



Volume: 03 Issue: 11 | 2022 ISSN: 2660-454X

<https://cajitmf.centralasianstudies.org>

## University Models in the Context of Globalization

<sup>1</sup> Ganiyev Golib Abdiraxmanovich

Received 16<sup>th</sup> Sep 2022,  
Accepted 19<sup>th</sup> Oct 2022,  
Online 14<sup>th</sup> Nov 2022

<sup>1</sup> Namangan State University, Namangan city,  
teacher, Namangan, Uzbekistan  
golibganiyev558@gmail.com

**Abstract:** The article discusses the shortcomings in the system of remuneration of labor in budgetary institutions (public education system).

**Key words:** description, tariff-free, rates, discharge, sign, salary, employee-employee, certificate, category, description, basic training plan, approximate training plan.

Global processes that determine the directions of development of modern higher education are conditionally divided into first and second level processes. Our connection with global processes of the first order: – globalization, which means the destruction of economic, cultural and other borders between states, increasing the flow of migration in the fields of Economics, employment, education; - internationalization, reflects the strengthening of the international level in the Educational, Scientific, innovative activities of the University; - the formation of an economy of knowledge, indicating the transition from an industrial economy to an economy, where knowledge is the main source.

For example, the internationalization of education is designed to form students in the process of learning the global competence necessary for successful work in a globalizing society.

The lack of such specialists leads to significant losses in the knowledge-based economy [1]. The impact of global changes on the university can be "direct" and "indirect". The direct impact is manifested in an increase in the intensity of international exchange of students and teachers, in the widespread use of modern communication technologies (the Internet).

Indirect effects are a consequence of the formation of the knowledge economy and are implemented in the educational and scientific activities of the university, as well as in the service sector[2,]. The global processes of the first order described above are the cause of second-order changes, which should include:

- massification, i.e. substantially growing demand for higher education;
- pragmatization
- transformation of the goals and values of higher education;

- uncertainty of the place of higher education in the social structure and social relations;
- the changing role of the state, the danger of reducing the share of state responsibility for higher education;
- marketization, i.e. the introduction of market relations in the field of higher education;
- a high degree of inequality among institutions of higher education [3, p 17]

The globalization of higher education has forced experts to talk about the formation of a new university model. According to Russian scientists, the formation of various models of university education is a "historically determined process that has a cyclical character." The content of each cycle is determined, on the one hand, by the real contradictions arising from the inertia of educational systems, on the other hand, by the dynamic development of real life, changes in a specific socio-cultural situation.

As a result, not only the content of education changes, but also the dominant type of university [4,p 155]. The classical university model focuses on improving the educational process. Classical universities train personnel for science, education, industry, and the service sector. This model is more focused on liberal rather than utilitarian principles of the organization of higher education, aimed at the development of personal qualities of students, their spirituality.

In the USA, the criteria of a research university include: a certain amount of grants received by the university, the availability of bachelor's degree programs, entry into the list of leading universities by the level of federal financial support for research and development work [5, 6].

In Russia, the model of the national research university is being implemented, the construction of which is possible primarily on the basis of a classical university [7]. Specialists, summarizing the experience of the first Russian national research universities, propose the following criteria for this national model:

- the volume of research and development at the university;
- the number of candidate and doctoral theses defended at the university;
- the number and breadth of the range of educational programs offered;
- number of full-time students and postgraduates;
- number of researchers and teachers of the highest qualification;
- the university's influence on the higher education system, the development of science and economics in the country;
- international recognition of the university's performance [6, p 27]

In the 1990s.y, a model of a regional university was formed in Russia, whose activities are primarily focused on meeting the needs of the region in the field of science, education, services, and production. The regional university differs from the classical one in that, along with the classical university types of vocational education – humanities and natural sciences - medical, pedagogical, and engineering education is supported. In the context of globalization and the formation of a knowledge-based society, the research university has become regarded as a key institution for the social and economic development of society [5, p 194].

The issue of forming a "global model" of a research university began to be discussed among specialists [8, 9]. This model includes those universities that have begun to pay even more attention to scientific research, have begun to compete for applicants and for leading teachers on a global scale, for attracting financial resources [9, p 6]. Such universities in their activities go beyond national borders and begin to work on a global scale. The ideas of academic capitalism, which presuppose the predominance of market

logic in the functioning of the university, were developed in the model of an entrepreneurial university, which was proposed by Harvard University researchers J. Angell and E. Dangerfield for the designation of an educational institution, the main priority for which is the extraction of money.

