

**Beztelesna L. I.** [1: OCID ID: 0000-0002-0262-9334],  
Doctor of Economics, Professor

*<sup>1</sup>National University of Water and Environmental Engineering, Rivne*

## **MANAGEMENT MECHANISM FOR ENHANCING THE COMPETITIVENESS OF UNIVERSITIES**

**It is proved that in modern conditions the priority in the mechanism of competitiveness management of the university should belong to socio-psychological methods, and their successful implementation should be illustrated by students' satisfaction with learning. A student survey questionnaire has been developed to assess the overall level of academic satisfaction at the university.**

**It is proved that the movement of students is a reaction to the implementation of internal university management. The dynamics of movement of students of Ukraine and the USA is analyzed; financial losses of universities and the state from this process are calculated. A methodical approach to increasing the competitiveness of universities is proposed, which involves comparing the coefficients of student turnover and their satisfaction, making appropriate management decisions that will contribute to the implementation of a competitive strategy – management differentiation.**

**The paper presents the essence and factors of ensuring the competitiveness of universities. The state expenses for the activity of universities are reflected, as well as the contingent of students, their distribution by regions and forms of education, the cost of one year of study.**

**Keywords:** competitiveness; university; students; strategy; socio-psychological methods; fluidity; satisfaction; management mechanism; financial losses; differentiation.

### **I. Introduction**

In modern conditions people are mobile and choose the educational program without limitation neither the country where the institution is located nor the financial resources, because the mentioned above can be obtained by combining training and work. Universities are forced to act in order to increase their competitiveness market not only national but also global. Therefore, in the condition of fierce competition, in order to increase financial resources, universities are trying to attract the most talented human resources and use advanced information technologies to implement the best management decisions to increase



competitiveness. Many domestic and foreign scientists have addressed the problem of increasing the competitiveness of universities. It is clear that foreign scientists are leading this issue, since the functioning of a market economy in their countries is much longer than in Ukraine. Thus, the vast majority of them concentrated their attention on research into the competitiveness of universities.

Although universities make managerial decisions to increase competitiveness in all areas of their activity, it seems that insufficient attention is paid to one of the main components, namely, students who are not university resources, but still the subjects of their influence. However, in the universities, it is for the students' sake that the educational process, the scientific activity are organized and various innovations are introduced. The infrastructure and the image policy, as well as many other things, are implemented.

Concerning this, the paper attempts to propose a methodological approach to the development of a management solution that would enhance the competitiveness of universities in the context of globalization.

## **II. Analytical review of the literature**

At the present stage of economic development of society, competition as a driving force is forcing entities to search for new avenues of competitiveness. The study of scientific sources gives the right to claim that there are different approaches to the interpretation of its essence, depending on the coverage of the tasks. In a broad sense, competitiveness is about winning in the competition. In the economic sense, competitiveness in its most general form means the presence of characteristics that create benefits for the participants of the competition [1].

The World Economic Forum defines competitiveness as a real and potential opportunity for an organization to design, produce and market goods that are more attractive to consumers than their competitors in terms of price and non-price [2].

M. Porter treats competitiveness as a property of a commodity, a service, a market entity acting on it in parallel with those of competing entities present there [3].

Although the university is also an enterprise, the subject of market relations, but its activities have certain specific features. First, the university is an institution that brings together educational and pedagogical staff who produce educational services for students, which are subsequently transformed into skills and are a prerequisite for their further employment in the labor market, and secondly, conduct

intellectual activity, which contributes to the development of the innovation system, and thirdly, to the social development.

In view of this, we believe that the interpretation given by V. I. Satsyk of the competitive university is quite successful and we will stick to it in our work. Therefore, a competitive university is one that is able to hold and hold steady positions in certain segments of the world market of educational services and intellectual products due to the effective realization of scientific and pedagogical potential, advanced innovation system and sufficient financial resources to provide high quality research and education [4].

Thus, J. Salmi [5] argued that they are the academic freedom and autonomy of universities, and F. Altbach [6] that breakthrough scientific research, the integration of research components into students' learning activities.

