

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-277-7-245>

**WAYS TO IMPROVE THE MANAGEMENT  
OF AN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION IN THE CONDITIONS  
OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF MARKET RELATIONS**

**Khakimov D. R.**

*Candidate of Economic Sciences, Associate Professor,  
Associate Professor at the Department  
of World and Regional Economics  
Fergana State University  
Fergana, Uzbekistan*

The development of market relations in the field of education, changes in the mechanisms for financing educational activities, increased competition between educational institutions, further development of the principle of autonomy of their activities – all this significantly affects the structure, organization, management of an educational institution, changes the style of educational activities, the atmosphere characteristic of it.

These processes are most clearly manifested at the level of university education. The article examines the changes taking place in the activities of universities under the influence of the development of market relations in order to determine ways to improve the management of a higher educational institution in such conditions.

Under the market model of university management, when funds come from different sources, the mechanisms for distributing funds are undergoing significant changes. In this case, the departments of the university, as it were, buy the services of the central administration. Heads of departments and even individual teachers and scientists of universities are looking for additional sources of funding. At the same time, it is important that the strategy for developing activities in order to obtain additional sources of funding is consistent with the strategic objectives and goals of the university, and ensuring this compliance is an important task of managing the university based on a market model of resource allocation.

The development of new computer and telecommunication technologies has led to the development of new types of organizational structures, such as university consortiums, teleuniversities, distance universities, and others, which allow traditional universities to significantly expand the range of educational services they provide, and, consequently, obtain additional sources of financial resources.

The central administration, in the case of using market financing mechanisms, often delegates many financial management functions to the management of departments to stimulate their effective work. As a result, as Williams G. notes, “at present, some universities are carrying out something similar to trading operations, when the central government taxes its subordinate outlets in exchange for providing basic services and an easily recognizable corporate image” [4, p. 89–90]. He also notes that at present “higher education institutions are in many respects similar to diversified firms that form a portfolio of orders for products depending on changes in production costs and market conditions for each group of products. We can say that the function of production is complex: some activities complement each other, while others compete with each other. Changes in the volumes and models of funding affect both the balance between academic and ancillary activities, and the structure of academic work” [4, p. 100–101].

The development of market mechanisms for financing the university makes it relevant to understand both the positive and negative results of this process.

The effectiveness of education carried out on a market basis based on modern computer and telecommunication technologies, with a sufficient scale of development of such education, while achieving the effect of economies of scale of educational activities, is more effective than traditional education.

However, on the other hand, the analysis of the market model of university financing leads to the identification of its possible negative consequences. They are related to the fact that market mechanisms of university management can lead to a decrease in the level of fundamentality of university education and scientific research, since, in accordance with market criteria, preference will be given to funding courses and developments of an applied nature. Diversification of sources of funding can also have negative consequences, as public funds go to support the foundations of the activities of educational institutions, and funds from sponsors are focused mainly on funding innovation, which gives these sponsors such a weight in determining the activities of universities that sometimes does not correspond to the amount actually provided. their support.

With the development of a market model for financing and managing a university, such a specific organizational feature of a traditional university as its autonomy undergoes a certain change.

A feature of the traditional university that is closely related to autonomy is collegiality in decision-making. The University exercises its autonomy

through collegial decision-making. At the same time, collegiality reflects the individual freedom of creativity of a university scientist and teacher, his individual professional autonomy.

The development of a market model of university funding is accompanied by a narrowing of collegial democracy. Neave G. notes both this process and what he calls “heterogeneity” (heterogeneity, heterogeneity) in the mechanisms of autonomy exercised by universities [3, p. 195–222]. Increasingly, collegiate decision-making bodies are bypassing university governance. The activities of universities are primarily determined by financial opportunities and limitations.

This is reflected in all activities of the university. More and more, the market, rather than the internal logic of the development of the university, sets the main vectors of its evolution. In order to survive in a competitive environment, the university is changing the principles of staff formation: increasing the number of commercially promising researchers, more actively signing contracts with part-time workers, etc. The scientific and pedagogical value of the work is often overshadowed by the success in saving money. “The academic system of university work is being replaced by a system of corporate owners” [1, p. 331–347].

