

MYKOLA MYKHAILICHENKO
National University of Life and Environmental
Sciences of Ukraine
Ukraine, Kyiv
mnv_2008@ukr.net

Mykhailichenko, M. (2018). Morphological and Functional Contexts of Higher Education Management Democratization. *Intercultural Communication*, ISSN 2451-0998, vol. 1(4)2018, pp. 147–156.

Morphological and Functional Contexts of Higher Education Management Democratization

ABSTRACT

The necessity of deep democratization of state influence on the system of social education has been analyzed. The reasons for contradictions between the development needs of the new educational system and the existing administrative practice have been revealed. The paper indicates the need for state structural and functional compliance, the education system and its partners on the part of civil society and the market.

Purpose: Our task is to identify the role of agents of the external and internal educational environment, which are participants in the decentralization of state influence on the education system. The author focuses on the peculiarities of students as the main client, payer and consumer of education services. Organizational interaction is fully executed only if there is a constant feedback in the management of the education system, which can be provided by civil society and its government bodies involved in the management of the education system.

Methods: To characterize the main provisions we take into account the interdisciplinary approach and the general scientific principles of objectivity and systematicity as well as logical-semantic, systemic and prognostic approaches in studying and generalizing the problem.

Results. The study reveals contradictions between the needs for developing a new education system and existing administrative practices. Democratization is seen as a mechanism to weaken the state's influence on the development of university autonomy.

Keywords: *power, management, model, civil society, business, organizational interaction, public-private partnership, morphology, functionality.*

Introduction

These days, the most popular topic in the modernization of higher education is the democratization of a higher educational institution (HEI) administration, that is, the reduction of administrative pressure on the educational sector on the part of the state. HEI strives for autonomy and this displays the immanent response of social education system to the pressure of external factors on it. Thus, the social system of global education seeks to escape from the control of national states or their associations, for example, the OSCE.

The sources of this kind of contradiction are: 1) globalization of the planetary world, which changes the volume of social systems towards the development of global education; 2) informatization, which leads to further fundamentalization of already existing knowledge and generation of global knowledge; 3) the state refusal to support universities as a cultural source of generation and reproduction of the phenomenon of statehood; 4) World Trade Organization (WTO) decisions that education is a service and should be paid for by those who seeks to obtain it, turns universities into commercial structures that directly depend on the modern market conjecture; 5) the all-round commercialization of education, which puts the relationship “man – education system” in completely different conditions than it was before that time. Thus, in practice this opposition is objectively transformed into an independent social problem.

In other words, the content of a new social problem of the educational process management on the part of the state in the horizon of planetary development is due to the conditions that transform its content into a social problem by its definitions, characteristics, structure and movement, if to quote Hegel. The problem appears to be something that is conditioned on its own. In practice it means that conditions simultaneously develop the behavior of the management system of higher education.

The transformation of the content of external conditions of educational process into a social problem leads to modification or enrichment of the system’s

functions not only of state, but, more broadly, social management. Herewith this process has two types of manifestation. The first type is a modification of those which already exist, and the second is the appearance of fundamentally new types of organizational activity. At the same time, it is worth emphasizing that conditions are the means of solving social problems of the educational management system.

The novelty of solving this problem in the sphere of social management of the educational system is that we deal with two objective circumstances, namely: 1) the transition of the planetary community from the technocratic to the informational civilization, which is accompanied by the generating a fundamentally different educational system which does not grow from the previous period; 2) the expansion of broader democratization in the sphere of public administration and even some loss of their influence on the educational systems by national states, which is accompanied by a significant reduction in its funding in terms of research activities and in the horizon of the state order for the training of personnel or in general production and the reproduction of the labor.

Purpose. In view of the above said, the question arises as to how the planetary community can influence the restructuring of the organizational sphere and the development of a global educational management system. We believe that it is possible to manage these processes only through such a phenomenon in state administration as democracy and in procedural meaning – democratization of state administration for the system of education.