Instead, A. Teich [7] and others convinced that a highly developed system of state support for universities, state funding for research and investment in the development of university infrastructure are essential positions for productive management. However, they underlined productive collaboration with business and other organizations, alumni (B. Clark). Some works were devoted to the criteria and indicators for determining the university rankings, which illustrate their achievements. It is clear that the achievement of university competitiveness requires the development of national strategies.

According to S. Marginson's systematization [8], there are three main models of world-class university development strategies. The breadth strategy (from high-quality mass higher education to the creation of world-class universities), the deep strategy (from pioneering research in breakthroughs to the creation of world-class universities), and a combined broad strategy and breadth depth strategy is a combination of the two previous strategies. S. Marginson argues that there is no optimal, or 'golden,' path, i.e. the best strategy for building a world-class university, and it cannot exist in principle, as each country is distinguished by its economic potential, available resources, cultural and mental values. In any case, universities in developing countries recommend that the researcher simultaneously pursue advanced scientific research and constantly improve the quality of educational services. A number of historical facts proves the importance of the factor supporting the role of the state in the formation of competitive universities.

Our universities while conducting their activities face with the problem, not only of reducing the supportive role of the state, but also of



establishing clear communications with students studying and conducting research activities.

In today's context the rating system is used to evaluate the competitiveness of universities. The most famous world rankings universities are The Times Higher Education World University Rankings, The Academic Ranking of World Universities, The QS World University Rankings [9]. Analysis gives the main factor for ensuring high competitiveness is scientific and research activity. The current state of university science in Ukraine does not meet global trends.

Ukrainian universities are overwhelmingly focused on fulfilling the educational function. In fact the share of income from education services and related services in the universities' budget is about 80%, while in the leading countries of the world spend more than 50% of all basic research [10].

The management mechanism of the University's competitiveness has many components (tools).

The management toolkit includes all the methods, methods and styles of influence of the management system on the managed, by means of which the university is managed in practice. Special management tools such as management styles and methods deserve special study.

In the mechanism of ensuring the competitiveness of the university it is necessary to use an individual approach, exercising managerial influence. The most flexible methods will be social and psychological management methods.

### **III. Object, subject and research methods**

The object of research is the processes of formation of competitiveness of universities in the context of globalization.

The subject of the study is the management mechanism of increasing the competitiveness of universities in the context of globalization.

Performing this work the following research methods as theoretical generalization, analysis and synthesis, induction and deduction, morphological analysis were used. To study the theoretical and methodological bases of the concepts of 'competitiveness', 'managerial mechanism' the methods above were used as well. Logical analysis is a study the development of scientific concepts of competition strategies and strategies of competitive universities; structural and logical analysis was used to build the logic and structure of the study; sociological survey was used to construct a survey of students' satisfaction with their studies at the university; graphic was important

for clarification of empirical data and schematic presentation of basic theoretical and practical provisions of the work.

#### **IV. Research results**

The activities of Ukrainian universities have been evaluated according to the Interactive Analytical Tool, prepared by the Ministry of Finance.

Dashboard data were collected from 176 higher education institutions with 347.000 students enrolled on government orders. The total expenditures of the state budget (general fund) for the payment of specialist training services by these institutions in 2018 amounted to UAH 16 billion. Training of higher education institutions is concentrated in 5 regions: Kyiv and Kharkiv, Lviv, Dnipropetrovsk and Odesa regions. These 5 regions account for 53% of higher education institutions receiving funding from the state budget. These institutions educate more than 60% of students on government procurement which account for more than 67% of state budget expenditures. The average estimated cost of preparing one student for a state in 2018 was 46 thousand UAH, but in some institutions, this number exceeds the national average by 2-3 times. According to the data collected by the Ministry of Finance In this survey took part 671.9 thousand students and people of different institutions. 51.72% of students are the budget form and the 48.28 are contracted. In terms of forms of study, 91.11% of full-time students and only 8.89% of part-time students [11].

Today, the most effective methods of management are social and psychological. They can be implemented through a questionnaire survey of students to determine their satisfaction with university management. It is in the domestic realities that students shape the financial capacity of universities, and therefore determine competitiveness.

