RESEARCH NOTES

Analysis of employees' social and psychological component indicators in the structure of higher education institution image

Análisis de los indicadores de los componentes sociales y psicológicos de los empleados en la estructura de la imagen de la institución de educación superior

Sergii Boltivets [ID]
State Institute of Family and Youth Policy of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4432-5272

Mykola Korolchuk [ID]
Kyiv National University of Trade and Economics, Kyiv, Ukraine
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7121-3474

Valentyna Korolchuk [ID]
Kyiv National University of Trade and Economics, Kyiv, Ukraine
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1147-3095

Vitalii Chornyi [ID]
National Defence University of Ukraine named after Ivan Cherniakhovskyi, Kyiv, Ukraine
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0342-1188

Serhii Vasilenko [ID]
National Defence University of Ukraine named after Ivan Cherniakhovskyi, Kyiv, Ukraine
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5318-9172

*Correspondence

Email: boltivetssergi@i.ua

Summary

The article presents the analysis of social and psychological component indicátors of academic employees in the structure of higher education institution (university) image. As a part of comprehensive study we determined the internal structure of a higher education institution image according the results of factor and correlation analysis which includes five factors: professional, social-psychological, motivational, emotional-volitional and individual-psychological. This approach gave a possibility to characterize the peculiarities of each factor, published in scientific articles, influence on the image of the university. Some of the factors have been stydied previously and we could find scientific publications on these issues. At the same time the results of the social and psychological component research have not been published yet but have a significant scientific interest since they characterize a sample of 285 representatives of the rectorate, dean's offices, heads of departments and academic staff of the university. We found out that each category of respondents has its own peculiarities regarding the level of satisfaction with quality of life, subjective satisfaction or not satisfaction with social or personal recognition, material and social security, level of personal authority. We were able to find the dominant type of university employees' attitude towards people in interaction: authoritarianism, egoism, aggression, suspicion, subordination, dependence, friendliness and altruism. The results of this study can be used for individual diagnosis and appropriate correction of each category of the respondents to have a positive impact on the image of the university.

Keywords: Social-psychological component; Image; Correlation analysis; Higher educational institution.

Resumen

El artículo presenta el análisis de los indicadores del componente social y psicológico de los empleados académicos en la estructura de la imagen de la institución de educación superior (universidad). Como parte de un estudio exhaustivo, determinamos la estructura interna de la imagen de una institución de educación superior de acuerdo con los resultados del análisis de factores y correlación, que incluye cinco factores: profesional, sociopsicológico, motivacional, emocional-volitivo e individual-psicológico. Este enfoque dio la posibilidad de caracterizar las peculiaridades de cada factor, publicado en artículos científicos, influyendo en la imagen de la universidad. Algunos de los factores se han obstaculizado anteriormente y podríamos encontrar publicaciones científicas sobre estos temas. Al mismo tiempo, los resultados de la investigación del componente social y psicológico aún no se han publicado, pero tienen un interés científico significativo, ya que caracterizan a una muestra de 285 representantes del rectorado, las oficinas del decano, los jefes de departamento y el personal académico de la universidad. Descubrimos que cada categoría de encuestados tiene sus propias peculiaridades con respecto al nivel de satisfacción con la calidad de vida, la satisfacción subjetiva o no con el reconocimiento social o personal, el material y la seguridad social, el nivel de autoridad personal. Pudimos encontrar el tipo dominante de actitud de los empleados universitarios hacia las personas en interacción: autoritarismo, egoísmo, agresión, sospecha, subordinación, dependencia, amistad y altruismo. Los resultados de este estudio pueden usarse para el diagnóstico individual y la corrección apropiada de cada categoría de los encuestados para tener un impacto positivo en la imagen de la Universidad.

Palabras clave: Componente sociopsicológico; Imagen; Análisis de correlación; Institución educativa superior.

Introduction

Image of a higher educational institution (hereinafter referred to as university) is gaining increasing scientific and practical importance due to the dynamic competitive changes in economic, social and educational spheres of modern society life. Ukraine's transition to market conditions has caused a sharp rise in the interest of population to higher education. This leads to competition between higher educational institutions in their struggle for quality of education, number of students what causes meticulous attention of administration to the image of institution.

