on institutional resources and management competencies, potentially creating gaps between legal guarantees and practice. This situation is explained by what is termed an 'implementation gap' in education law: a norm exists but its application mechanism is insufficiently institutionalized [6; 7].

International sources emphasize the 'participation' component in rights-based approaches to children in educational environments, meaning students are viewed not only as objects of protection but as subjects of school life [5]. Our results suggest that local acts may tend to define discipline as one-sided obligation, potentially relegating students' procedural guarantees to secondary status. This difference means the effectiveness of legal foundations for a comfortable environment is determined not only by prohibitions and sanctions but by an 'architecture of legal services' including fair dispute resolution, right to be heard, complaint

mechanisms, and referral to psychological assistance. If the complaint review procedure at an educational institution is not open and trustworthy, even with formal comfortable environment requirements, the subjective sense of safety decreases; this indirectly but powerfully impacts educational outcomes [3; 9].

Uzbek scholars note the necessity of integrating legal culture and legal education with institutional management in the education system, which supports our findings on responsibility distribution [2]. Nevertheless, legal education often remains limited to lectures or events, whereas the institutional expression of legal education should manifest precisely in procedures. That is, students do not merely learn their rights in class but experience legal practice firsthand when school disputes are handled fairly, their opinions are heard, and decisions are substantiated. From this perspective, legal foundations for creating a comfortable environment become the 'hidden curriculum' of the pedagogical process and stabilize school climate [4].

In the Russian scholarly tradition, local normative documents of educational organizations are considered as the institution's 'internal law,' and quality assessment criteria have been developed [8]. Our results also show that the more precise, procedurally complete, and transparent local acts are, the more institutionally protected the comfortable environment becomes. The principle of proportionality is particularly important here: disciplinary measures must correspond to the severity of behavior, the child's age, and situational context, and be applied in a manner that does not diminish child dignity [6; 8]. International sources note greater application of restorative practices principles, but these should not be directly copied to any environment but rather adapted to national law and school management traditions [9]. Here, the main scientific position based on article results is that the legal model of a comfortable environment should be designed not as a 'one-time document' but as a continuously updated system of local regulation and monitoring.

Another important issue within the discussion: the abundance of legal foundations does not automatically guarantee a comfortable environment. If implementation mechanisms, such as practical guidelines for enhancing teachers' legal competencies, planning preventive work, early identification of risk factors, and conducting fair internal investigations, are insufficient, norms may remain 'on paper' in practice [7]. Therefore, the main conceptual conclusion emerging from the article's results is that legal foundations for a comfortable school environment represent not filling a normative hierarchy but a management task requiring conversion of normative requirements into specific procedures, their measurement, and connection to accountability.

Conclusion. The article substantiated the legal foundations for creating a comfortable school environment as a three-tier system: general legal guarantees, special education sector regulation, and school local normative documents. The research demonstrated that the sustainability of a comfortable environment primarily depends on clear definition of procedural guarantees, responsibility distribution, and complaint and dispute resolution mechanisms in local acts. As a scientific contribution, ensuring a comfortable environment was interpreted as an 'institutional implementation system,' illuminating key links in translating legal norms into school internal procedures. Practically, conducting legal expertise of school regulations and internal rules, strengthening proportionality and fairness criteria for disciplinary decisions, implementing transparent complaint channels, and connecting monitoring with outcome indicators can enhance the comfortable environment. Future research should focus on developing quality criteria for local normative documents, integrating school climate assessment indicators with legal accountability, and empirically studying implementation gaps across regional practices.

REFERENCES:

1. Constitution of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Official text with amendments. Tashkent, Uzbekistan, 2023. 128 p.
2. Ziyomuhammadov B. Issues of Legal Culture and Legal Education in the Education System. Tashkent, Science and Technology, 2020. 184 p.
3. Jurayev R. Kh., Saidov U. O. Management and Legal Norms in Educational Institutions. Tashkent, Economics-Finance, 2019. 216 p.
4. Ghofurov A. M. Pedagogical Environment and Educational Quality: Theory and Practice. Samarkand, SamSU Publishing, 2021. 200 p.
5. Convention on the Rights of the Child. United Nations Treaty Series. New York, United Nations, 1989. 55 p.
6. UNESCO. Behind the Numbers: Ending School Violence and Bullying. Paris, UNESCO Publishing, 2019. 70 p.
7. OECD. Education Policy Outlook 2019: Working Together to Help Students Achieve their Potential. Paris, OECD Publishing, 2019. 242 p.
8. Vorontsov A. V. Local Normative Acts of Educational Organizations: Legal Status and Application Practice. Moscow, Prospect, 2020. 192 p.
9. Cohen J. School Climate: Research, Policy, Practice, and Teacher Education. New York, Teachers College Press, 2010. 336 p.