

DOI: 10.52363/passa-2024.1-20

UDC: 351:37

*Kovtun I. - PhD in Public Administration, Associate Professor, Associate Professor of the Department of Public Administration and Administration, Leonid Yuzkov Khmelnytskyi University of Management and Law
ORCID: 0000-0001-8530-8642*

THEORETICAL ANALYSIS OF THE PROBLEM OF SOCIAL RISKS IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT OF AN INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The article analyzes the problems of social risks of administrative management of a higher education institution. It was determined that the integration of the state into the global system of international relations, which is accompanied by the active development of digital technologies, excessive replication of information flows, and modern world trends led to the search for effective forms of adaptation of universities to changes in modern conditions.

Keywords: *social risks, higher education, administrative management, education, education management.*

Formulation of the problem. For almost three decades, the higher education system of Ukraine has been significantly modified. Despite the fact that this process may appear quite chaotic to outside observers, a general trend can still be identified in it. It manifests itself in the purposeful pragmatization of higher education, and the issue of social risks in the administrative management of higher education institutions requires a deeper study and the provision of adequate recommendations.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The issue of social risks in the administrative management of institutions of higher education and their division into

levels has not been sufficiently studied by modern researchers, and requires an in-depth analysis with the results in the form of recommendations.

Presenting main material. The problems of the significance of higher education for the life of society, its mission and key tasks over the centuries have been and remain the subject of many scientific discussions. This is due to the fact that institutions of higher education are "the heart and brain of an innopolis, its city-forming element", the most important components of social well-being, which have absorbed the accumulated knowledge and human values in the field of science and education, which do not exist separately from the social system. In the conditions of globalization, the acquisition and transmission of new knowledge become the same "important element as the production and distribution of energy resources in the industrial economy of the old system." The university, which represents today's most widespread type of higher education institution, is the custodian of the scale of values, public and state foundations, but at the same time easily accepts innovations that allow creating a single cultural field, on the basis of which a strong state organism is formed.

The integration of the state into the global system of international relations, which is accompanied by the active development of digital technologies, excessive replication of information flows, modern world trends have caused the search for effective forms of adaptation of universities to changes in modern conditions and the interaction of three development subjects: science, business and the state.

A model of a higher education institution integrating scientific ideas, projects and knowledge into business was developed, which provides this process with material and financial resources. The role of the state consists in the formation of the regulatory and legal framework. The theory of the "triple spiral" found its continuation in the development of three concepts: "university 3.0", "university 4.0", "university 5.0". According to these concepts, the paradigms of the traditional model of the university, its mission, and management models are being transformed in society. In this context, it can be argued that the traditional functions of higher education institutions (educational, research, and educational, which Karl Jaspers noted back in 1949 in his book "The Idea

of a University") are qualitatively changing and diversifying, gradually expanding by enriching them with new characteristics and mechanisms, or relegating to secondary plan. This leads to the appearance of fundamentally new functions as obvious drivers of the differentiation process. [2]

So, for example, universities implement a new function aimed at promoting social development, in other words - "service to the community".

The emerging social function of higher education institutions, understood in a broad sense, in addition to the development of the socio-economic state of society, has many sub-functions:

- satisfaction of vital social needs of the population of the territory;
- solving the most acute social problems;
- strengthening the relationship between higher education and the labor market;
- expanding the availability of higher education for socially vulnerable sections of the population;
- support of mass indicators of higher education;
- promoting entrepreneurship to create jobs and social progress.

Being involved in econocentric changes, institutions of higher education are transformed from classical to non-classical, which are complex entities that influence the development of the territory in which they are located. Thus, traditional universities are integrated and appear as entrepreneurial universities, the main priority of which is "making money" and close cooperation with the business industry. Moreover, the identification of a university with a business organization takes place in the form of connections within the organization, management methods, functions, but with the types of organization specified in the normative legal acts of Russian legislation.

As a result of the collaboration of three typical players - "university - state - business", whose union is often defined by the concepts of "triangle of coordination", "third role" ("third mission") or "triple spiral" ("Triple Helix Model"), a change occurs mission of the university: it becomes entrepreneurial both in the field of providing educational services and in the field of the management system, i.e. - corporatized.