This model is characterized by property rights to knowledge and the resulting restrictions on the dissemination of knowledge. The laws of the market and competition require the development of secrecy in the field of knowledge dissemination. The type of professor-entrepreneur is becoming more common for universities. The activity of trade unions, which control the conditions of employment, is increasingly relegated to the periphery of university life.

So, in the market model, the university is considered as a structure that produces competitive goods for the market of educational services and scientific developments. In many countries, strengthening links between universities and the business community is seen as the most promising way for universities to develop in the modern world.

This leads to a radical transformation of traditional universities, which were previously isolated from the action of market forces. As Hague D. notes, “traditional British universities are a system protected from the pressure of competition by two types of monopoly: a natural monopoly of the power of the mind and resources such as libraries and laboratories, as well as a man-made, or rather bestowed by the government, monopoly on awarding degrees and titles. Over time, the growth of the knowledge industry will allow organizations outside the universities to break these

monopolies” [2, p. 31–32]. The expansion of the market for educational services and scientific research involves universities in competition.

Improving university management in the context of the development of market relations, that is, on the basis of a market model, involves:

- Ensuring that the central administration complies with the strategy for the development of the activities of the departments in order to obtain additional sources of funding for the strategic objectives and goals of the university;

- Promoting the development of new organizational structures that operate independently in the general system of the university and contribute to the expansion of the range and increase in the volume of production of educational products and services by the university departments;

- Maintaining the level of fundamentality of education and scientific research;

- Development of collegiality as the main way of managing the university;

- Implementation of intellectual property rights in universities by patenting and licensing the results of activities, protection of rights to these results and their implementation in the market;

- Strengthening the role of trade unions in the activities of the university.

### References:

1. Buchbinder H. The market oriented university and the changing role of knowledge. *Higher education – Dordrecht etc.* 1993. Vol. 26. № 3. P. 331–347.

2. Hague D. Beyond Universities. Institute of Economic Affairs. L., 1991.

3. Neave G. On preparing for markets: trends in higher education in Western Europe, 1998–1990. *European Journal of Education.* 1990. 25(2). P. 195–222.

4. Williams G. L. New funding mechanisms in higher education. Milton Keynes : Open University Press, 1992.

5. Тихонов А. и др. Управление современным образованием: социальные и экономические аспекты. М. : Вита – Пресс, 1998. 256 с.

6. Rahmonaliyevich, K. D. (2020). Role Of Innovation In The Economy. *The American Journal of Management and Economics Innovations*, 2(09), 43–47.

7. Rahmonaliyevich, K. D. (2020). Choosing the optimal rule of monetary policy, taking into account changes in the main macroeconomic

indicators. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 10(12), 1351–1356.

8. Raximov, D. (2021, December). Determined criteria for diversification in industrial enterprises. In *International Scientific and Current Research Conferences* (pp. 60–64).

9. Khakimov, D. R., Kurbanov, D., & Khalildinov, A. A. (2022). Formation of New Economic Mechanisms in the Field of Education. *American Journal of Economics and Business Management*, 5(11), 76–81.

10. Хакимов, Д. Р. (2021). Худуд саноатини диверсификация қилиш орқали рақобатбардошлигини ошириш имкониятлари. *Scientific progress*, 2(1), 631–638.

11. Mannapova, M., & Abdullayeva, S. (2022). The work done and the designated tasks for the development of fruit and vegetable clusters in Uzbekistan. *Gospodarka i Innowacje.*, 24, 1126–1129.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-277-7-246>

## ANALYSIS OF UZBEKISTAN'S PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL LABOR MIGRATION

**Urinov D. A.**

*Teacher, Department Finance  
Fergana State University  
Fergana, Uzbekistan*

**Xamidov E. T. o'g'li**

*Graduate Student  
Fergana State University  
Fergana, Uzbekistan*

The pace of sustainable economic development in Uzbekistan, the modernization of various sectors and sectors of the economy, changes in the structure of industries as a result of reforms, the introduction of modern techniques and technologies into the sphere of production and management, a change in the demand for labor resources – led to an increase in pressure on the national labor market. Due to the natural increase of the population and the large number of people coming from remote areas, the number