We offer to conduct a survey of students on a questionnaire that contains seven blocks. It aims to evaluate:

- overall level of student satisfaction with the university;
- the goals and strategy of the university and the students' future intentions;
- student satisfaction with development, collaboration, management, communication, information and engagement opportunities. Each component has several alternatives chosen by the respondent.

All options include three options of agree, disagree and uncertain.

As for the students' future moods, the question is open and they are self-taught.

Table 1

## Questionnaire of university students

Dear Respondent!

This survey is aimed at determining the level of student satisfaction at the university.

1. Evaluate the following statements on a scale that describes your overall satisfaction level:

	I agree	I disagree	Not sure
I'm proud to be at university.			
Learning brings me pleasure.			
I would again choose a university to continue my studies.			
I would recommend the university to friends and acquaintances for higher education.			
I feel completely involved in the educational process.			
I feel motivated to study to the full extent.			
I feel the motivation of the whole team to study.			
I am satisfied with my studies.			

2. Rate the statements below on a scale of 0 to 100% by making a note on the scale:

	0 – 10%	11 – 20%	21 – 30%	31 – 40%	41 – 50%	51 – 60%	61 – 70%	71 – 80%	81 – 90%	91 – 100%
I know the goals and the strategy of University.										
I am optimistic about the future of the university. I have the following intentions.										

3. Please evaluate the following statements on the following scale, which characterize the level of satisfaction with studying at the university in the area of 'Communication, information, involvement'

	I agree	I disagree	Not sure
I am sufficiently informed about educational issues.			
I get all the information I need for my studies on time and in full degree.			
At my institute (group, faculty) there are good ideas and tips offered by students			
Students' interests are taken into account when making management decisions.			
Communication at the university is open and honest.			
I am satisfied with the communication, information support and the extent of my involvement in learning			

4. Evaluate the following statements on the following scale, which characterize the level of satisfaction with studying at the university in the direction 'Management'

	I agree	I disagree	Not sure
I feel the help of my tutor in teaching			
I get fair and honest feedback on my learning from my tutor.			
Tutor commends me for the good results in my work.			
Tutor makes the necessary decisions quickly.			
Tutor motivates me to refine the task.			
Tutor takes into account my interests as a student			
Tutor makes me understand the importance of learning			
Tutor is credible and sets a personal example in teaching			
I am satisfied with my tutor			

5. Rate the statements below on the scale characterizing the level of satisfaction of studying at the University in the direction of 'Cooperation'

	I agree	I disagree	Not sure
My group has a good working climate.			
If I need support, I can rely on my colleagues.			
Conflicts in the team are resolved in opened manner.			
Collaboration with other colleagues is successful.			
am pleased to cooperate with the university			



6. Evaluate the following statements on the following scale, which characterize the level of satisfaction with studying at the University in the direction of 'Development'

	I agree	I disagree	Not sure
I am well informed about the extra learning opportunities and practical skills.			
I have good opportunities to gain knowledge and practical skills.			
I am supported in gaining knowledge and practical skills.			
Training programs and practical skills provide me with the new knowledge I need to work.			
I am pleased with the opportunities to gain knowledge and practical skills.			

7. Please indicate what year of studying are you \_\_\_\_\_ and the \_\_\_\_\_ educational program you belong to.

The processing of student questionnaires and answers is a valuable source for developing precautionary measures for timely completion or worst of all – expelling students from the university and thus enhancing the university's competitiveness.

Of course, the students' education at the university, which lasts for years, is accompanied by processes of movement. However, student movement can be seen as a positive thing, that is academic mobility, when students are studying for a term at another university, thus, having the opportunity to gain knowledge from other teachers and universities, but with a return to the university they were attending. But, another type of student movement is the deduction of students for some reason. And not a problem when the deduction is for personal reasons (for example, changes in social status, residence, health, etc.). It is clear that the evaluation of students' movement occurs by calculating the yield factor. It is calculated as the ratio of the number of students enrolled to the average number of students:

$$K_{\text{yield factor.}} = K_{\text{enrolled.stud.}} / K_{\text{average number stud.}}, \quad (1)$$

where  $K_{\text{enrolled.stud.}}$  – a number of deducted students;  $K_{\text{average number stud.}}$  – average number of students.