Among the national studies in the field of image first of all we should mention the work of .Karamushka (2015) on the formation of corporate culture in the structure of image of higher educational institutions, Karpenko, Karpenko (2015) (components and peculiarities of forming the higher educational institution image), Korolchuk and Korolchuk, Mironets (2017) (professionally important qualities and image of rescuers), Korolchuk and Chernega (2019) (research of psychological factors of higher educational institutions image formation).

Some foreign scientists highlighted the problems related to the study of university image (Kazoleas, Kim, Moffit, 2001); cognitive approaches to image understanding (Arpan, 2003); relationship between university image and students' satisfaction (Palacio, Meneses, Pérez, 2002).

In our opinion, the problems connected with social and psychological factors of the research and formation of the organization image have not been sufficiently considered in the modern Ukrainian and foreign scientific literature. It still remains relevant to determine the features of socio-psychological component of the university image, to substantiate the research methods and psychological technologies for the positive image formation.

At the same time, taking into account all the achievements of modern science and practice, the problem of the state institution of higher education (HEI) image was not considered in a direct statement, comprehensively, with the definition of structure, psycho-diagnostic tools and features of social and psychological component manifestations in sustainable economic development (Kostetska et al., 2020; Yankovyi et al., 2020).

The main *goal* of the study is to identify the characteristics of social and psychological component of employees in the structure of the university image. This involves solving two complementary problems that can be combined on this topic of the research. Firstly, to find out the peculiarities of assessing the quality of life of all categories of university employees on nine scales and to determine the integral index of life quality and secondly, to evaluate the prevailing type and differences in the attitude to people manifested by different categories of the university employees in academic interaction what has a significant impact on the image of the university.

Methods, procedure, participants

According to the expert survey we found that social-psychological sphere of employees plays a special role in the structure of image since social-psychological determinants significantly affect the quality of educational and social services (Bukanov et al., 2019) and, as a consequence, affect the image of the university in general (Bodnar, Mirkovich, Koval, 2019; Kvitka et al., 2019). The studies of social and psychological component were conducted among people providing organizationional and educational services at the university – representatives of administration, dean's offices, heads of departments and research and academic staff (AS). The first task was solved with the help of the questionnaire "Quality of life" by Vodopianova and the second with the help of psychological technique "Diagnosis of interpersonal relations" by Leary (Bodrov, 2003).

Quality of life. The experience of psychological comfort (well-being) is an important indicator of health dynamics as it is the most subtle indicator of transient states from health to illness. The term "quality of life is widely used in foreign psychology for the definition of psychological (mental) well-being, what is a subjective experience of satisfaction with personal life. It correlates with satisfaction with self-realization of the personality and with his or her psychological health.

Quality of life assessment questionnaire was developed at the Institute of Stress Medicine (USA) in 1993 to help patients balance the stressful impact and the power of choosing their own behavior to help overcome stress. The questionnaire is based on an existential approach to life stress. In the primary source, it consisted of 40 categories, which evaluate the individual perception of stress tension on a scale from 1 to 9 points. The higher is satisfaction with each rating category, the lower is the level of existential stress. The ultimate result is a total quality of life index, which is considered as subjective satisfaction with self-actualization of personal resources to overcome life and work stress.

In the current version we have 36 questions with a scale from 1 to 10 points. Questions relate to satisfaction with the following categories of individual life: work, personal achievements, health, communication with relatives, support (internal and external – social), optimism, tension (physical and psychological discomfort), self-control, negative emotions (mood).

The purpose of the questionnaire is to assess the degree of overall satisfaction with the quality of the individual life and to identify the areas of life that cause the most discomfort or dissatisfaction. The study is conducted individually or in groups. The time of response should not exceed 30 minutes.

Processing and interpretation of the results is carried out according to the appropriate key, the sum of points for each category of life is calculated (9 subscales, each containing 4 questions). The minimum amount for each subscale is 4 points, the maximum is 40. The subscale scores correspond to the notion of satisfaction in different spheres of life. The lower is the score, the higher is the mental tension and the lower is satisfaction with the quality of life. It also calculates an integral quality of life index which is equal to the average of points scored on all nine subscales.

Very low index is typical for depressed patients. Low indexes are common among people with burnout syndrome. People with high index are characterized by expressed optimism and active life position (Bodrov, 2003).

