

Higher Education and Employment Indicators of the Republic of Armenia: Methodological Issues and Analyzes

Khachatryan Mariam G.

Armenian State University of Economics,

postgraduate student of the Chair of Macroeconomics (Yeghegnadzor, RA)

mararm1991@gmail.com

UDC: 331.5:378; **EDN:** KWWIAM; **JEL:** F16, J24, J3, J31, P46, R23

Keywords: Higher education system, current professions, modular higher education, indicators, labor market, salary

Հայաստանի Հանրապետության բարձրագույն կրթության և զբաղվածության ցուցանիշները. մեթոդաբանական խնդիրներ և վերլուծություններ

Խաչատրյան Մարիամ Գ.

Հայաստանի պետական տնտեսագիտական համալսարանի Մակրոէկոնոմիկայի ամբիոնի սասյիրանտ (Եղեգնաձոր, ՀՀ)

mararm1991@gmail.com

Անփոփում. Ժամանակակից աշխարհը անընդհատ փոխվում է, և կրթության ոլորտում նոր մարտահրավերներ են առաջանում, և կարիք կա, որ մարդիկ ավելի շատ ռեսուրսներ ծախսեն իրենց մասնագիտական կարողությունները բարձրացնելու համար, քանի որ կրթությունը մարդուն հնարավորություն է տալիս ոչ միայն գտնել համապատասխան զբաղմունք, այլև ուղղակիորեն որոշում է մարդկանց կենսամակարդակը: Բնակչության կենսամակարդակի հայեցակարգը շատ լայն է և կարող է պարունակել մի շարք գործոնային ցուցանիշներ, որոնցից հատկապես վերջին շրջանում արդիական է դարձել կրթության բաղադրիչը: Կարևոր է վերլուծել բարձրագույն կրթության բաղադրիչի դերը բնակչության կենսամակարդակի ցուցանիշներում ոչ միայն զարգացած, այլև զարգացող երկրներում:

Այս գիտական հոդվածը նպատակ ունի ուսումնասիրելու աշխարհում ընդունված բարձրագույն կրթության մակարդակը բնութագրող հիմնական ցուցանիշները, համեմատել և վերլուծել դրանք Հայաստանի Հանրապետության օրինակով:

Հանգուցաբառեր` բարձրագույն կրթական համակարգ, արդիական մասնագիտություններ, մոդուլային բարձրագույն կրթություն, ցուցանիշներ, աշխատաշուկա, աշխատավարձ:

Показатели высшего образования и занятости в Республике Армения:

методологические вопросы и анализ

Хачатрян Мариам Г.

Государственный экономический университет Армении,

аспирант кафедры макроэкономики (Егегнадзор, РА)

mararm1991@gmail.com

Аннотация. Современный мир постоянно меняется и в сфере образования возникают новые вызовы, и возникает потребность в том, чтобы люди тратили больше ресурсов на повышение своих профессиональных способностей, ведь образование не только дает человеку возможность найти подходящую профессию, но и также напрямую определяет уровень жизни людей. Понятие уровня жизни населения очень широкое и может содержать ряд факторных показателей, из которых особенно актуальным в последнее время стал образовательный компонент. Важно проанализировать роль компонента высшего образования в показателях уровня жизни населения не только в развитых, но и в развивающихся странах.

В данной научной статье ставится цель изучить основные принятые в мире показатели, характеризующие уровень высшего образования, сравнить и проанализировать их на примере Республики Армения.

Ключевые слова: система высшего образования, актуальные профессии, модульное высшее образование, показатели, рынок труда, заработная плата

When studying the field of higher education, it can be stated that it primarily characterizes the state and private universities operating in the given country, the specialties, the quality and modernity of the educational services provided, the professionalism of the specialists, the educational materials, etc. however, one of the most important

components of the higher education sector is its impact on the population's standard of living, job placement indicators, and the relevance of professions to market demands. In order to clearly visualize the extent of the above influence, it is first necessary to identify the main indicators

characterizing the level of higher education of the population of this or that country.