Higher education institutions begin to "demonstrate entrepreneurial behavior as an organization, and members of the university - teachers, students, employees - must be entrepreneurs, and the interaction between the university and the environment leads to a combination of the structure of the university and the region" and "correspond to the entrepreneurial model". The main message of the new concept of the university is "University of excellence": the university is no longer a place of concentration and reproduction of national culture. In other words, "HEIs are turning into client-oriented organizations, and teachers are turning into regular employees, which fundamentally changes the organizational culture and incentives." [3]

There are opinions regarding two areas of activity of entrepreneurial universities, which are taken into account:

1. Training of specialists-professionals who in the future will be able to open their own business, that is, to be entrepreneurs;
2. Informational and advisory and resource support for entrepreneurship.

In addition to the reinterpretation of students into customers, the selected areas of corporatization of universities include the external environment in the potential market for the sale of their goods - educational services, projects, and developments. At the same time, the integration of well-known constituent components of the educational process into business content (a curriculum is a business plan, a scientific journal is a business project) inevitably leads to the destruction of the educational process.

The general idea of the transformation of universities into an entrepreneurial organization belongs to the American scientist Burton R. According to the concept of an entrepreneurial university developed by him, the key feature of which is powerful commercial activity aimed at ensuring the inflow of various development resources, but at the same time does not change traditional academic values, has the following significant features: reinforced guide core; expanded periphery of development; diversified funding base; stimulated academic stronghold; integrated entrepreneurial culture.

The specified five general features inherent in an entrepreneurial university imply

the adjustment of management structures and the entire activity of the institution of higher education with the aim of institutionalizing university management.

Undoubtedly, the idea of an entrepreneurial university is not shared by all researchers. Some of them consider the university to be "a unique educational community that has historically formed traditions, a special corporate culture that appears as a driving force for the development of the entrepreneurial spirit of the university." Entrepreneurial universities have been compared to "hard-nosed card players or exiled royals who always run out of money to meet their ever-increasing needs."

Researchers often distinguish two types of entrepreneurial university:

- entrepreneurial as a result, characterized by the creation of favorable conditions for the development of new innovative projects by teachers and graduates;
- entrepreneurial in the type of action of the management team, based on the creation of a scientific center that produces new scientific and technical products to attract financial investments and increase independence from the state.

We consider it possible and necessary, in addition to them, to distinguish a new type of entrepreneurial university based on the method of management organization. It is "considered a special 'bureaucratic' type of corporation in which:

- firstly, the manager in the role of an administrator has the skills of effective management and is the main figure of influence, more significant than scientists, holding in his hands the regulation of financial processes, human resources, determination of priority directions of the university's development;
- secondly, such a higher education institution has "an extensive system of administrative management, an official hierarchy that forms and spreads a bureaucratic corporate culture, and professors, teachers, scientists become the same bureaucratic officials as deans and presidents (rectors)";
- thirdly, in such a university, "students and professors occupied the bottom of the pyramid, and "academic management" undertook the reproduction of epistemological and technological efficiency, which is evaluated in PR indicators and marketing ratings, which allow the university to enter the global market of innovative educational services

and earn money";

- fourthly, the internal and external processes of such a university are formalized, the factor of documentation acquires decisive importance, which is especially strengthened in the context of digitalization processes.

The formation of this type of higher education institution, on the one hand, reflects the desire to be effective in a situation where the efficiency of participating in commercial activities, selling one's product - higher education for consumers is crucial for the university's survival, which, in turn, requires the streamlining of important decisions (especially in strategic matters). In addition, the result of higher education interaction with traditional corporate structures is "stimulation of convergent processes between them", i.e. higher educational institutions are becoming more and more "corporately structured", adopting the methods of economic corporations. [4]

Thus, today, the strengthening of the business orientation of the university brings the practice of their work closer to business corporations, which the institution of higher education no longer "serves, but quite successfully imitates them." The concept of "corporation" can be interpreted in several meanings: in the broad sense of the word, it is a synonym of a legal entity, in a narrow sense, it is a category used to designate economic companies. The identification of a university with a corporation is not a metaphor, but, on the contrary, implies their identity in many ways.

One of the conditions for the transformation of a traditional university into an entrepreneurial one is the "structural connection" of the university and the region. Considering the fact that "globalization breeds regionalization" of higher education, the priority direction of state policy today is the development of regional universities as regional centers of innovation, which are often defined purely metaphorically as: the "face" of the region; "an active player in the socio-economic development of the region"; "generator, driver and moderator of the development of the region"; "a resource that allows to accumulate and realize the intellectual, scientific and cultural potential of the

region"; "actor of regional development"; "a powerful engine of regional cultural development, a center of scientific research and progress"; "a natural incubator of new regional enterprises".