It is believed that if the yield factor is 3-5%, then this is a natural norm. However, if the value is above this norm, then it requires appropriate management decisions. Despite the widespread stereotype that Ukrainian universities rarely enroll students, in 2011–2013 the

proportion of those who did not complete the program at all or in the allotted time for the various reasons was 15–18%. Among government employees, this figure is 8–11%, much less than in contractors (24–25%). To a certain extent, this disproves the rather popular idea of higher motivation and, consequently, greater success of contractors. At the same time, it should be remembered that, for the most part, the state pays more per student than the contract students [12].

The financial losses of the universities of Ukraine from the deduction of students are over 1.5 million UAH.

Table 2

Estimation of financial losses of Ukrainian universities from non-completion of educational programs at all or in the allotted time

Number of university students, thousands of people	Usual level of turnover, %	The proportion of students who do not complete their studies, %	The cost of training, thousand UAH (2018)	Insufficiency of university income, thousand UAH	Total for all forms of education, thousand UAH
Scholarship student 347	3–5	8–11	46	798,1–957,7	1616,6 (according to 3% turnover)
Obligated student 324,9		24–25	12	818,5–779,8	1737,5 (according to 5% turnover)

Losses from student deductions are typical not only for Ukrainian but also for American universities. Only 19% of US university students complete a 4-year Bachelor's degree in time.

More than \$ 200 billion is invested in the education sector in the US budget per year. More than \$ 15.000 is spent per student. In 2018, 20.8 million students are enrolled in America, including 15.2 million enrolled in public universities and colleges. If a student fails to complete their studies on time, this is a problem for his or her own budget as well as for the entire country. \$ 1.5 billion – just as much for Americans as an extra year of undergraduate students [13].

The competitiveness of universities is influenced by many external factors. Among them are politics and the state, which through legislative regulation, taxation, government procurement and other mechanisms of influence significantly influence the choice of competitive strategy and internal university management.

In spite of this, the factors of external influence create only a certain framework of activities for universities at the macro level.



Intra-university management regulates micro-level competitiveness. Each university is guided by its own internal rules, regulations, procedures, which will determine its competitiveness in the market.

External factors include those that the university cannot influence and change, but should only take into account in its strategy. They include:

1. Demographic situation (number of graduates of schools intending to get vocational education for the first time), unemployment rate (number of persons intending to retrain or get a new profile education), educational and innovation policy of the country, state employment policy, etc.

2. The presence of competitors in the market. Competitors in this case are other universities competing to achieve the same goal of attracting the best students and faculty in a particular educational area of knowledge.

3. Information on volumes and assortment of educational supply on the market. Under the proposal we mean the number of licensed educational programs and the education of students for them. The level of development of the educational field in which the university operates.

But achieving competitive advantages in the market, compared to other universities, is possible provided that students are satisfied with their studies at the university. An indicator of effectiveness will be the decrease in student turnover compared to competing universities.

Internal factors are factors that characterize the internal state of a university and may change under the influence of management decisions of its management.

Internal factors include the following:

1. The level of organization of the educational process.

2. The level of material security of the university and technological and information equipment. The availability of advanced equipment and its sufficient amount will help to improve the organization and technologies of training.

3. Management methods and styles used.

4. System of motivation at university.

Universities have to develop their own competitive strategies in order to win the competition.

Famous scientist M. Porter distinguishes two types of competitive strategies [14]:

1) differentiation strategy;

2) price leadership strategy.

Transferring these concepts to the competitiveness of universities in a market environment, we understand that a differentiation strategy means that the university must create a market supply that is different from the competition of competitors. One of the components of differentiation, apart from image and service [15], is the differentiation of educational programs. And that means attracting professionals, competent workers who will be distinguished by offering unique educational programs, their attention, delicacy and polite attitude of students, while always being honest, responsible and loyal to the university.