The technique of interpersonal relations diagnostics was created by Leary, Leforge, Sazek in 1954 and was intended for the study of the subject's ideas about himself or herself and the ideal "Me", as well as for the study of relationships in small groups. With the help of this technique the prevailing type of attitude towards people in self-esteem is revealed. When studying interpersonal relationships the most distinguished are two factors: domination – subordination and friendliness – aggression. These factors particulary determine the overall impression of the person in the processes of interpersonal perception.

To represent the main social orientations Leary developed a conditional scheme in the form of a circle divided into sectors. There are four orientations in this circle along the horizontal and vertical axes: domination-subordination, friendliness-aggression. In turn, these sectors are divided into eight. For the more nuanced description the circles are divided into 16 sectors, but octants are more commonly used in some way oriented towards the two major axes.

The questionnaire contains 128 evaluative judgments, where each of the 8 types of relationships forms 16 items, arranged in ascending intensity. The methodology is constructed in

such a way that judgments aimed at clarifying a certain type of relationship are not arranged in a row, but in a special way: they are grouped by 4 and repeated through an equal number of definitions. During the processing, the number of relationships of each type is calculated.

According to the technique there are 8 types of attitude toward others: authoritarian, independent, aggressive, distrustful, submissive, dependent, cooperative, altruistic. The maximum grade level is 16 points, but it is divided into four levels:

0-4 points – low;
5-8 points– moderate (adaptive behavior);
9-12 points – high (extreme behavior);
13-16 points – extreme (to pathology) (Bodrov, 2003).

The research was conducted with the participation of 12 representatives of the administration, 27 representatives of the dean's offices, 32 – heads of departments, 80 – academic staff (AS) and 90 – students. A total of 224 people was surveyed including 30% of men and 70% of women aged 25-65. Most respondents were in the age group of 23-29 years old – 25% were predominantly graduate students, while other categories of respondents were as follows: 30-35 years old – 20%; 35-39 years old – 15%; 40-45 years old – 20%; 46-50 years old – 10%; 55-60 years old – 5%; 61-65 – 5%.

Therefore, all age categories and all employee categories participated in the empirical study.

Research results

According to the results of the analysis obtained by Vodopianova's "Quality of life assessment" questionnaire we found out the degree of general and individual satisfaction (dissatisfaction) with social achievements in the main spheres of life and found the facts that cause discomfort or dissatisfaction.

We found out that the highest level of satisfaction among the representatives of administration was observed in terms of optimism (37.9 ± 4.12 p.), job satisfaction (37.7 ± 4.31 p.) and personal achievements (37.2 ± 2.12 p.). Subsequent levels of satisfaction in decreasing order but at a fairly high level, were communication with relatives (35.8 ± 2.12 p.) and self-control (35.1 ± 3.17 p.). As for the scale of tension, its level for representatives of administration was within (33.2 ± 3.17 p.). Satisfaction with support was determined at (31.7 ± 3.19 p.). The lowest level of satisfaction was recorded for the health scale (27, 7 ± 2.44 p). and negative emotions scale (26,4 ± 2,13p).

Thus, according to the results of analysis of the data obtained on the questionnaire "Quality of life assessment" among the representatives of administration we found that such individual characteristics as optimism, job satisfaction, personal achievements, communication with relatives, as well as level of self-control, tension and support indicators are sufficiently high. However, some level of discomfort is caused by poor health and negative emotions, although these indicators are at a high level, but they are significantly lower than others (p <0.05).

It was found that according to individual integral quality of life index assessment (33.74 ± 2.98 p.) administration had a rather high level of self-esteem. We proved that the obtained indicators turned out to be typical for people with high efficiency, high self-realization and confident in their future. At the same time, the surveyed in this category experience discomfort with the perception of negative emotions and personal health, although the level of optimism, self-control, job satisfaction, personal achievements, communication with relatives dominate and

determine positive personal image that creates the image of HEI. For the representatives of the dean's offices the most pronounced indicators were personal achievements (37.7 ± 3.19 p.) and job satisfaction (35.9 ± 4.35 p.). Self-control (34.9 ± 2.91 p.), optimism (30.9 ± 3.19 p.) and health (30.4 ± 3.21 p.) were the next indicators in the satisfaction hierarchy. The lowest in terms of satisfaction in the structure of quality of life self-assessment representatives of the dean's offices recorded such indicators as level of tension (27.7 ± 3.91 p.), support (26.6 ± 2.13 p.) and negative emotions (25,9±2,17p.).

