

Despite the seeming simplicity of the organization, distance learning also has its own problems in this direction. First, the main problem in the development of distance learning is the technology of course development. Modern distance learning courses are characterized by a lack of interactivity. At present, the content of the courses is made up of lectures in the form of text materials and the simplest graphic objects (pictures, photos), blocks of knowledge control in the form of test tasks. To create high-quality multimedia courses, you need a team of subject matter specialists, webmasters, designers, programmers, etc. The quality of the developed course depends on the well-coordinated work of this entire team. Secondly, the work of a teacher in distance learning becomes more difficult. When organizing distance learning, the role of the teacher is changing, who is now to a lesser extent a disseminator of information and to a greater extent a manager and analyst of the educational process. Thirdly, one of the key problems of distance learning remains the problem of user authentication when checking knowledge. Modern technical means allow the teacher to observe his students in real time and "see" who and when "came" to a lecture or seminar and what exactly is doing at that time. But not all educational institutions can afford such communication. For short-term programs, this is not relevant, they have a different goal - to provide the student with material. And a serious and purposeful student himself will receive everything that is necessary from the courses.

УДК 378

M. Omoush, PhD, Associate Professor  
Business Administration Department, Business Faculty  
Tafila Technical University, Jordan

### **THE INTERACTION BETWEEN STUDENT FEES AND SUPPORT AT EUROPEAN LEVEL**

The interaction between student fees and support is complex, and it is challenging to compare national realities accurately and clearly at European level. This is because there are many dimensions to consider: Do all students pay fees? Or only some? If some, what are the main criteria that determine which students pay and which do not? And how much do students actually pay?

Similar questions need to be asked about student financial support systems. What are the main forms of student support, and what is the purpose of such support: to reward and incentivise good academic performance, or to mitigate financial need? Is financial support paid directly to students in the form of a grant, which does not have to be paid back, or as a loan, which does have to be repaid? Where there are grants, are they awarded to some or to all students? If it is to some, what are the main criteria, and how much support is provided? In addition to direct financial support, are families of students supported indirectly in the form of family allowances or tax relief?

Higher education studies entail substantial investment, and students may be required to bear (a part of) the costs through fees. Student fees may comprise a variety of costs charged to students, including for example, tuition fees, enrolment, administration and examination fees. Contributions to student organisations are excluded from the analysis.

Among the 43 higher education systems covered in this report, there are seven where full-time home students pay no fees in first-cycle programmes. These are

Denmark, Greece, Cyprus, Malta, Finland, Sweden and Turkey. In contrast, in 12 higher education systems, all first-cycle students pay fees.

In the remaining 24 education systems, there are some students who pay fees, while others do not. The share of fee-payers in these systems commonly reflects different policies. For example, there are systems (Belgium – French Community, Bulgaria, Ireland, Spain, France, Italy, Bosnia and Herzegovina, North Macedonia and Serbia) where in principle all students pay fees, but some are exempt from paying fees. Such exemptions are most commonly based on their socio-economic need, but they may also be given to students who study in certain programmes to which authorities wish to attract more students or a more diverse student body. In these systems, typically more than half of the students are subject to fees.

In further 12 systems where typically fewer than half of the students pay, only certain categories of students need to pay fees. They may be students with insufficient academic performance or study progression, students studying in certain types of higher education institutions or those studying for a second or further degree at the same education level, for example.

In most of the higher education systems studied, the share of fee-paying students in the second cycle (not shown) is comparable to first-cycle data. There are eight systems (Greece, Ireland, Cyprus, Malta, the United Kingdom – Scotland, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Turkey), however, where a different fee policy applies to each of the two cycles, which then translates into different percentages of fee-payers. For example, in Greece, Cyprus and Malta, no fees are charged to first-cycle full-time students, but students in the second cycle generally pay fees. Turkey also belongs to this group, but the fee charged to second-cycle day-time students corresponds to an amount below EUR 100. In Ireland, the United Kingdom (Scotland) and Bosnia and Herzegovina, only some categories of first-cycle students pay fees (or fees above EUR 100), while in the second cycle, all students are expected to pay. In the United Kingdom (Scotland), first-time first-cycle students do not pay fees (though first-cycle students studying for a second degree at the same level pay fees), but the majority of second-cycle students pay tuition fees. In Ireland, first-cycle need-based grant holders do not pay fees (public authorities cover their student contribution of EUR 3 000), whereas in the second cycle, all students are expected to pay tuition fees set by higher education institutions. Similarly, in Montenegro, first-cycle students progressing normally in their studies do not pay fees as from 2017/18, but all second-cycle students paid fees in the reference academic year 2019/20. The no-fee policy is, however, extended to the second cycle from the academic year 2020/21: first-time second-cycle students in the first year of their studies and those who progress normally in subsequent study years do not pay a fee.

Beyond the percentage of fee-payers, an important aspect of fee policies is the amount that students pay. The amount paid by the highest number of fee-paying students in the system. The figure takes into account only fees charged to first-time students progressing normally through their studies, i.e. acquiring at least the minimum number of ECTS required per academic year, and having not yet completed the maximum number of academic years set for the specific programme. The focus is, once again, on first-cycle full-time home students.

As outlined previously, seven higher education systems have a no-fee policy in the first-cycle. In addition, in two further systems, no fees are charged to first-cycle students who progress normally through their studies: the United Kingdom – Scotland (first-time students) and Montenegro. Estonia uses the same approach, the only difference being that fees may also be charged to those studying in languages other than Estonian.