Considering the University's competitiveness in the market, we propose to introduce into the concept of differentiation strategy another component, it is managerial differentiation. It includes all those mechanisms of managerial influence that will have a positive impact on potential students, create a healthy climate in the team and act as a positive factor in the university's competitiveness. These include the management styles and methods used, the basics of the psychological and pedagogical approach to students, the processes of communication at the university, and so on. However, when implementing a strategy of managerial differentiation, it should be borne in mind that the sources of differentiation will change depending on changes in the values and needs of students and potential entrants. The interpretation of the price leadership strategy in the process of considering the competitiveness of the university in the market is somewhat limited in the price range, so it can be neglected.

In addition to student satisfaction with the student's learning, the university's competitiveness will also be affected by student movement, namely the number of students expelled from the university, which is measured by the turnover factor. This parameter is in some way related to the previous one and speaks for itself: the fewer students enrolled for any reason, the more satisfied they are at university. In addition, the low level of turnover has a positive effect on the image of the university from the point of view of potential entrants. The low performance of this factor also allows managers to spend less on career guidance, adapting to student learning, and channeling these into student motivation and other goals that will contribute to university satisfaction.

Thus, students' satisfaction with student learning should go to its maximum value and be as high as possible, and student turnover should go to zero and tend to decline.



Therefore, we propose our own author's methodology for calculating the university's competitiveness in market conditions, which will include the calculation of the university's competitiveness factor in the market according to two parameters: the student turnover rate and the student satisfaction rate. Therefore, the University's competitiveness factor in the market is calculated by the formula ( $K_{крП}$ ):

$$K_{yp} = K_{\text{turnover students}} / K_{\text{satisfaction. studying}}, \quad (2)$$

where  $K_{yp}$  – the University's competitiveness factor in the market;  $K_{\text{turnover students}}$  – student turnover factor;  $K_{\text{satisfaction. studying}}$  – student satisfaction rate with the educational process.

The student turnover factor is determined by the formula 1.

The student turnover coefficient reveals deficiencies in university management and states that students are dissatisfied with certain management parameters, which induces students or administration to deduct them. Thus, there is a clear correlation between two parameters: student turnover and satisfaction with their studies at the university.

When calculating the student turnover factor, the calculation formula of which is presented above, one should also talk about its normative values. If the ratio reaches 3-5%, it indicates the success of the university's internal management and health of the university's personnel policy and does not require any concern. This level of student turnover will speak about the natural movement of students at the university, and does not indicate any problems either in management or in the team. If the turnover rate is higher than 5%, then this should lead to a change in management and economic tools and requires a stabilization of the situation with students at this university. If you do not pay attention to this indicator in time, then the university expects high financial costs current and future for career guidance and loss of image in the market, which will lead to the loss of its attractiveness as a producer of educational services, and consequently to a decrease in the level of competitiveness in the market. In addition, the university will, in these circumstances, incur significant loss of income due to a decrease in the student population.

Thus, based on the above, the student turnover factor should be lower than 0.05 in order to meet the normative indicators and testify to the normal functioning of economic and management mechanisms.

The student satisfaction rate is estimated by interviewing the university students through a questionnaire or interview, which is

described in detail in Section 3.1. This student survey should be conducted anonymously in order to achieve the most realistic value of learning satisfaction, as well as to be permanent in order to compare the results and make adjustments to the management system and to improve the results. It is important for managers to remember that the purpose of evaluating student satisfaction with university studies is not to produce end results, but to further improve their learning environment and identify weaknesses in management.

The student satisfaction rate is estimated by interviewing the university students through a questionnaire or interview, which is described in detail in section 3.1. This student survey should be conducted anonymously in order to achieve the most realistic value of learning satisfaction, as well as to be permanent in order to compare the results and make adjustments to the management system and to improve the results. It is important for managers to remember that the purpose of evaluating student satisfaction with university studies is not to produce end results, but to further improve their learning environment and identify weaknesses in management.

According to the results of the survey, the average score for each individual question by individual criteria (groups of questions) is calculated, as well as the average score of students' overall satisfaction with studying at the university.

The results are interpreted as follows: 4,3–5 very well; 3.7–4.4 good, 3.1–3.6 satisfactory; 1.0–3.0 is unsatisfactory.