Thus, we found out that image of dean's offices representatives is influenced by such individual indicators of life activity self-assessment as personal achievements, job satisfaction, communication with relatives, level of optimism, level of health. These indicators contribute to the quality of educational services and create a positive image of HEI. At the same time, some discomfort is connected with negative emotions, level of tension and need for more effective support. With regard to the quality of life self-esteem indicators among the heads of departments the following results are found. The greatest satisfaction the surveyed receive from such components of life activity as personal achievements (37,6 ± 4,11 p.), communication with relatives (36,7 ± 4,12 p.), job satisfaction (35,4 ± 4 25 p.), level of self-control (33.8 ± 3.92 p.), optimism (30.4 ± 1.29p.). At the same time, the lower level of satisfaction is defined by such components of life quality as: level of support (26.9 ± 2.17 p.), health (26.4 ± 3.17 p.), tension (25.0 ± 3.01 p.) and negative emotions (23.7 ± 2.18 p.).

Consequently, according to the results of the analysis of quality of life self-assessment for heads of departments, we found out that its such high indicators as personal achievements, communication with relatives, job satisfaction, self-control and optimism influence positively on personal image. Some discomforts is connected with such quality of life characteristics as need for support, high levels of tension, health problems and negative emotions.

Self-assessment of life quality for academic staff has its own characteristics. We recorded only 3 indicators within 30 p. and more, namely: communication with relatives (37.4 ± 4.1 p.), job satisfaction (33.1 ± 4.21 p.), self-control (29.7 ± 2.85 p.). At the same time, other characteristics of life quality were evaluated by academic staff at an average level, but within the limits of 22-26 p. Thus, in descending order self-esteem indicators of individual life satisfaction are the following: personal achievements (26.9 ± 3.96 p.), health (25.1 ± 1.74 p.), tension (24, 9 ± 2.15 p.), support (23.6 ± 2.13 p.), optimism (23.3 ± 1.18 p.) and negative emotions (22.4 ± 1.4 p.).

So, the analysis of self-assessment results of life quality shows that academic staff positively assessed the level of satisfaction with communication with relatives, job satisfaction and level of self-control. There is a strong need for comprehensive analysis of quality of life indicators at an average level, but which cause discomfort and diminish personal image what can negatively affect the level of educational services and, in general, image of the institution. These are such spheres of academic staff life activity as: influence and perception of negative emotions, relative decrease in the level of support, optimism, health problems and low level of satisfaction with personal status. Thus, the analysis of the results of the survey according to the questionnaire "Quality of life assessment" showed that the integral quality of life index is the highest among representatives of the administration (33,74 ± 2,98 p.), then almost the same among the representatives of the dean's offices (31.63 ± 3.15 p.) and heads of departments (30.66 ± 3.13 p.) and the lowest (27.38 ± 2.64 p.) among academic staff. In general, self-esteem of certain spheres of life led to a sufficiently high integral level of quality of life assessment due to some indicators that were typical for all surveyed: job satisfaction, personal achievements, communication with relatives, optimism, self-control. All these indicators have rather high level. Some discomfort of varying degree is connected with negative emotions, individual health problems and job tension.

Job satisfactions, communication with relatives and self-control have a positive influence on image and quality of educational services. A certain level of dissatisfaction among academic staff is connected with such quality of life self-assessment characteristics as perception of

negative emotions, certain lack of support, optimism, health problems and dissatisfaction with personal achievements what can adversely affect the quality of service and image of a higher education institution. For a more in-depth study of the quality of life determinants affecting the image of HEI we performed a comparative analysis on indicators of individual spheres of life in different categories of the surveyed. Thus, according to the indicators of the first scale which determine job satisfaction of the surveyed, the highest level is observed for the representatives of administration (37.7 ± 4.31 p.), then, in decreasing order, almost the same indicators were found for representatives of the dean's offices and heads of departments (35.9 ± 4.35 p. and 35.4 ± 4.25 p., respectively). Job satisfaction indicator for academic staff is 33.1±4.21 p. Such results show a high level of job satisfaction among the surveyed.