Democratization of state influence on education system cannot be carried out spontaneously, like any relatively independent organizational process, and therefore it requires step-by-step practical realization and development of appropriate implementation mechanisms. In this case we see the decentralization of power in the sphere of education being an executive mechanism of the democratization process. Today theorists of education management and practical pedagogues offer a model of public-private partnership (management) to be a general scheme of realizing the process of decentralization of state power in the sphere of education.

Research methods. To characterize the main provisions, we take into account the interdisciplinary approach and the general scientific principles

of objectivity and systematic, as well as we use logical-semantic, system and prognostic approaches in studying and generalizing the problem.

The essence and relevance of the problem of decentralization of state power

Therefore, researchers are constantly monitoring the problem of decentralization of the state power. All of them have the same understanding that the national state bases on a strictly multileveled system, which has the following structural elements: a) the mechanism of state administration; b) the apparatus of state; c) state administration body; d) the institute of state administration; e) the principles of organization and operation of the state administration apparatus (Hromadski orhanizatsii..., 2011).

It means that the current education system should build its own structure which is adequate to the state one. Researchers and practitioners see the way out in the development of a system of so-called public-private partnership (management). Otherwise, the organizational interaction cannot be ensured between state and education system.

In order to “synchronize” these organizational structures, it is necessary to use not only and not just geographic/territorial criteria of establishing this organizational interaction system, but pay more attention to the functional structure of state influence on education system into which the higher education system should be included. Let us briefly comment on this thesis, since many researchers do not consider the structure of this function in their publications, and methods of organizational interaction of state officers and managers of education differ significantly on each level.

Generally, we agree with this constructive and practically accessible idea of creating a model of public-private partnership (management), and draw attention to the fact that there are three different levels of the organizational interaction between state and education system: 1) state educational policy; 2) state regulation of the sphere of education; 3) state management of scientific and educational work in the university.

Let’s clarify each term, mentioned above, since each of these carries such a different content that it will be necessary to create specific bodies and

original technologies in the field of education. In order to do it let us turn to the article by V. Bekh “State educational policy, regulation and management of the education as a subject of scientific analysis” in which these terms are distinguished (Bekh, 2014).

It is necessary to pay special attention to this point, since each of these levels of organizational and political influence of state on education system requires specific forms of organizational interaction of social partners, unique algorithms and original tools for making managerial decisions in the field of education. It turns out that:

- 1) state educational policy is a purposeful participation in the management of political processes;
- 2) state regulation exists in the form of specific measures determining the conditions for entry and exit: obtaining licenses for educational activities, accreditation of specialties, taxes, permits, state order for specialists training and other specific regulators;
- 3) public administration of education is the closest to the public depending on state administration, state management system, decentralization, autonomization of educational institutions, demonopolization and competition of educational services, orientation to creative and innovative development of education, scientific, analytical and prognostic support which is impossible without powerful information and analytical support for management decisions, monitoring educational needs, offers training, education of high quality, independent assessment of knowledge, integrity, lifelong learning.

Organizational interaction in the regime of social partnership is the content of “agent-agent” relations in management. In this case, the subject and the management object change places and roles for some period which means that the subject of management becomes an object and vice versa. It is clear that if it matters, it has its own carriers of organizational activity and producers of information content of feedback channels.

Therefore, we should agree with the well-known opinion by L. Kondrashova that “modernization of professional training in university education is impossible without updating its structural elements and the management system of the educational process as a whole” (Kondrashova, 2003, p. 41).

The question how to realize it in practice arises naturally. In our opinion the whole complexity here lies in the distribution of functional interactions in the horizon of organizational interaction. There are certain difficulties since university professors teach their students modern concepts of marketing and management but often universities themselves do not use these concepts in their administrative activities.

It means that in functional terms it makes sense to isolate the criterion or determine the extent of participation of social partners in the development, adoption, implementation and correction of management decisions in the field of education. We believe that such a criterion can be the so-called management cycle.

We should point out that the management cycle is in the most general form, a complete sequence of repetitive actions aimed at achieving goals. The management cycle begins with the clarification of the task or problem and ends with the achievement of a certain result. After this the cycle repeats. In social systems this cycle is repeated continuously. The ultimate goal of system management can be achieved by one or more control cycles. Cyclic realization of processes allows establishing and fixing characteristic features, common dependencies and the same features of processes and providing the rational rationalization and foresight on their basis.