Hence, we can conclude that the maximum permissible assessment of student satisfaction at university should be 3.6. For the healthy functioning of the management mechanism to ensure the competitiveness of the university this value should be at least 3.1 and go to 5.

## **V. Conclusions**

1. The university is the subject of market relations, but its activities have specific characteristics. A competitive university is one that is able to hold and hold steady positions in certain segments of the world market of educational services and intellectual products due to the effective realization of scientific and pedagogical potential, the developed innovative system and the sufficiency of financial resources that provide high quality education and training.

2. Universities are required to develop national strategies in order to be competitive. It is proposed to use the combination of both 'breadth'



and 'deep' strategies as the most appropriate in the work in the current conditions of globalization.

3. On the basis of research of scientific sources, it is established that in modern conditions the competitiveness of universities is evaluated by the rating system.

4. It is proved that the managerial mechanism of ensuring the competitiveness of the university has many components (tools), namely: methods, methods and styles of influence of the management system on the managed.

5. It is analyzed that the state spent \$ 16 billion on the activities of universities in Ukraine in 2018. The contingent of students and their distribution by regions and forms of study, as well as the cost of one year of study are reflected.

6. Satisfaction with university studies is found to be a social and psychological tool for managing university competitiveness. For this purpose, a questionnaire was developed for the students survey, and the processing of its results gives an opportunity to determine the level of satisfaction with the students' studies at the university.

7. It is proved that the student movement is a reaction to the implementation of internal university management and determines to a certain extent the competitiveness of the university. The dynamics of the movement of students of Ukraine and the USA is analyzed. The financial losses of universities and the state from this process in Ukraine are calculated and data on the USA are given.

8. It is proved that the competitiveness of universities is determined by a combination of external and internal factors. A list of both is specified. It is proved that university management cannot influence external factors and, in fact, they set the framework of the university activity, since internal management is an indicator of realization of its quality and can change under the influence of managerial decisions of university management.

9. A methodological approach to enhancing the competitiveness of universities is proposed, which involves comparing student turnover rates and satisfaction with their studies at the university and making appropriate management decisions that will facilitate the implementation of a competitive strategy – managerial differentiation.

1. Бекетов Н. В. Понятие конкурентоспособности и его эволюция. *Маркетинг в России и за рубежом*. 2007. № 6. С. 83–86.
2. The Global Competitiveness Report 2014–2015 URL: [http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF\\_GlobalCompetitivenessReport\\_2014-15.pdf](http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GlobalCompetitivenessReport_2014-15.pdf) (дата звернення: 01.09.2020).
3. Портер Майкл Е. Стратегія конкуренції. К. : Основи, 1998. 390 с.
4. Сазик В. І. Ключові фактори становлення конкурентоспроможних університетів. *Економіка України*. 2013. № 5 (618). С. 79–85.
5. Салми Дж. Создание университетов мирового класса / пер. с англ. М. : Издательство «Весь Мир», 2009. 132 с.
6. Altbach P. G. The costs and benefits of world-class universities. *Academe*. 2004. Vol. 90. № 1. P. 20–23.
7. Teich A. H. Research Competitiveness and National Science Policy. *Strategies for Competitiveness in Academic Research* / Hauger J.S. & McEnaney C. eds. Washington, DC : American Association for the Advancement of Science, 2000.
8. Marginson S. Emerging countries need world-class universities. *University World News*. № 214. 2012. URL: <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20120320114704953&/query = marginson>.
9. QS World University Rankings: Methodology. URL: <https://www.topuniversities.com/subject-rankings/methodology> (accessed: 22.08.2020).
10. Попович Л. О. Аналіз сучасного стану фінансування закладів вищої освіти в Україні. *Вісник ОНУ імені І.І. Мечникова*. 2018. Вип. 2 (67). Т. 23. С. 37–41.
11. URL: <https://www.mof.gov.ua/uk/the-reform-of-education> (дата звернення: 01.09.2020).
12. Освіта 2015 : ілюстрований збірник від CEDOS. URL: <https://www.cedos.org.ua/uk/articles/zvit-osvita-2015> (дата звернення: 01.09.2020).
13. Як американська освіта економить мільярди доларів завдяки Edtech та чи потрібні нам такі ж складні технологічні рішення? URL: <https://ain.ua/2018/06/13/edtech-v-ssha> (дата звернення: 01.09.2020).
14. Портер М. Е. Стратегія конкуренції. Методика аналізу галузей і діяльності конкурентів / пер. з англ. А. Олійник, Р. Скільський. К. : Основи, 1998. 390 с.
15. Безтелесна Л. І., Василів В. Б. Інтернет-маркетинг як ресурс формування іміджевої політики і конкурентоспроможності університету. *Вісник Національного університету водного господарства та природокористування. Сер. Економічні науки*. 2016. Вип. 3(75). С. 17–29.