Why there is a need to analyze the main indicators of higher education in detail, because higher education is a broad concept, and it is necessary to specify which main indicators best characterize the given field when conducting research, since higher education system mainly has several degrees, such as bachelor's, master's, postgraduate, research, science, now also modular education, which has become more relevant. As the results of various researches show that higher education determines what field people will work in, how much they will get paid, and what kind of living standard they will provide. Currently, almost all job announcements in the world require specialists with higher education in the field of management, information technology, medicine, law, etc.

Various indicators characterizing the quality of higher education can be found from various national and international literature sources.

The educational indicators, like the rest of the social indicators, have experienced great diffusion in recent years. For this reason, education indicators are increasingly being talked about, in very different contexts and referring to very different realities. Despite the many drawbacks that present, quantitative indicators are still in the process of improvement and even creation, the truth is that they facilitate the analysis of education, although their values do not explain the causal relationships or allow conclusions to be drawn univocal. Although in the different editions (OECD, 2008) [1] some concrete indicators have been varying, the general structure is maintained around four groups: context, resources, process, and results. The articulation between the education system and the world of work is one of the priority objectives of economic development policies. The finding that in most countries the qualification of workers does not correspond to that required by employers, converts these educational indicators - which evaluate the effectiveness of education in the training of workers - into indispensable for educational and labor planning. Effectiveness of education can be increased by: eliminating discrepancies between the competences acquired by graduates of higher education and the demand of the labor market and industry; lowering the disparity between the number of students enrolled in scientific careers and in the humanities, as well as the proliferation of private service providers.

The educational indicators, like the rest of the social indicators, have experienced great diffusion in recent years. Several causes have made this possible. They include the process of globalization

that favors spatial comparisons on levels of well-being and that includes among its parameters measuring educational indicators. Secondly, the concern of international and national organizations to create adequate statistical systems to evaluate the educational levels of the population. Finally, the growing demand for manageable synthetic indicators, not only by social scientists, but also by those responsible for educational institutions - precisely this political use has led some authors to consider them instruments in service of a technocratic consideration of education and not very useful for teaching practice [2].

In 1987, the Center for Educational Research and Innovation (CERI), in cooperation with the Education Indicators and Statistics Unit of the OECD, developed an international system of indicators of the educational situation. The general structure is maintained around four groups: context, resources, process, and results[3].

Context indicators serve to characterize the demographic, socioeconomic and cultural conditions in which education is developed.

Resource indicators evaluate material and human resources.

The process indicators are the most recent and report on the organization and functioning of the centers, educational practice, and school climate.

The results indicators show the achievements of the educational system through the success of the students' school through the evaluation tests, certificates, and degrees they obtain and their insertion in the labor market.

Hera are indicators suggested for higher education

- ✓ Graduation and retention rates, disaggregated to capture community college students and other nontraditional students, and perhaps also financial aid status, family income, and need for remediation at the time of matriculation
- ✓ Measure of the highest level of education attained by students 10 years after they first enrolled in a postsecondary institution
- ✓ Transfer rates—students who successfully transfer from a community college to a 4-year institution or proportion of students who graduate or transfer within 4 to 6 years of normal completion time
- ✓ Educational progress rates, such as: measure of proportion of students college-ready at matriculation; percentage of students who persist through graduation; completion rates for remedial coursework and progression to college-level coursework; cumulative credits earned; or an indicator tracking students K-highest level of schooling in which they enroll

- ✓ Preparation for careers and job placement, using employment rates and salaries at 1 and 5 years postgraduation
- ✓ Research and development activity, using, e.g., spending on research and development, number of patents secured, or income earned through licenses; indicator for humanities and social sciences also needed

Individual outcomes:

- ✓ Job placement and earnings
- ✓ Learning outcomes, such as: cognitive skills or functioning, occupational competence and preparedness; civic awareness and responsibility, global and intercultural competence, moral reasoning
- ✓ Net cost and affordability for families—could include net cost of tuition and fees, minus grants, disaggregated by family income, or average student’s loan burden relative to starting salary important that it be amplified,” in Dougherty’s view, and he noted that such proposals are currently under consideration [4].

