LEADERSHIP QUALITIES OF YOUTH

Abstract. In this study, it is aimed to examine the youth leadership characteristics of graduate students. Research is in the scanning model. Youth Leadership specialties scale was used as a data collection tool. The study included 216 students from the Educational and scientific institution of pedagogical education, social work and art of Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University at Cherkasy in 2017–2018 academic year. Data collected were analyzed using Mann Whitney-U and Kruskal Wallis from nonparametric tests. Descriptive factor analysis (FA) and confirmatory factor analysis (DFA) were performed for structural validity of the scale. According to the analysis results, the scale consists of 40 items and 9 factors. These factors have been identified as challenge and goal setting, Communication, Group skills, confidence and confidence, decision-making skills, problem-solving skills and responsibility. Cronbach’s Alpha internal consistency coefficient calculated for reliability of the whole scale was determined as 922. The results of the research according to the characteristics of youth leadership has been influenced by several factors.
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INTRODUCTION

Young people are affected by rapid change and transformation in today’s world and are dealing with personal and social problems. In addition, they have difficulty in discovering and managing themselves. In order to overcome these challenges, it has become even more important to prepare young people for the future in terms of different skills. In this context, it can be said that determining
leadership characteristics, building leadership capacity and developing them are important [1].

**Leadership**

Management, which began to progress as a science from the old times, has made various definitions of leadership along with the pioneers of science, some assumptions and models have been enriched and various ideas of leadership have come up. Leadership is an English word and the word is “lead” as its original verb. In other languages, management in English is not a word that reflects exactly the words “management” and “administration”, but rather a word that meets leadership, which is a necessary and important subject of study. In Turkish, although the word “leadership” and “satisfactory” are suggested, the word “leadership” is used in general [2].

Hemhill and Coons [3] defined leadership as the behaviour of an individual who directed the actions of a group towards a shared goal. According to Burns [4], leadership is the activation of corporate, psychological, political and other resources by individuals to predict, uncover and increase what their followers want [5].

B. Bass [6] leadership is a group process, a matter of personality, influence, persuasion, power relations, and the tool of achieving organizational objectives, or as a combination of structure refers to the establishment of this behavior.

According to T. Yıldırım et al. [7, p. 438], understanding leadership change is the requisite for managing it, but it is not enough. Managers who will do this must have leadership qualities. Every manager is not a good leader. It is enough to define leadership to see the relationship between change and leadership. There are three characteristics that a good leader should have: 1) Vision 2) persuasion 3) ability to motivate. In other words, he has a leading vision. The point to be reached knows. Then it brings people under this vision. He convinces them to think and act accordingly. Big goals require great efforts. Therefore, it is not enough for people to be convinced at first. They need to be constantly motivated on the long road that they need to walk. Otherwise, the excitement will go out in the short term and you will not be able to realize the vision (trf. S. Unal [8, c. 52]).

**Youth Leadership**

Youth leadership can be considered as a separate competence area, encompassing features such as team work, responsibility and ownership in youth development. Youth development also covers the field of youth leadership competencies and looks more holistic in adolescence. A. Edelman et al. [9]. It is observed that the field of leadership is related to different areas of youth development. In fact, the two concepts intersect in particular places for their purposes [10]. According to W. Wheeler and C. Edelbeck [11], youth development activities and youth leadership are separated from each other at this point: youth development activities focus on empowering young people for adolescents’ problems and coping with problems (trf. [1]). The leadership characteristics of young people are shown in Table 1 below:

| Features                  | Fund                                                                 |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Problem solving skills**| Addison, 1985; Karnes, and Bean, 1990; Meyer, 1995; Central Michigan Uniandrsity, 2004:5; ACUI, 2005 |
| **Target setting**        | Addison, 1985; Anyon vd., 2007                                        |
| **Decision-making skills**| Addison, 1985; Fertman and Long, 1990; Fertman and Linden, 1999; Joy, Yang and Farzanehkia, 2000; ACUI, 2005; Anyon vd., 2007 |
| **Group skill**           | Addison, 1985; Meyer, 1995; ACUI, 2005; Conner and Strobel, 2007; Kouzes and Posner, 2007; Ayres ,1987'den akt.,Horstmeier and Ricketts, 2009; Youthbuild, 2015 |
**METHOD**

This section includes the type and pattern of the research, sampling, data collection tools, data collection processes, and data analysis.