## REFERENCES:

1. Beketov N. V. Ponyatie konkurentosposobnosti i ego evolyutsiya. *Marketing v Rossii i za rubezom*. 2007. № 6. S. 83–86.
2. The Global Competitiveness Report 2014–2015 URL: [http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF\\_GlobalCompetitivenessReport\\_2014-15.pdf](http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GlobalCompetitivenessReport_2014-15.pdf) (data zvernennia: 01.09.2020).
3. Porter Maikl E. Stratehiia konkurentsii. K. : Osnovy, 1998. 390 s.
4. Satsyk V. I. Kliuchovi faktory stanovlennia konkurentospromozhnykh univrsytetiv. *Ekonomika Ukrainy*. 2013. № 5 (618). С. 79–85.
5. Salmu Dzh. Sozdanye unyversytetov myrovoho klassa / per. s anhl. M. : Yzdatelstvo «Ves Myr», 2009. 132 s.
6. Altbach P. G. The costs and benefits of world-class universities. *Academe*. 2004. Vol. 90. № 1. P. 20–23.
7. Teich A. H. Research Competitiveness and National Science Policy. *Strategies for Competitiveness in Academic Research* / Hauger J.S. & McEnaney C. eds. Washington, DC : American Association for the Advancement of Science, 2000.
8. Marginson S. Emerging countries



need world-class universities. *University World News*. № 214. 2012. URL: <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20120320114704953&/query=marginson>. **9.** QS World University Rankings: Methodology. URL: <https://www.topuniversities.com/subject-rankings/methodology> (accessed: 22.08.2020). **10.** Popovych L. O. Analiz suchasnoho stanu finansuvannya zakladiv vyshchoi osvity v Ukraini. *Visnyk ONU imeni I.I. Mechnykova*. 2018. Vyp. 2 (67). T. 23. S. 37–41. **11.** URL: <https://www.mof.gov.ua/uk/the-reform-of-education> (data zvernennia: 01.09.2020). **12.** Osvita 2015 : iliustrovanyi zbirnyk vid CEDOS. URL: <https://www.cedos.org.ua/uk/articles/zvit-osvita-2015> (data zvernennia: 01.09.2020). **13.** Yak amerykanska osvita ekonomyt miliardy dolariv zavdiaky Edtech ta chy potribni nam taki zh skladni tekhnolohichni rishennia? URL: <https://ain.ua/2018/06/13/edtech-v-ssha> (data zvernennia: 01.09.2020). **14.** Porter M. E. Stratehii konkurentsii. *Metodyka analizu haluzei i diialnosti konkurentiv / per. z anhli. A. Oliinyk, R. Skil'skyi. K. : Osnovy*, 1998. 390 s. **15.** Beztelesna L. I., Vasylyv V. B. Internet-marketynh yak resurs formuvannya imidzhevoi polityky i konkurentospromozhnosti universytetu. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho universytetu vodnoho hospodarstva ta pryrodokorystuvannia. Ser. Ekonomichni nauky*. 2016. Vyp. 3(75). S. 17–29.

---

**Безтелесна Л. І.** <sup>[1: OCID ID: 0000-0002-0262-9334]</sup>,

д.е.н., професор

<sup>1</sup>Національний університет водного господарства та природокористування, м. Рівне

## **УПРАВЛІНСЬКИЙ МЕХАНІЗМ ПІДВИЩЕННЯ КОНКУРЕНТОСПРОМОЖНОСТІ УНІВЕРСИТЕТІВ**

Доведено, що на сучасному етапі економічного розвитку суспільства конкуренція як рушійна сила змушує суб'єктів, що функціонують, змагатися між собою та вибудовувати стратегії підвищення конкурентоспроможності. Визнано, що університети є суб'єктами ринкових відносин і вимушені також будувати власні стратегії підвищення конкурентоспроможності.