There are three main tasks of the entrepreneurial university:

- offer entrepreneurship programs and train people who will organize their business in the future;
- development of entrepreneurial thinking among students of other specialties;
- to work as an Institute of entrepreneurship, to establish business incubators, technoparks, to involve students and graduates in their activities and thus to facilitate their organization of their own companies [10-12].

The main thing in the idea of an entrepreneurial university is to change the model of organization and management of the university: the transition from financing at the expense of the state budget to multi-channel financing based on an independent search for sources of additional funds [13-15]. An entrepreneurial university should be understood as a higher educational institution that systematically makes efforts to overcome limitations in three areas – knowledge generation, teaching and the transformation of knowledge into practice – by initiating new activities, transforming the internal environment and modifying interaction with the external environment [15, p 55]. American universities are considered pioneers of academic entrepreneurship.

The first examples of entrepreneurial educational programs at US universities were found in the 40s and 50s. The surge in the supply of entrepreneurial education in the USA occurred in the 80s– 90s of the XX century [17,18]. A little later, academic entrepreneurship was developed in the UK, the Netherlands, Belgium, Germany, etc. The experience of transition to an entrepreneurial type university of Chalmers University of Technology (Sweden) is indicative. This transition is connected with the academic core (academic heartland) – university employees who demonstrated an entrepreneurial approach by personal example and set the tone in the university's transformations. They were supported by the administrative core – the rector and the administrative director. The activities of the academic core are also supported by the "periphery of development", the interdisciplinary elements of which are focused on specific projects [19]. Halmers University claims to be a "pioneer in the field of founding new companies and applied research [20]." Doing business for many universities is a way of survival in the competitive struggle in the global market of educational services. In a general sense, entrepreneurial activity is understood as the realization of an individual's special abilities, expressed in a rational combination of production factors based on an innovative risk approach [21]. At the same time, the entrepreneurial activity of the university differs from the entrepreneurial activity of a commercial enterprise. The purpose of the company's commercial activity is to maximize profits [22]. While the purpose of the university's entrepreneurial activity is to receive funds that will be further directed to the development of the university itself. Some researchers consider it necessary to distinguish between the concepts of "entrepreneurial activity of a university" and "extra-budgetary activity of a university". Entrepreneurial activity is associated with initiative, risk, and income generation within the legal framework. Extra–budgetary activity is any activity of the university, the source of financing of which is not the funds of the state budget. Thus, entrepreneurial activity is a narrower concept than extra–budgetary activity [16, p 82]. The conditions for building entrepreneurial universities in the UK should include changes in the policy of higher education in 1979, associated with the election of M. Thatcher as head of government.

The policy of her Government was defined by such concepts as "market", "economic efficiency", "privatization", "reduction of the state budget"[23, p 129]. For UK universities, this meant a reduction in government funding, the need to independently search for additional funds. Modern conditions of

functioning of universities, as well as the experience of the first entrepreneurial type universities, allow us to identify the main sources of additional funds attracted by the university:

- increase in private donations, including the creation of endowment trust funds;
- development of new forms of education (online, corporate, contract, etc.);
- development of trade on campus;
- introduction of payment cards and electronic cards on campus;
- development of graduate programs;
- leasing of property on the campus;
- income from intellectual property rights (research results)[24]

The policy of academic capitalism pursued at universities has put them in the dilemma of partially abandoning academic freedom in favor of activities aimed at attracting additional funds necessary to ensure scientific and educational processes. In particular, this is expressed in the need to choose the direction of research that is of interest: for the researcher himself, for business (commercial structures, industrial enterprises) [25, 26]. With the strengthening of market logic in the field of higher education, the concept of "new managerialism" ("new management") began to take root, which means the adoption by public sector structures of those organizational forms and technologies, management practices and values that exist in the field of private entrepreneurship [27-30]. Managerialism characterizes the principles of management adopted in private corporations, but extended to state and public institutions [28, p 38].

The development of the ideas of managerialism in the last decade is associated with the penetration of neoliberal principles into public administration and the public sector. Changes in the university management system are associated with the introduction of a top-down management decision model, as well as with the rooting of the very concept of "university management". The sphere of higher education has undergone changes, for which J. Keller proposed the formulation "the management revolution in the university" ("the management revolution in the academy"). As a result of the "revolution", the university's management is forced to strengthen strategic control over the activities of the university and its divisions [30, p 38].

The adoption of the ideas of new managerialism explains the increased attention to the problem of managing the activities and internal culture of the university. The head of the university is now considered not only as an academic leader, but also as a manager – staff, students, finance, teaching system [29]. The complication of the university structure in the conditions of managerialism is associated with the emergence of professional groups within the university that have their own ideas about the priorities of university life.