It is an obvious fact that the system of higher education is simply obliged to have different active subjects to communicate with government employees in state bodies and local government. This circumstance eventually determines modernization of a control system of a modern university for the purpose of optimization of management by it.

Modern directions of increasing the efficiency of the functioning of the system of higher education

It was quite recently considered that there were three main directions of efficient increasing of functioning of higher education institutions of education system: optimization of organizational activity of state bodies education (factor of the external environment); professional development of the faculty (factor of the internal environment) active development of the student (factor of the internal environment) (Yaremenko, 2003, p. 231).

We consider that it is impossible to be limited to formally proclaimed connection of students to process of decentralization of the government as it is a main customer, the payer and the consumer of services of the educational sphere.

O. Nevmerzhytska has founded that young men and girls are quite capable to take part in creation of system of state and private partnership (management) as in structure of their biological organism the corresponding expertise, knowledge and skills served by organizational consciousness and organizational thinking (Nevmerzhytska, 2009) arise and function.

Besides, during this period in the structure of identity of future university graduates the corresponding mechanisms which serve this process are intensively formed namely: mechanisms of sense arising, goal-setting, self-determination, self-updating and self-realization. Such a personality forms a special type of consciousness, namely – organizational consciousness that makes this person self-sufficient, and systems in which this person is involved – self-organized and capable to self-development under any circumstances. As a result of a certain maturity of organizational consciousness of student's contingent it promotes acquisition of a phase of a homeorhesis by higher education institutions, that is self-expansion with preservation of initial parameters of social system.

The appeal to students is not casual as information stage of development of planetary community conducts to the fact that old forms of relationship of higher education institution and student by the principle “the agent - object” will sink into oblivion, and the arising new – “the agent - agent” insistently demand personal participation of young men and women in self-determination and self-organization in the sphere of higher education. Therefore, we will stop on this moment and consider it in more detail as it will play an essentially new role in management of the sphere of university education in the future.

In the principle of responsible officials of employees of the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine in the order of 15/11/07 No. 1010 which has approved “The provision about students’ government in higher educational institutions” it is written down: “Self-government in a higher educational institution is an independent public work of students on realization

of functions of management to higher educational institutions which is defined by rectorate (administration), by dean's offices (departments) and is carried out by students for and the tasks facing student's collectives" (Pro zatverdzhennia, 2010).

Thereby the technological capability of participation of system of student government in the course of adoption of administrative decisions concerning the organization and adjustment is put by teaching and educational activity that considerably enhances efficiency of this process a steady feedback appears in the control system of higher education institution.

Here we have systemic effects. The main sign of the multiplier effect is that student self-organization and managerial activities of university administration lead to the formation of a system of value-semantic determination of the management of an educational institution (Bekh, Semenenko, 2009). This is a significant increase in the self-deployment of attributive properties of social education system, as it acquires two main ones, namely, the integrity and self-regulation qualities inherent in the so-called simple social organisms (Bekh 2014).

Conclusions

Thus, the problem of creating relations between the university and the state lies in several planes. As the practice of many countries shows, the strengthening of the responsibility of higher education institutions for the results of their activities, the expansion and deepening of university autonomy is a necessary condition for improving the quality of higher education.

In terms of morphology, the system of public private partnership (management) to ensure the high quality execution of part of administrative authority delegated by state to higher educational institutions is obliged to form a virtual morphological structure, which should have at least several substructures, namely: marketing for the region's needs; analytical for generalization of marketing information in the horizon of modern world trends in education; legal for the regulatory requirements (requirements) of national, regional and world labor markets in regulatory and legal documents, with a view to submitting them to public authorities and corporate governance of HEIs; initiative or lobbying, which is entrusted with the function of

making proposals for the management of education, support for the period of discussion, adoption and implementation, followed by an assessment of economic efficiency, political expediency and cultural effectiveness.