**Model Of Research**

This is a research on the descriptive survey model to identify the youth leadership characteristics of the students of the National Institute of Education-Scientific pedagogical education at the Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University in the Cherkassy region of Ukraine. This model is scanning the universe or a group of samples or samples to be taken from it in order to reach a general judgment about the universe in a universe of many elements [12, p. 77–79].

**Universe**

The research universe is composed of the students of the Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University Institute of Education-Scientific pedagogical education, the year 2017–18. During this period, 216 students from 250 students studying at the institute completed the questionnaire. The personal characteristics of the group (gender, age, class, number of siblings, mother and father levels of learning, family income, number of books read in a month and family attitude) were revealed:
Table 2.  
Frequency and Percentage Distributions of Sample Group Demographic Information

| Variants       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Total |
|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| Male           | 15| 201|     |    |    |    | 216   |
| Female         |   | 93.1|    |    |    |    | 100   |
| Gender         | % | 6.9|    |    |    |    |       |
| Age            | 17–| 18| 19| 20| 21+|     | 100   |
| n | 23| 66| 54| 41| 32|  | 216   |
| % | 10.6| 30.6| 25| 19| 14.8| |       |
| Class          | 1 | 2| 3| 4| 5+|     | 100   |
| n | 78| 36| 65| 37|    |    | 216   |
| % | 36.1| 16.7| 30.1| 17.1|    |    |       |
| Sibling        | 1 | 2| 3| 4| 5+|     | 100   |
| n | 82| 80| 34| 8| 12|  | 216   |
| % | 38| 32| 15.7| 3.7| 5.6| |       |
| Mother Education Status |  | Primary | Middle | High | University | Other |  |
| n | 4| 27| 61| 102| 22|  | 216   |
| % | 1.9| 12.5| 28.2| 47.2| 10.2| | 100   |
| Father Education Status |  | Primary | Middle | High | University | Other |  |
| n | 1| 30| 79| 72| 34|  | 216   |
| % | 0.5| 13.9| 36.6| 33.3| 15.7| | 100   |

Analysis of Data
The data collected as a result of the research were encoded in digital environment and made using the SPSS 17.0 (Statistical pack age for the Social Sciences) Program. First of all, according to the personal data sheet survey, gender, age, class, number of siblings, level of education of mother and father, family income, number of books read in one month and family attitude responses, frequency and percentage distributions were obtained. In this way, distribution of sample group was investigated according to demographic differences. In this context:

1. The homogeneity test was conducted while examining the effect of each variable on youth leadership. The results of the analysis of variance (Anova) and the non-parametric Kruskal Wallis-H and Mann Whitney-U tests were used for the non-parametric variables.

2. When differentiation is detected as a result of Anova, multivariate LSD tests between variance to determine the variable.

3. A non-parametric Mann Whitney-U test was used to determine the variable when the difference was determined as a result of the Kruskal Wallis test.

Manicures were tested at Level 05, other manicure levels were also specified and the findings were presented in tables for the purposes of the study.

FINDINGS
Below are the findings of the students’ perceptions of youth leadership characteristics.

The reliability test of the youth leadership characteristics scale was conducted and was found as 922.

The Mann Whitney U test is shown in Table 3 to examine the effect of youth leadership characteristics scores on gender variables.
Table 3

| Leadership features                  | Gender  | n   | Sequence average | The sum of the sequence | U      | Z       | p      |
|-------------------------------------|---------|-----|------------------|-------------------------|--------|---------|--------|
| Struggle and target setting         | Female  | 201 | 108.46           | 21800.00                | 1499.00| -0.036  | .970   |
|                                     | Male    | 15  | 109.07           | 1636.00                 |         |         |        |
| Communicating                       | Female  | 201 | 109.12           | 21932.50                | 1383.50| -0.532  | .594   |
|                                     | Male    | 15  | 107.98           | 17204.00                |         |         |        |
| Group skill                         | Female  | 201 | 107.98           | 21704.00                | 1403.00| -0.448  | .654   |
|                                     | Male    | 15  | 115.47           | 1732.00                 |         |         |        |
| Confidence and Being reliable       | Female  | 201 | 107.43           | 21593.00                | 1292.00| -0.926  | .354   |
|                                     | Male    | 15  | 122.87           | 1843.00                 |         |         |        |
| Decision making skills              | Female  | 201 | 108.31           | 21770.00                | 1469.00| -0.165  | .868   |
|                                     | Male    | 15  | 111.07           | 1666.00                 |         |         |        |
| Problem solving skills              | Female  | 201 | 107.39           | 21584.50                | 1283.50| -0.968  | .333   |
|                                     | Male    | 15  | 123.43           | 1851.50                 |         |         |        |
| Liability and responsibility        | Female  | 201 | 107.73           | 21654.00                | 1353.00| -0.664  | .506   |
|                                     | Male    | 15  | 118.80           | 1782.00                 |         |         |        |

In Table 3, non-parametric Mann Whitney-U test results were presented to determine whether the subscales of youth leadership characteristics differ significantly from gender. In terms of gender variables, there was no statistically significant difference between female students and male students (p > .05).