У роботі, на основі аналізу наукових праць, визначено фактори здобуття університетами конкурентоспроможності. Відображено світові моделі побудови національних стратегій здобуття конкурентоспроможності університетами. Рекомендовано для університетів з країн, що розвиваються, для підвищення конкурентоспроможності одночасно займатися передовими науковими дослідженнями і постійно вдосконалювати якість освітніх послуг.

Доведено, що вітчизняні університети у своїй діяльності наразі стикаються з проблемою не лише скорочення підтримуючої ролі держави, але й налагодження чітких комунікацій зі студентами, що навчаються, та ведення дослідницької діяльності. Проаналізовані витрати держави на діяльність університетів в Україні. Відображено

контингент студентів, їх розподіл за регіонами і формами навчання, вартість одного року навчання та їх рух.

Реалізація стратегії конкурентоспроможного університету вимагає розробки механізму, який базується на використанні цілої низки інструментів. Доведено, що в сучасних умовах пріоритет у механізмі управління конкурентоспроможністю університетом, має належати соціально-психологічним методам. Визначено, що задоволеність студентів навчанням в ЗВО є соціально-психологічним інструментом управління конкурентоспроможністю університету. З цією метою в роботі розроблено анкету опитування студентів, що передбачає оцінювання загального рівня задоволеності навчанням в університеті, знання цілей і стратегії розвитку університету, майбутніх намірів студентів і ще низки напрямків, таких як комунікація, інформація та зацікавленість; управління, співпраця та розвиток.

Доведено, що рух студентів є реакцією на реалізацію внутрішньоуніверситетського менеджменту. Проаналізовано динаміку руху студентів України і США. Розраховано фінансові втрати університетів і держави від цього процесу в Україні та наведено дані по США. Запропоновано методичний підхід до підвищення конкурентоспроможності університетів, який передбачає співставлення коефіцієнтів плинності студентів і задоволеності їх навчанням в університеті, прийняття відповідних управлінських рішень, які сприятимуть реалізації конкурентної стратегії – управлінської диференціації.

**Ключові слова:** конкурентоспроможність; університет; студенти; стратегія; соціально-психологічні методи; плинність; задоволеність; управлінський механізм; фінансові втрати; диференціація.

---

Безтелесная Л. И. [1; OCID ID: 0000-0002-0262-9334],  
д.э.н., профессор

## УПРАВЛЕНЧЕСКИЙ МЕХАНИЗМ ПОВЫШЕНИЯ КОНКУРЕНТОСПОСОБНОСТИ УНИВЕРСИТЕТОВ

В работе изложена суть и факторы обеспечения конкурентоспособности университетов. Отражены государственные расходы на деятельность университетов, а также контингент студентов, их распределение по регионам и формам обучения, стоимость одного года обучения.

Доказано, что в современных условиях приоритет в механизме управления конкурентоспособностью университета должен принадлежать социально-психологическим методам, а их успешная реализация имеет иллюстрироваться удовлетворенностью студентов обучением. Разработана анкета опроса студентов, которая



предусматривает оценивание общего уровня удовлетворенности обучения в университете.

Доказано, что движение студентов является реакцией на реализацию внутриуниверситетского менеджмента. Проанализирована динамика движения студентов Украины и США, рассчитаны финансовые потери университетов и государства от этого процесса. Предложен методический подход к повышению конкурентоспособности университетов, который предусматривает сопоставление коэффициентов текучести студентов и их удовлетворенности, принятия соответствующих управленческих решений, которые будут способствовать реализации конкурентной стратегии – управленческой дифференциации.

**Ключевые слова:** конкурентоспособность; университет; студенты; стратегия; социально-психологические методы; текучесть; удовлетворенность; управленческий механизм; финансовые потери; дифференциация.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 10.08.2020 р.