Summarizing the indicators obtained from several information sources, it can be stated that there are different quantitative indicators that are clearly measurable and can be calculated for countries, and accordingly there are uncountable indicators that are individual and can be obtained only because of conducting social surveys.

In this scientific article, the quantifiable indicators characterizing the higher education program were studied, which are as follows:

- ✓ the number of school graduates per year in a given country (19 170 graduates of public schools with secondary education in 2020 in Armenia) [5]
- ✓ annual number of university admissions (17 027 students were admitted to higher state and non-state educational institutions in 2020 in Armenia) [6]
- ✓ the number of state universities operating in the given country and the number of specialties in them (55 Higher state and non-state educational institutions in Armenia and their 14 branches and approximately 25 different specialties)
- ✓ number of teaching staff (10 831 the number of teaching staff in Armenia was 10,831 in 2020) [6]
- ✓ the average amount of tuition for specific professions
- ✓ student performance indicators (according to the assessment methods defined by the Bologna educational system)
- ✓ graduates employment rates in their profession and beyond (In 2020, 100.4 people

from the total number of employed people in Armenia have higher education)

- ✓ average salary of employed graduates
- ✓ payback period for education costs

There are also many other indicators that are not quantitative and are individual, such as:

- ✓ satisfaction with the quality of education
- ✓ interest and demand for higher education
- ✓ state of educational conditions

Quality of education is defined by UNICEF (2000) as outcomes that encompass knowledge, skills and attitudes, and are linked to national goals for education and positive participation in society. Quality in higher education is a multidimensional concept that looks at the quality of a whole institution. Educational quality can be measured by means of indicators which include educational input, process, outcome and context indicators. Education indicators provide information about the health of the educational system [7].

The quality of higher education is multi-content. This implies that educational programs should be up-to-date, electronic and physical educational materials should be realistic and practical, as well as accessible. The application of the modern methodology for the provision of educational services is of particular importance. Universities in Armenia have certain problems, the solution of which requires systemic changes in some cases, but it is important to note that quite a lot of work has already been done in that direction, especially the need to strengthen the scientific component of universities.

The world is now moving towards the introduction of a modular education system. it enables members of society to adapt more easily to the environment. people have the opportunity to learn and work in a new profession in a short period of time.

The problems of education and science are of a specific nature in the republics that gained independence after the collapse of the Soviet Union. The general decline in the economy and, as a result, the standard of living of the population has led to a decrease in the level of education in these countries and the emergence of a number of problems of a technical and substantive nature. Among them: the imbalance in the training of humanitarian and technical specialists, the outflow of young people from science, the violation of the continuity of scientific schools, the continuity of various levels of the education system, etc. [8].

According to the method of assessing the quality of education, countries can be divided into two groups. The first group includes countries where there are relevant state bodies regulating the development of higher education. In some cases, the

evaluation system is based on the priority of state authorities and is related to state control, licensing, attestation, state accreditation, comparison of different universities, distribution of financial resources and influencing these educational institutions. The internal system for assessing the quality of education in universities is organized in the form of a final and stage-by-stage attestation of students for the purpose of self-assessment of the university and its structural divisions.

It is known that the countries with appropriate state structures regulating the development of higher education are mainly European countries (Germany, France, Great Britain, etc.), as well as the CIS countries that have adopted the university traditions of European countries). And the countries where the process of self-assessment of higher education prevails are primarily the United States, as well as those countries that have begun to follow American models of higher education, for example, the Philippines, Taiwan, etc. In Armenia, the assessment of the quality of education in universities is regulated by the relevant state bodies, which carry out control, licensing, attestation for the purpose of self-assessment of universities [9]. Due to the imbalance between the actual and required number of university graduates, the prerequisites for unemployment among young professionals and the removal of a significant part of the most active and efficient young people from practical work have arisen [10].