In order to achieve the goals set for regional universities that are transforming into specific corporations, it is necessary to find an adequate set of tools. This task is usually solved by strengthening and developing the administrative management system.

This system is built on the basis of modern administrative forms of management, aimed at rationalizing management processes for the construction of the optimal organizational structure of higher education institutions, as well as the creation of an effective model of intra-organizational relations. Such a system of administrative management, which is characterized by a high orientation to economic efficiency and at the same time a low orientation to personality, contributes to increasing the synergistic effect of the management system, identifying unused resources of the organization.[1]

Thus, the administrative management system, the university management system is considered as a system based on a hierarchically structured bureaucratic apparatus that subordinates its activities to formal rules and widely uses coercive influence on employees. Considering the modern model of administrative management of the university, we will analyze its main principles:

1. The presence of a hierarchically constructed management (administrative) apparatus. The university, as a subject of administrative law, has an established organizational structure in the form of a multi-level system of interdependence and mutual relations between actors of management relations, which is based on their subordination, interdependence and inequality of participants in solving university issues.

2. Regulation of internal processes. University regulations (regulations, statutes, instructions, orders, rules, recommendations, etc.) are an integral element of administrative management. They establish general internal rules that allow the leveling of interests between different levels of management and components of the organizational

structure.

3. Formalization and standardization of internal university processes. In the management system of a modern university, formalization and standardization practices aimed at producing some stable "supporting structure", standards and forms that are set according to certain requirements have been widely used.

4. Use of measures of administrative responsibility focused on coercion. Since the basis of administrative management is the subordination of lower levels to higher ones, and not the organization of fruitful cooperation, it is quite logical that the tool of such management becomes the fear of losing additional good, and in no case is everyone's interest in achieving general success.

5. Development and support of corporate culture. The importance and necessity of corporate culture in a university is determined by a number of reasons: firstly, it is a kind of marketing tool, in other words, an advantage that can ensure the promotion of educational products of the university, working on the image of the organization, secondly, it is social and psychological, which unites the team with a factor that carries a single idea.

6. Managerial competence of heads of higher education institutions. Since in modern market conditions, the university is an organization in which people of different ages, different orientations with different levels of requests and requirements work, and in which the maximum centralization of power prevails, it is important that responsible decisions are made by a manager who possesses professionalism, as a certain "measure of possessing modern means solution of professional tasks, productive ways of its implementation".

Conclusions. Therefore, society does not have any guarantees, it is not insured against undesirable consequences, on the contrary, it becomes a generator of risks that determine the degradation of the human environment. Nevertheless, the risk arises as a result of the uncertainties of social life, as a rule, it is associated with threats and dangers

that cannot be "localized and limited to specific population groups", because they are already global in nature, and which arise against the background of modernization processes in social life. Risk is causally linked to progress, it is an integral part of it, a "by-product that is produced in such abundance that it is desirable to prevent it" in order to prevent future threats. In turn, the initiators of modernization themselves sooner or later face the dangers that arose as a result of their own actions, which "they created and from which they benefited."

References:

1. Adaptivne upravlinnia: mizhhaluzevi zviazky, naukovo-prykladnyi aspekt: Kol. Monohrafiia / H.V. Yelnykova, T.A. Borova, Z.V. Riabova ta in./ Za zah. i nauk. red. H.V. Yelnykovoii. Kh.: Machulin, 2017. 440 s.
2. Antonowicz D., Jongbloed B. Jaki ustrój uniwersytetu? Reforma szkolnictwa wyższego w Holandii, Portugalii i Austrii: wnioski dla Polski. Sprawne Państwo Program EY. Warszawa 2015. 119 s.
3. Sokolova I.V. Upravlinnia vyshchoiu osvitoiu u zarubizhnykh krainakh. Neperervna profesiina osvita: teoriia i praktyka: naukovometodychnyi zhurnal. 2014. S. 30–38Gnezda N. Art-Therapy in Educational Settings: A Confluence of Practices. Arts&Teaching Journal, 2015. Vol. 1, Iss. 1. PP. 92–102.
4. Vasylchenko L.V. Upravlinska kultura i kompetentnist kerivnyka. Kh.: Vyd. hrupa «Osnova», 2007. 176 s.