Regarding the indicators on the following scale, the group of management (administration, representatives of the dean's offices, heads of departments) also has a sufficiently high level within 37.2 ± 2.12 p., 37.7 ± 3.19 p. and 37.6 ± 4.11 p., respectively. The peculiarity is that the indicator of personal achievements for academic staff is reduced and equals 26,9 ± 3,96 p. This indicates that a significant part of academic staff is not entirely satisfied with their personal achievements.
}
In terms of satisfaction with level of health, the highest rates on this scale are among representatives of the dean's offices - 30,4 ± 3,21 p., administration - 27,7 ± 2,44p., heads of departments - 26,4 ± 3,17 p. ., and the lowest indicators are among academic staff - 25,1 ± 1,74 p. According to analysis of particular life quality indicators, communication with relatives is the most uniform one. This indicator is recorded as the most pronounced among academic staff - 37,4 ± 4,1p; then among the heads of departments - 36.7 ± 4.12 p., administration - 35.8 ± 2.12 p. and representatives of the dean's offices - 34,7 ± 2,91 p.

According to the following scale, we analyzed the satisfaction with the level of support and found that there were no problems with the level of support for administration. At the same time, a certain level of discomfort with support is indicated by self-esteem for a certain part of academic staff, the indicator is fixed at 23.6 ± 2.13 p. Somewhat high level of support, but within the limits of discomfort is among representatives of the dean's offices - 26,6 ± 2,13p. and heads of departments - 26,9 ± 2,17 p.

The level of optimism is beyond any doubts for the administration, which is set at 37.9 ± 4.12 p., representatives of the dean's offices - 30.9 ± 3.19 p. and heads of departments - 30,4 ± 1,29 p. At the same time, there is a reduced level of optimism for academic staff what affects negatively the personal image, level of educational services and image of HEI. Such persons need psychocorrection.

In terms of satisfaction with the level of tension the highest indicators are among the administration - 33.2 ± 3.17 p., and 5.5 p. lower for representatives of the dean's offices - 27.7 ± 3.91 p. and heads of departments - 26,4 ± 3,01 p. The lowest level of satisfaction with the level of tension is among academic staff - 24,9 ± 2,15 p.

Self-control satisfaction level is quite high for all categories of the surveyed. Thus, for administration this indicator was determined at the level of 35.1 ± 3.17 p., for the representatives of the dean's offices - at the level 34.9 ± 3.26 p. and for academic staff - 29,7 ± 2,85 p., which turned out to be significantly lower than for the management group (at $p < 0.05$), but also within rather high criteria values. Peculiarity of comparative analysis of the results of the surveyed by the questionnaire "Quality of life assessment" is that for all categories there were discomfort indicators with the level of negative emotions (within 22.4 b. - 26.4 p.) but with the high level of self-control, optimism, job satisfaction, communication with relatives, this indicator of life activity has little effect on the individual integral quality of life index.

Thus, analyzing the results of the integral quality of life index (IQLI) by the indicators of life activity we found out that for administration it is equal to 33.74 ± 2.98 p., for heads of departments - $30,66 \pm 3,13$p. and for academic staff - 27.38 ± 2.64 p.

The analysis of the results on the questionnaire "Quality of life assessment" by N. Vodopianova gives grounds to say about the high level of integral quality of life index resulted by the highest satisfaction rates for the individual spheres of life activity among the surveyed: first of all - representatives of administration, representatives of the dean's offices, heads of departments. This is confirmed by high level indicators of job satisfaction, personal achievements, optimism, communication with relatives, level of tension and self-control.

It is determined by the results of the comparative analysis that academic staff showed lower indicators in certain spheres of life than the group of management. We found out that such areas as perception of negative emotions, dissatisfaction with personal achievements, level of support, optimism and health problems cause the greatest discomfort or dissatisfaction for academic staff. At the same time, self-control level and other indicators characterize the surveyed as active and optimistic that contributes to positive image of surveyed, corresponds with high quality of educational services and leads to positive image of HEI.

In addition to the defined integral quality of life index with the help of questionnaire "Quality of life assessment" by N. Vodopianova we studied social sphere with the help of psychological technique "Diagnosis of interpersonal relations" by T Leary. The technique allows us to evaluate the prevailing type of attitude to people in interaction with the help of self-esteem. According to the results of comparative analysis of the data obtained by T. Leary technique , we found out that on the scale of authoritarianism the indicators of the management are within the average values (9-12 p.). Thus, the most pronounced authoritarianism was found for the representatives of the dean's offices - 12.5 ± 1.06 p. and for 2.1-1.99 p. this indicator is lower for representatives of administration and heads of departments, respectively $10,4 \pm 1,12$ p. and 10.01 ± 0.79 p. (at $p < 0.05$). Individuals with this level of reliability show dominance, energy, competence, leadership, independence and ability to take responsibility (Luchaninova et al., 2019). For academic staff indicator is significantly lower - 8.3 ± 0.71 p., that is for 1.99-4.2 p. lower than for management group (at $p < 0.05$). This result on the scale of authoritarianism indicates the manifestation of such personality traits as confidence, perseverance.