The new managerialism is a condition for the emergence of value contradictions between representatives of management and academic staff. For the academic community, the key value is research work, the results of which can be expressed in the form of publications. It is important for representatives of administrative staff to follow procedures and formal instructions that streamline the management of the university [28]. The contradiction of managerialism in the university environment is connected with the dilemma "effective management – academic freedom", which reflects the values of "administrators" in the first case and "academics" in the second. Studies of the activities of universities in the UK have shown that the ongoing changes in the culture and values of higher education, as a rule, are expressed in the emergence of new values and their coexistence next to the old (traditional) values [28, p 49].

The new managerialism affects, on the one hand, the organizational culture of the university (organizational structure, management system, management style), on the other hand, the corporate culture (values, norms of the academic community) and the value foundations of the functioning of universities become the object of attention.

The new managerialism poses several difficult choices for the academic community, related to:

- with the coexistence of old and new types of management structures;
- with a combination of different management styles, for example, "soft" and "hard" forms of management;
- with a change in the nature of relations between managers and "managed";
- with a combination of old and new values of the internal culture of the university

As a development of models of the research and entrepreneurial university, A. O. Grudzinsky proposed a model of a project-oriented university. The concept of a project-oriented university was the result of an analysis and generalization of organizational innovations carried out at Lobachevsky Nizhny Novgorod State University for a decade. The concept is based on the ideas of the entrepreneurial university, as well as the theory of project management. A "project" means some purposeful and time-limited activity. The characteristic of project activity, which is important for understanding the principles of its application in university conditions, is its possible "risky" nature. The "serial" activity of the university for the implementation of traditional educational programs, according to A. O. Grudzinsky, should be supplemented by a project-product approach aimed at fulfilling risky, one-time and "small-scale" orders of the educational and scientific services market [31, 32]. The emergence and development of the virtual university model became possible thanks to modern telecommunications and information technologies. The essence of a virtual university is to provide educational programs and courses online for profit. At the same time, virtual universities do not assume the physical existence of a university campus. The leaders in this field are the USA, Australia, Great Britain and Canada. Virtual universities in these countries provide online educational services beyond national borders [10]. Among the university models in the context of globalization, the corporate university model stands out. It is commonly understood as a developed system of training the personnel of a particular company, which can combine both modules read by the company's specialists and adapted modules of external training providers. In the West, the advantage of corporate training became apparent in the 1980s, when multinational companies began to actively compete for leadership in national markets [33]. Among global companies, corporate universities include McDonald's (Hamburger University), Coca-Cola, Boeing, Walt Disney, Procter & Gamble, General Electric, etc. In Russia, corporate universities began to appear in the 1990s at large companies. Today, they are operated by such companies as Rostelecom, Wimm-Bill-Dann, Severstal, Sukhoi Design Bureau, LUKOIL, etc. The Corporate University is designed to provide corporate training, promote the competitiveness of the company in the current economic situation, initiate and support organizational changes, form a unified management ideology, form a personnel reserve, common corporate values and corporate culture, generate ideas, stimulate the continuous development of the organization [35]. Taking into account the Russian experience, some researchers of higher education believe that at present real prerequisites have been created for the construction of a new type of university, which organically combines the principles of a traditional classical university and the activities of an innovative university with the preservation of cultural transference function and the best educational traditions. The emergence of new models of the university is associated with the expansion of the spheres of activity of higher educational institutions, the need to compete in the global market of educational services, scientific developments and innovations [36]. Modern models of the university are designed to change the nature of relations with society, the population, the business environment, the state, to respond to the challenges of the global world [37].