In the functional relation there is a reason to define obligations of the parties of organizational interaction on the basis of the maintenance of an administrative cycle that allows to spread out an algorithm of adoption of administrative decisions in university on certain stages and to define on what possibly to attract the public and what it should delegate a part of administrative powers from an arsenal of public administration by university.

In the horizon of the choice and activization of agents of organizational interaction of state and higher education system it must be kept in mind not only public servants and administrations, but also students united in student government as main customers, payers and consumers of services of the sphere of professional education. Their participation in management of the university provides constant feedback of service provider of education, market of labor, business and state. To our big regret it should be noted here that business in the countries of Commonwealth of Independent States remains indifferent, that is indifferent in relation to democratization of higher professional education management, so far.

At the same time, it is necessary to pay attention that democratization of the higher education is: firstly, a long process in time, secondly, it should be introduced into higher education institutions activities step by step; thirdly, educational management unlike pedagogical management as it plays a crucial role in the development of a self-regulatory complex of a social body of university has to be the leading channel or a form of democratization of higher education here.

References

- Bekh, V. (2014). Derzhavno-hromadske upravlinnia universytetom: ukrainskyi kontekst. [University Public Administration: Ukrainian context]. *Fenomen universytetu v konteksti „suspilstva znan”*. [University phenomenon in the context of the “knowledge society”]. Kyiv, pp. 228–230. (In Ukrainian).

- Bekh, V., Semenenko, L. (2009). *Samorehuliatsiia sotsialnoho orhanizmu navchalnoho zakladu. [Self-regulation of the social organism of the educational institution]*. Kyiv: National Pedagogical Dragomanov University, 330 p. (In Ukrainian).
- Bekh, V. (2014). Derzhavna osvितnitsia polityka, rehuliuвання y upravlinnia osvitan'skoiu haluzziu yak predmet naukovoho analizu. [State educational policy, administration and regulation of education sector as the subject of scientific analysis]. *Proceedings of the National Aviation University: Philosophy. Culturology*. 2014. No. 1, pp. 5–7. (In Ukrainian).
- Hromadski orhanizatsii u dyskursi demokratyzatsii suspilstva. [Public organizations in the discourse of democratization of society]*. (2011). Ed. V.P. Bekh. Kyiv: National Pedagogical Dragomanov University, 680 p. (In Ukrainian).
- Kondrashova, L. (2003). Problemy vyshchoi shkoly u svitli natsionalnoi doktryny rozvytku osvity Ukrainy. [Problems of higher education in the light of the national doctrine of the development of education in Ukraine]. *Vyshcha osvita Ukrainy. [Higher education of Ukraine]*. Vol. 1, pp. 39–43 (In Ukrainian).
- Nevmerzhytska, O. (2009). *Studentske samoupravlinnia u konteksti demokratyzatsii vyshchoi osvity Ukrainy. [Student self-governance in the context of democratization of higher education in Ukraine]*. (PhD Thesis). Kyiv, 226 p. (In Ukrainian).
- Pro zatverdzhennia Prymirnogo polozhennia pro studentske samovriaduvannia u vyshchykh navchalnykh zakladakh Ukrainy. [On Approval of Model Regulations on Student Self-Government in Higher Educational Institutions of Ukraine]*. (2010). Publication 15.11.2007. Retrieved (05.12.2017) from: http://osvita.ua/legislation/Vishya_osvita/3141 (In Ukrainian).
- Reforma vyshchoi osvity Ukrainy: realizatsiia profilnogo zakonu v 2014–2016 rr. [Reform of higher education in Ukraine: the implementation of the profile law in 2014-2016]*. Retrieved (05.12.2017) from: <http://parlament.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/HE-shadow-report-final-1.pdf> (In Ukrainian).
- Yaremenko, B. (2003). *Ravnovesie v ekonomicheskoy sisteme perehodnogo tipa: predposylki, mehanizmy, upravlenie. [Equilibrium in an economic system of a transitional type: prerequisites, mechanisms, management]*. Har'kov: NUA, pp. 171–185. (In Russian).

Received: 22.12.2017

Accepted: 12.02.2018