On the second scale, which reflects egoistic type (confident - self-confident) we determined that the highest level of self-confidence is typical for representatives of the dean's offices (11.9 ± 0.81 p.), representatives of administration - (11.1 ± 1.07 p.), heads of departments - ($11,0 \pm 0,5$ p.) and academic staff representatives - ($10,4 \pm 0,69$ p.). All surveyed to a greater or less extent on this scale are characterized by such features as confidence, self-confidence, independence, efficiency, self-orientation and, in extreme cases, a pronounced tendency to compete. On the third scale of aggression we determined the level of demand – rigidity. On this scale, representatives of the management group have indicators within the average criteria ($\bar{X} = 9$-12 p.). In fact, we found that indicators of the administration representatives are 10.8 ± 1.11 p., representatives of the dean's offices are 10.6 ± 0.96 p. and heads of departments - $10,1 \pm 0,73$ p. This characterizes this category of the surveyed as demanding, strict and outspoken in their assessment of other people, critical, intolerant to errors.

At the same time for academic staff the indicators of aggressiveness are significantly lower ($7,2 \pm 0,32$ p.) than for the group of management (at $p < 0,05$). This characterizes this category as persistent, energetic and possibly stubborn. Indicators of the fourth scale - suspect make possible to evaluate skepticism, stubbornness, negativism. The highest value of this indicator is recorded for academic staff (8.6 ± 0.2 p.) that may characterize this category of respondents as distrustful, suspicious, jealous and offensive, malicious and inclined to complain. They need psychological correction.

Representatives of the management group recorded sufficiently low levels on the suspicion scale within the range of 0-8 p., for the representatives of administration - 6,1 ± 0,27 p., representatives of the dean's offices - 6,7±0,25p., heads of departments - 6,4 ± 0,21 p.

Such results characterize the surveyed as critical to many social phenomena and surrounding people, but without negativity, insult or malice. Analyzing the results of the fifth scale - subordinate, we determined the level of concession or passive submission. Peculiarity of the data obtained on this scale is that it is fixed at 8.1 ± 0.42 p for administration; representatives of the dean's offices - 8.3 ± 0.37 p., 8.2 ± 0.3 p. - the heads of departments; what is on the border of medium and low values. This characterizes such persons as compliant under certain arguments, capable to adequately accept criticism. This indicator for academic staff was lower for 1.0-1.2 p than for management group at p <0.05. This indicates that some members of academic staff may manifest passive obedience, excessive modesty, lack of opinion, but honesty in the performance of their duties.

Indicators of the sixth scale – dependence allow to assess credibility, obedience, dependence. For the management group indicators on this scale are defined at the following levels: for administration representatives - 7.9 ± 0.26 p., representatives of the dean's offices - 7.8 ± 0.3 p., heads of departments - 7.6 ± 0.42 p. This means that the surveyed with such level of indicators have respect for others, gratitude, and desire for positive interaction with others.

At the same time, this indicator among academic staff is for 1.8-2 p higher than for management group. This gives grounds to characterize a certain category of academic staff as dependent, unable to resist and provide assistance. This category needs psychocorrection.

The analysis of indicators on the seventh scale - friendliness (kindness) allows to evaluate excessive conformism and kindness. For management group this indicator is observed at range 0-8 p. In fact, representatives of the administration recorded 7.1 ± 0.29 p., representatives of the dean's offices 7.0 ± 0.37 p., heads of departments - 7.7 ± 0.35 p. This characterizes the surveyed as inclined to cooperation, flexibility and compromise in resolving work problems and conflicts, consciously conforming, adhering to the rules when dealing with people, initiative, enthusiastic in achieving the goal.

At the same time, the level of kindness for academic staff is 9.8 ± 0.42 p, that is for 2.1-2.8 p. higher compared to the indicator of the management group. This gives grounds to characterize academic staff as benevolent and kind to everyone, oriented on social approval with desire to be good for all without regard to situation, emotionally labile, with well-developed mechanisms of psychological protection such as displacement and suppression.