**List of literature:**

1. Brustein, W. I. The Global Campus: Challenges and Opportunities for Higher Education in North America / W. I. Brustein // *Journal of Studies in International Education*. Fall/Winter. – 2007. – V. 11, № 3/4. – P. 382–391.
2. Rhoads, R. A. Globalization, Social Movements, and the American University: Implications for Research and Practice / R. A. Rhoads, A. Liu // *Higher Education Handbook of Theory and Research / Chapter in John C. Smart (ed.)*. – New York : Springer Netherlands, 2009. – V. 24.
3. Nikolsky, V. Global education: the limits of liberalization / V. Nikolsky // *Higher education in Russia*. - 2004. – No. 8. – pp. 17-25.
4. Zapesotsky, A. S. Education: Philosophy, Cultural studies, Politics / A. S. Zapesotsky. – M. : Nauka, 2003.
5. Naletova, I. V. Modern socio-cultural models of universities / I. V. Naletova, V. N. Okatov // *Socio-humanitarian problems of modernity : mezhvuz. sb. scientific tr.* – Issue 2. - Tambov : Publishing house Pershina R. V., 2009. – pp. 191-203.
6. Chubik, P. S. Research universities in Russia: ways of formation and development / P. S. Chubik, A. I. Chuchalin, Yu. P. Pokholkov, B. L. Agranovich // *University management: practice and analysis*. – 2009. – No. 1. – pp. 22-30.
7. Gurbatov, S. N. Classical University as a base of the National Research University / S. N. Gurbatov, E. V. Chuprunov // *University management: practice and analysis*. – 2009. – No. 1. – pp. 7-16.
8. Skolnikoff, E. B. Research Universities and National Security: Can Traditional Values Survive? / E. B. Skolnikoff // *Science and Technology in a Vulnerable World*. – Supplement to AAAS Science and Technology Policy Yearbook, 2003.
9. Mohrman, K. The Research University in Transition: The Emerging Global Model / K. Mohrman, W. Mab, D. Baker // *Higher Education Policy*. - 2008. – No. 21. – P. 5-27.
10. Naletova, I. V. Higher education research: the concept of metaphundamentalism : monograph / I. V. Naletova. – Tambov : Publishing House of TSU named after G. R. Derzhavin, 2005.
11. Naletova, I. V. Diversification of higher education: a challenge to universities / I. V. Naletova // *Higher education in Russia*. – 2005. – No. 5. – pp. 39-45.
12. Schulte, P. The Entrepreneurial University: a Strategy for Institutional Development / P. Schulte // *Higher Education in Europe*. – 2004. – V. 29, No. 2.
13. Atoyán, V. Universities in modern society / V. Atoyán, N. Kazakova // *Higher education in Russia*. - 2005. – No. 4. – pp. 3-9.
14. Grudzinsky, A. O. University as an entrepreneurial organization / A. O. Grudzinsky // *Sociological research*. - 2003. – No. 4. – pp. 113-121.
15. Konstantinov, G. N. What is an entrepreneurial university / G. N. Konstantinov, S. R. Filonovich // *Questions of education*. - 2007. – No. 1. – pp. 49-62.
16. Shafranov-Kutsev, G. F. University in the regional community: monogr. / G. F. Shafranov-Kutsev. – M. : Higher School, 2003.
17. Klandt, X. Development and prospects of academic education in the field of entrepreneurship in Germany / X. Klandt, K. Volkmann // *Higher education in Europe*. - 2006. – Vol. 31, No. 2.

18. Volkman, Ch. Entrepreneurial Studies in Higher Education. An Ascending Academic discipline in the Twenty-First Century / Ch. Volkman // Higher Education in Europe. – 2004. – V. 29, No. 2.
19. Sorokina, I. Entrepreneurial University (Swedish Experience) / I. Sorokina // Higher education in Russia. - 2002. – No. 3. – pp. 89-92.
20. Website of Halmers University. – URL: <http://www.chalmers.se/en/>
21. Bagiev, G. L. Organization of entrepreneurial activity: studies. manual / G. L. Bagiev, A. N. Asaul ; under the general editorship of Prof. G. L. Bagiev. – St. Petersburg : Publishing House of SPbGUEF, 2001.
22. Kutsev, G. F. Issues of ownership and taxation of state universities in the conditions of reform / G. F. Kutsev // Classical University and regional priorities: imaginary and genuine aporias : materials of All-Russian. the seminar. – Tyumen, 2004. – pp. 3-62.
23. Shpakovskaya, L. Higher Education policy in Europe and Russia / L. Shpakovskaya. – St. Petersburg: Norma, 2007.
24. Lee, J. Key Trends in Higher Education / J. Lee, S. Clery // Academic American. - 2004. – V. 1, No. 1. – P. 21-36.
25. Grudzinsky, A. O. European technology transfer: cooperation without "brain drain" / A. O. Grudzinsky, E. S. Balabanova, O. A. Pekushkina // Sociological research. - 2004. – No. 11. – pp. 123-131.
26. Prokhorov, A.V. The influence of the values of academic capitalism on the functioning of modern universities / A.V. Prokhorov // Bulletin of TSU. Ser. "Humanities". - 2012. – No. 5. – pp. 271-278.
27. Mircea, M. Institutional approaches to entrepreneurship: analysis and experience of Babes-Bolyai University in Cluj-Napoca / M. Mircea // Higher education in Europe. - 2006. – Vol. XXXI, No. 2.
28. Abramov, R. N. Managerialism and the academic profession. Conflict and interaction / R. N. Abramov // Sociological research. - 2011. – No. 7. – pp. 37-47.
29. Dim, R. "New managerialism" and higher education: managing the quality and productivity of work at universities in the UK / R. Dim // Education issues. - 2004. – No. 3. – pp. 44-56.
30. Rhoades, G. Academic Capitalism in the New Economy: Challenges and Choices / G. Rhoades, S. Slaughter // Academic American. – 2004. – V. 1, No. 1. – P. 37-59.
31. Grudzinsky, A. O. The concept of a project-oriented university / A. O. Grudzinsky // University management: practice and analysis. – 2003. – No. 3. – pp. 24-37.
32. Grudzinsky, A. O. Project-oriented University. Professional entrepreneurial organization of the university : monogr. / A. O. Grudzinsky. – N. Novgorod : Publishing House of UNN, 2004.
33. Bekarev, A.M. Corporate University in the lens of sociology / A.M. Bekarev, T. V. Radaev // Bulletin of the Nizhny Novgorod University named after N. I. Lobachevsky. – 2007. – No. 1. – pp. 9-13.
34. Yerofeev, D. S. Development of modern classical universities in Russia in the context of the Bologna process (pedagogical aspect) : autoref. dis. ... Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences: 13.00.01 / Erofeev D. S. – Krasnodar, 2006.
35. Ганиев Г. А. Учет затрат в животноводстве //актуальные вопросы экономики и агробизнеса. – 2020. – с. 44-49.
36. Ганиев Г. А. Учет затрат в животноводстве и особенности калькуляции себестоимости //информационные технологии в образовании и аграрном производстве. – 2020. – с. 30-35.