In Czechia, Germany (eight Länder), Croatia, Poland, Slovenia and Slovakia, full-time students progressing normally through their studies most commonly pay only administrative charges of up to EUR 100.

In contrast, more than half of all higher education systems register most common annual fees that are higher than EUR 100. More specifically, in 14 higher education systems, the most common fee fee-payers pay is between EUR 101 and 1 000. Among these, in Austria, students in Fachhochschulen (universities of applied sciences) pay annual fees of EUR 736, while students who progress normally in universities and university colleges of teacher education do not pay fees. In Ireland, Spain, Italy, Hungary, the Netherlands, Switzerland and Liechtenstein, the most common fee is relatively high, ranging from EUR 1 001 to 3 000. In Lithuania, while data on the most common fees are not available, the minimum fee for full-time fee-paying students is higher than EUR 1 500. Finally, in the United Kingdom (England, Wales and Northern Ireland) and in Norway, the most common annual fees are the highest in Europe, above EUR 3 000. In Norway, students in government dependent private higher education institutions pay fees, in public universities there are no fees.

Interestingly, the countries where the most common fees for students progressing normally in their studies are above EUR 100 are also mostly countries where all or the majority of students pay fees. Only in Lithuania, Hungary, Austria, Romania and Norway are fees above EUR 100 charged to a minority of first-cycle full-time students who progress normally. In Lithuania, Hungary and Romania, these fee-payers are mainly those who, based on their study performance, did not obtain a state-funded place. In Austria and Norway, as mentioned above, these fee-payers are students who study in certain types of higher education institution.

In the second-cycle (not depicted), fees most commonly paid by students progressing normally in their studies are similar to first-cycle fees in most education systems where students typically pay fees. There are, however, exceptions. In Cyprus, Malta, the United Kingdom (Scotland) and Turkey, students do not pay fees in the first cycle, but they are generally charged in the second cycle. The most common second-cycle amounts range from around EUR 15 in Turkey, to more than EUR 5 125 in Cyprus; and in the United Kingdom (Scotland) they may be even higher, as they are unregulated. In Greece, while there are no fees in the first-cycle programmes and in some second-cycle programmes, second-cycle students generally pay fees, which may amount to EUR 7 500.

In a further eight higher education systems, there are fee-payers both among first- and second-cycle students, but the most common amounts are typically higher in the second cycle. In Ireland, Spain, Romania and North Macedonia, the most common amount in the second cycle is substantially higher compared to the first cycle (there is a difference of more than EUR 500). The difference in most common amounts is less substantial, but second-cycle students still need to pay somewhat higher amounts in

France, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Serbia. Interestingly, in these eight education systems, the minimum annual fees for second-cycle studies are also higher than those in the first cycle. In contrast, in the United Kingdom (England, Wales and Northern Ireland), annual fees were lower on average in the second cycle than in the first cycle for full-time students in 2018/19.

Two countries have recently implemented new policy measures, which had an impact on fee amounts paid by students. Both countries have reduced fees. In the Netherlands, since 2017/18, annual statutory fees for first-time students in their first year in short- and first-cycle programmes have been halved in order to make higher education more accessible. In addition, in first-cycle initial teacher education courses annual fees have been halved for the first two years, and from 2020/21, the halved fee also applies to second-cycle programmes in teaching. In Portugal, top-level authorities, aiming to reduce financial barriers to accessing higher education, have gradually been reducing first-cycle (and the legally regulated second-cycle) tuition fees (both minimum and maximum) for the last two years. In the academic year 2018/19, annual first-cycle fees ranged from EUR 657 to 1 063; while in 2020/21, they range from EUR 495 to 697 per year.

УДК 159.922

Н. М. Савелюк, доктор психологічних наук, доцент  
Х. Р. Вояк, здобувачка вищої освіти  
Тернопільський національний педагогічний  
університет імені Володимира Гнатюка  
м. Тернопіль, Україна

### **ПСИХОЛОГІЧНІ ЗАСАДИ ФОРМУВАННЯ ЛІВЧАТ-ЛІДЕРОК У СУЧАСНІЙ ВИЩІЙ ШКОЛІ**

Вступ. Як засвідчує офіційна статистика, серед майже 8 мільярдів населення сучасного світу приблизно половина – жінки. При цьому є держави, у яких відносно більшість становлять чоловіки (країни Африки, Азії, Південної Америки, а також Австралія), а є і такі, де навпаки, кількісно домінують жінки (країни колишнього СРСР, у тому числі, Україна). За даними Інтернет-видання «Economist UA», в Україні жінок – приблизно 53 % [5]. Назагал же реальне становище жінок у багатьох країнах світу ще далеке від ідеалів соціальної рівності та психологічної паритетності. Висловлене стосується, між іншим, й участі жінок у громадсько-політичному житті соціуму та їх лідерства в цій сфері, а тому відповідна проблема потребує свого вивчення та аналізу.

Аналіз останніх досліджень. Лідерство, як відомо, є одним із важливих механізмів регулювання взаємин між людьми, соціальними групами, інституціями суспільства. Активність лідерів у різних сферах життя – це діяльність енергійних, цілеспрямованих, відповідальних, амбіційних особистостей. Лідерство як соціальний інститут виконує низку важливих для суспільства і людей функцій. Здебільшого воно визначається характеристиками соціуму, соціально-психологічними особливостями спільноти та конкретною ситуацією [4, с. 64]

На думку С. Захарії, різні концепції лідерства можна поділити на 3 основні групи: 1) ті, які розглядають лідерство як універсальний феномен людської