The Kruskal Wallis-H test is shown in Table 4 to examine the effect of youth leadership characteristics scores on age variables.

Table 4

| Leadership features                  | Groups          | n   | \(X_{	ext{raw}}\) | \(X^2\) | SD  | p      |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----|-------------------|--------|-----|--------|
| Struggle and target setting         | 17 and – age    | 23  | 107.04            | 3.59   | 4   | .463   |
|                                     | 18 age          | 66  | 111.28            |         |     |        |
|                                     | 19 age          | 54  | 95.68             |         |     |        |
|                                     | 20 age          | 41  | 118.26            |         |     |        |
|                                     | 21 and + age    | 32  | 112.92            |         |     |        |
| Communicating                       | 17 and – age    | 23  | 81.63             | 8.63   | 4   | .071   |
|                                     | 18 age          | 66  | 112.11            |         |     |        |
|                                     | 19 age          | 54  | 100.21            |         |     |        |
|                                     | 20 age          | 41  | 125.52            |         |     |        |
|                                     | 21 and + age    | 32  | 112.53            |         |     |        |
| Group skill                         | 17 and – age    | 23  | 82.56             | 8.66   | 4   | .070   |
|                                     | 18 age          | 66  | 122.68            |         |     |        |
|                                     | 19 age          | 54  | 99.38             |         |     |        |
|                                     | 20 age          | 41  | 109.45            |         |     |        |
|                                     | 21 and + age    | 32  | 112.00            |         |     |        |
| Confidence and Being reliable       | 17 and – age    | 23  | 114.06            | 13.98  | 4   | .007   |
|                                     | 18 age          | 66  | 124.31            |         |     |        |
|                                     | 19 age          | 54  | 83.14             |         |     |        |
|                                     | 20 age          | 41  | 106.90            |         |     |        |
In Table 4, nonparametric Kruskal Wallis-H test results were presented in order to determine whether the subscales of youth leadership characteristics differ significantly from age variables.

When the level of youth leadership was examined in terms of age, a statistically significant difference was observed between age variable and trust sub-dimension of trust \( (\chi^2=13.98; p<.05) \).

Given the average range of groups, it is observed that those 18 years of age have the lowest level of confidence and reliability, followed by those 21 years and older, those 17 years and six years, those 20 years and those 19 years, respectively. After this result, the Mann Whitney-U test was used to determine which groups of differences were related.

When we look at the age range of confidence and confidence subscale as age variables, there was a statistically significant difference between 18 and 19 years of age in favor of 18 years of age \( (U=1104.00; p<.05) \).

There was a statistically significant difference between 19 years and 21 years and above in favor of 21 years and above \( (U=595.00; p<.05) \).

The Kruskal Wallis-H test is shown in Table 5 in order to examine the effect of youth leadership characteristics scores on class variables.

**Table 5.**

Kruskal Wallis-H Test Results of youth Leadership Characteristics According to Students' Class Variable