Conclusion. Having a stable system of higher professional education is very important for every country, because according to the results of research, countries with a large number of people with higher education record both economic success and an increase in the level of social well-being. The study and analysis of the indicators characterizing the higher education system for one year gives an opportunity to highlight the existing problems in the given country and to develop a strategy for their solution, as well as to bring the higher education services to the quality level that the given country becomes a leader in the field of export of educational services, especially this is current and important. is for those countries that have few natural resources for economic development, but can have a great potential of human resources by developing the education system.

References

1. Higher Education Institutions and Regional Mission: Lessons Learnt from the OECD Review Project, May 2008
2. Indicators of quality in Higher Education -Literature review, Dugagjin Sokoli, Edmond Hajrizi UBT

- College, Prishtina, Kosovo, Conference Paper · October 2020
3. Centre for Educational Research and Innovation – CERI <https://www.oecd.org/education/ceri/>
4. "4 Indicators for Higher Education." National Research Council. 2012. Key National Education Indicators: Workshop Summary. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. doi: 10.17226/13453.×
5. ՀԱՅՁԱՍՏԱՆԻ ՀԱՆՐԱՊԵՏՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՍՈՑԻԱԼ-ՏՆՏԵՍԱԿԱՆ ՎԻՃԱԿԸ 2021 թ. ՀՈՒՆՎԱՐ-ՍԱՐՏԻՆ https://armstat.am/file/article/sv_03_21a_5130.pdf
6. ՀԱՅՁԱՍՏԱՆԻ ՀԱՆՐԱՊԵՏՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՍՈՑԻԱԼ-ՏՆՏԵՍԱԿԱՆ ՎԻՃԱԿԸ 2021 թ. ՀՈՒՆՎԱՐ-ՍԱՐՏԻՆ https://armstat.am/file/article/sv_03_21a_5170.pdf
7. **Agyeman, D. K., Baku, J. J. K., & Gbadamosi, R.** (2000). Review of education sector analysis in Ghana 1987 – 1998. Paris: UNESCO Working Group on Education Sector Analysis.
8. **Григорян К. Г.** Тенденции и проблемы взаимосвязи университетов и общества на современном этапе развития экономики Республики Армения. // коллективная монография «Университеты в евразийском образовательном пространстве». Серия «Евразийские университеты XXI века». Ред. кол.: В. А. Садовничий и др., Евразийская ассоциация университетов, МГУ имени М. В. Ломоносова. – Москва, Издательство Московского университета: «МАКС Пресс», 2017. – С. 378-380. Электронная версия: URL: http://www.eau-msu.ru/files/eau_mono.pdf
9. **Григорян К. Г.** Интеграция в сфере образования в рамках ЕАЭС. Трансформация системы мирохозяйственного взаимодействия в контексте современных глобальных вызовов: материалы Международной научно-практической конференции профессорско-преподавательского состава, молодых ученых, аспирантов, магистрантов и студентов, 17-18 мая 2016 г. – Ростов н/Д: изд-во ООО «АзовПечать», 2016, стр. 111-114. URL: <https://goo.su/ZnzI3f> (ссылка укорочена. Дата обращения: 10.11.2022).
10. **Григорян К. Г.** Реальный сектор экономики Армении и проблемы трудоустройства среди молодых специалистов. Международная научно-практическая конференция «Молодежная предпринимательство в странах восточного партнерства: опыт формирования и перспективы развития». Батумский государственный университет Шота Руставели». – Батуми: Изд-во «БГУ», 2018, – С. 139-141. https://drive.google.com/file/d/1kELiGfCuXYoh8blbA8m_rYwyFpxpU5HK/view.

Сдана/Հանձնվել է՝ 15.11.2022
 Рецензирована/Գրախոսվել է՝ 19.11.2022
 Принята/Ընդունվել է՝ 26.11.2022