The eighth scale provides an opportunity to evaluate unselfishness – ability to sacrifice. For all the surveyed indicators were set at 7.6-8.1p. Thus, representatives of the administration have an indicator on the scale of altruism at the level of 7.9 ± 0.45 p., representatives of the dean's offices - 7.6 ± 0.34 p. and academic staff - 8,1 ± 0,31 p. Such indicators give grounds to characterize the respondents as responsible in relationships with people, empathetic, able to cheer up and forgive.

Conclusions

According to the study of social sphere which significantly affects the quality of educational services, image of specialists and higher education institution in general we set out the determinants for specific spheres of life activity and integrated assessment of life quality. We proved that high level of satisfaction with the quality of life according to the self-esteem of the

respondents led to positive and high rates of satisfaction typical for all respondents. They are connected with job, personal achievements, communication with relatives, optimism and self-control. Such positive determinants of life quality complement the effectiveness of interaction with other people due to the professional qualities, ability to take responsibility, confidence, focus on positive interaction.

Such areas of life as: work, communication with relatives and self-control has a positive impact on the image and quality of educational services in the group of academic staff. A certain level of quality of life dissatisfaction among academic staff is connected with negative emotions, a certain lack of support, optimism, health problems and dissatisfaction with personal achievements, which can adversely affect the quality of service and image of the higher education institution.

At the same time15% of academic staff demonstrate suspicion, mistrust, abusiveness with signs of passive subordination and dependence, which in the aggregate can characterize professional burning out and indicate that this category of people requires psychological correction.

Reference

Arpan, L. M. et al. (2003). A cognitive approach to understanding university image. Corporate *Communications: An International Journal*, 8(2), 97–113.

Bodnar, S., Mirkovich, I., & Koval, V. (2019). Human capital development in Ukrainian education system by means of language integrated teaching. *Dilemas contemporaneos-educacion politica y valores*, 7 (SI), 14.

Bodrov, V. (2003). *Practicum on Differential Psychodiagnostics of Professional Suitability*. M.: PER SE.

Bukanov H., Kolesnyk A., Tashkinova O., Kotlubai V., & Koval V. (2019). Social marketing in public administration of social service institutions. *Revista Genero & Direito*, 8 (6), 457-468.

Gorbenko, N. (2014). Features of forming the image of a modern university. *Educational discourse*, 1 (15), 36-45.

Karamushka, L.M. (ed.) (2015). Psychological determinants of organizational culture development. K .: Pedahohichna dumka.

Karpenko, Yu.M., Karpenko, N.L. (2015). The image of higher education institution: the main components and problems of formation. *Polisia Scientific Bulletin*, 1 (1), 118-124.

Kazoleas, D., Kim, Y. And Moffit, M. A. (2001). Institutional image: a case study. Corporate *Communications: An International Journal*, 6(4), 205-216. http://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000006148.

Korolchuk, M.S., Korolchuk, V.M, Berezovskaya, L.I. (2017). *Professional burnout of research and educational personnel.* Kyiv: Kyiv.nats. torh-ekon. un-t.

Kostetska, K., Khumarova, N., Umanska, Y., Shmygol, N., & Koval, V. (2020). Institutional qualities of inclusive environmental management in sustainable economic development. *Management Systems in Production Engineering*, 28 (2), 15-22.

Kvitka, S., Starushenko, G., Koval, V., Deforzh, H., & Prokopenko, O. (2019). Marketing of Ukrainian higher educational institutions representation based on modeling of Webometrics Ranking. *Marketing and Management of Innovations*, 3, 60-72. http://doi.org/10.21272/mmi.2019.3-05

Luchaninova, O., Koval, V., Deforzh, H., Nakonechna, L. & Golovnia, O. (2019). Formation of communicative competence of future specialists by means of group work. *Espacios*, 40 (41), 11.

Palacio, A. B., Meneses, G. D., Pérez, P. J. P. (2002). The configuration of the university image and its relationship with the satisfaction of students. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 40(5), 486-505. http://doi.org/10.1108/09578230210440311.

Yankovyi, O., Koval, V., Trokhymets, O., Karpenko, M., & Matskevich, Y. (2020). Economic assessment of investment on the basis of production functions. *Turismo: Estudos &Práticas*, 2.