| Leadership features | Groups | n  | X̄ara | X²  | SD  | p    |
|---------------------|--------|----|-------|-----|-----|------|
| Struggle and target setting | 1st class | 78 | 112.35 | 6.66 | 3   | .084 |
|                     | 2nd class | 36 | 127.26 |     |     |      |
|                     | 3rd class | 65 | 102.78 |     |     |      |
|                     | 4th class | 37 | 92.14  |     |     |      |
| Communicating       | 1st class | 78 | 111.58 | 0.51 | 3   | .915 |
|                     | 2nd class | 36 | 110.90 |     |     |      |
|                     | 3rd class | 65 | 105.55 |     |     |      |
|                     | 4th class | 37 | 104.82 |     |     |      |
| Group skill         | 1st class | 78 | 114.05 | 6.48 | 3   | .090 |
|                     | 2nd class | 36 | 123.18 |     |     |      |
|                     | 3rd class | 65 | 104.83 |     |     |      |
|                     | 4th class | 37 | 88.93  |     |     |      |
| Confidence and Being reliable | 1st class | 78 | 127.14 | 17.07 | 3 | .001 |
|                     | 2nd class | 36 | 118.86 |     |     |      |
|                     | 3rd class | 65 | 88.40  |     |     |      |
|                     | 4th class | 37 | 93.76  |     |     |      |
| Decision making skills | 1st class | 78 | 122.76 | 8.57 | 3 | .036 |
|                      | 2nd class | 36 | 112.52 |     |     |      |
|                      | 3rd class | 65 | 98.60  |     |     |      |
|                      | 4th class | 37 | 91.89  |     |     |      |
In Table 5, non-parametric Kruskal Wallis-H test results were presented in order to determine whether the subscales of youth leadership characteristics differ significantly from the class variable.

A statistically significant difference was observed between the class variable and the sub-dimension of trust and trust when looking at the level of youth leadership characteristics in terms of class variables ($x^2=17.07; p<.05$).

When we look at the level of youth leadership characteristics in terms of class variables, there was a statistically significant difference between the class variable and the sub-dimension of decision making skills ($x^2=8.57; p<.05$).

Considering the row averages of groups, the bottom-dimension of reliability and reliability is the highest level of 1. the class is owned by those who do this, respectively. the ones in Class, 4. those of you at the age of 3. those who are in the class are watching.

Given the row averages of the groups, decision making skills sub-size, maximum level 1. the class is owned by those who do this, respectively. the ones in Class, 3. class year-olds, 4. those who are in the class are watching. After these results, the Mann Whitney-U test was used to determine which groups of differences were related.

As a result of the Mann Whitney-U test, the confidence and reliability subscale is considered as class variables. class 3. Class 1. there was a statistically significant difference in favor of the Class ($U=1634.00; p<.05$). When you look at the child dimension of trust and trust as class variables, you see that 1. Class 4. Class 1. there was a statistically significant difference in favor of the Class ($U=978.50; p<.05$).

When you look at the child dimension of trust and trust as class variables, you see 2. Class 4. between Class 2 and Class 2. statistically significant difference in class favor ($U=839.00; p<.05$).

As a class variable to the lower dimension of Decision-Making Skills, 1. class 3. Class 1. there was a statistically significant difference in favor of the Class ($U=1971.50; p<.05$). As a class variable to the lower dimension of Decision-Making Skills, 1. Class 4. Class 1. there was a statistically significant difference in favor of the Class ($U=1027.0; p<.05$).

Kruskal Wallis-H test was used to examine the effect of Youth Leadership Characteristics scores on the number of siblings and there was no statistically significant difference.

The Kruskal Wallis-H test to examine the effect of the Youth Leadership Characteristics scores on the mother’s education level variable is shown in Table 6.
The results of the non-parametric Kruskal Wallis-H test were presented in Table 6 to determine whether the subscales of youth leadership characteristics differ significantly from the maternal learning status variable.

When we look at the level of youth leadership in terms of maternal learning level variables, there was a statistically significant difference between the desire to fight with the mother learning level variable and the target setting subscale ($\chi^2=11.68; p<.05$). After this result, the Mann Whitney-U test was used to determine which groups of differences were related.

When we look at the sub-size of the struggle request and target setting as the maternal learning level variable, there was a statistically significant difference between the primary school and University in favor of the University ($U=79.50; p<.05$).

When we look at the sub-size of the Fight Request and target setting as the maternal learning level variable, there was a statistically significant difference between the University and the other in favor of the University ($U=660.00; p<.05$).

Kruskal Wallis-H test conducted to examine the effect of the Youth Leadership Characteristics scores on the father’s education level variable is shown in Table 7.