37. Ганиев Г. А. Новые технологии-как фактор снижения себестоимости продукции //актуальные вопросы экономики и агробизнеса. – 2020. – с. 49-54.
38. Abdiraxmanovich, g. G. (2022). Problems of remuneration in educational institutions. *European multidisciplinary journal of modern science*, 5, 203–205.
39. Ғ.А.Ғаниев. (2022). Таълим муассаларида меҳнатга ҳақ тўлашдаги муаммолар. *Научный журнал инволта*, 1(5), 86-93.
40. Кенжаев И. Э. СОЗДАНИЕ УСЛОВИЙ ДЛЯ ИНОСТРАННЫХ ИНВЕСТИТОРОВ В УЗБЕКИСТАНЕ //ПРИОРИТЕТНЫЕ ВЕКТОРЫ РАЗВИТИЯ ПРОМЫШЛЕННОСТИ И СЕЛЬСКОГО ХОЗЯЙСТВА. – 2019. – С. 157.
41. Кенжаев И. Кичик бизнесга хорижий инвестицияларни жалб қилишнинг норматив-ҳуқуқий асослари //Общество и инновации. – 2021. – Т. 2. – №. 4/S. – С. 329-344.
42. Икром Кенжаев Нормативно-правовая база привлечения иностранных инвестиций в малый бизнес // ОИИ. 2021. №4/S. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/normativno-pravovaya-baza-privlecheniya-inostrannyh-investitsiy-v-malyu-biznes> (дата обращения: 05.04.2022).
43. Kenjaev I. E. Theoretical aspects of attracting foreign investment in the economy of the region //Economics and Innovative Technologies. – 2019. – Т. 2019. – №. 3. – С. 8.
44. Кенжаев, И. Э., Балтабаев, М. Т., & Абдурахманов, Ш. Ш. (2022). Иностранные Инвестиции В Малый Бизнес. *CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF THEORETICAL & APPLIED SCIENCES*, 3(5), 159-164. Retrieved from <https://cajotas.centralasianstudies.org/index.php/CAJOTAS/article/view/508>
45. Кенжаев, И. Э., & Бахрамжанова, Ф. Т. к. (2022). Особенности Развития Рынка Капитала В Узбекистане. *CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF THEORETICAL & APPLIED SCIENCES*, 3(5), 165-168. Retrieved from <https://cajotas.centralasianstudies.org/index.php/CAJOTAS/article/view/509>
46. Ikrom Ergashboevich Kenjaev, & Bahodirjon Tursunbaevich Bayhonov. (2020). Development Of Organizational Mechanisms For Attracting Investment In Small Business. *The American Journal of Management and Economics Innovations*, 2(09), 6–16. <https://doi.org/10.37547/tajmei/Volume02Issue09-02>