**Table 7**
The Results Of Kruskal Wallis-H Test According to the Student Learning Level Variable Of The Youth Leadership Characteristics of the Students

| Leadership features | Groups       | n  | $X_{med}$ | $X^2$ | SD  | p   |
|---------------------|--------------|----|-----------|-------|-----|-----|
| Struggle and target setting | Primary School | 1  | 70.50     | 4.99  | 4   | .288|
|                     | Middle School | 30 | 107.63    |       |     |     |
|                     | High School  | 79 | 112.87    |       |     |     |
|                     | University   | 72 | 114.19    |       |     |     |
|                     | Other        | 34 | 88.16     |       |     |     |
| Communicating       | Primary School | 1  | 91.50     | 4.99  | 4   | .369|
|                     | Middle School | 30 | 103.18    |       |     |     |
|                     | High School  | 79 | 103.67    |       |     |     |
|                     | University   | 72 | 120.68    |       |     |     |
|                     | Other        | 34 | 99.10     |       |     |     |
| Group skill         | Primary School | 1  | 150.50    | 6.43  | 4   | .169|
|                     | Middle School | 30 | 107.93    |       |     |     |
The results of the non-parametric Kruskal Wallis-H test were presented in Table 7 to determine whether the sub-dimensions of youth leadership characteristics differ significantly from the father learning status variable.

There was a statistically significant difference between the parental level variable and the liability and liability subscale ($X^2 = 10.60; p < .05$). After this result, the Mann Whitney-U test was used to determine which groups of differences were related.

When we look at the sub-dimension of responsibility and responsibility as the father Education Level variable, there was a statistically significant difference between high school and high school in favor of high school ($U = 957.50; p < .05$).

The Kruskal Wallis-H test was conducted to examine the effect of youth leadership characteristics scores on the number of monthly books and monthly family income variables, and there was no statistically significant difference.

The Kruskal Wallis-H test to examine the effect of the Youth Leadership Characteristics scores on the family attitude variable is shown in Table 8.

Table 8
Kruskal Wallis-H Test Results According To The Student’s Family Tutum of Youth Leadership Characteristics

| Leadership features          | Groups                  | n    | $X_{sra}$ | $X^2$ | SD  | p   |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|------|-----------|-------|-----|-----|
| Struggle and target setting | Reassuring and consulting | 182  | 114.53    |       |     |     |
|                             | Extreme requester and protectionist | 17   | 80.32     | 11.01 | 3   | .004|
|                             | Forced everything       | 17   | 72.02     |       |     |     |
| Communicating               | Reassuring and consulting | 182  | 113.30    |       |     |     |
|                             | Extreme requester and protectionist | 17   | 93.73     | 7.92  | 3   | .019|
|                             | Forced everything       | 17   | 71.79     |       |     |     |
| Group skill                 | Reassuring and consulting | 182  | 113.22    |       |     |     |
|                             | Extreme requester and protectionist | 17   | 96.55     | 8.21  | 3   | .016|
In Table 8, non-parametric Kruskal Wallis-H test results were presented in order to determine whether the subscales of youth leadership characteristics differ significantly from the family attitude variable.

When we look at the level of youth leadership characteristics in terms of family attitudes variable, there was a statistically significant difference between the desire to fight against the family attitude variable and the target setting subscale ($X^2=11.01; p<.05$). When we look at the level of youth leadership characteristics in terms of the family attitude variable, there was a statistically significant difference between the family attitude variable and the sub-dimension of communication ($X^2=7.92; p<.05$). There was a statistically significant difference between the family attitude variable and the sub-dimension of Group skills when the level of youth leadership characteristics was compared with the family attitude variable ($X^2=8.21; p<.05$). When we look at the level of youth leadership characteristics in terms of family attitude variables, there was a statistically significant difference between the family attitude variable and the sub-dimension of trust and trust ($X^2=14.29; p<.05$). When we look at the level of youth leadership characteristics in terms of family attitude variables, there was a statistically significant difference between the family attitude variable and the lower dimension of decision-making skills ($X^2=9.19; p<.05$). A statistically significant difference was observed between the family attitude variable and the liability subscale ($X^2=13.70; p<.05$). After these results, the Mann Whitney-U test was used to determine which groups of differences were related.

When we look at the family attitude variable in the Fight Request and target setting subscale, there was a statistically significant difference between reassuring and opinion consultation and overly trusting and advocate in favor of opinion consultation ($U=1051.0; p<.05$).

As a family attitude variable to the lower dimension of decision-making skills, there was a statistically significant difference between reassuring and opinion consultation and overly trusting and protectionist in favor of opinion supervision ($U=1043.5; p<.05$).

**CONCLUSION and RECOMMENDATIONS**

There was no statistically significant difference in the gender dimension of the youth leadership characteristics of the participants. This result supports some research [13-15], and does not support some research [16-18].

The characteristics of the students who participated in the study differed statistically from the age of the children in terms of their confidence and reliability in the sub-dimensions of youth leadership. According to this, the size of reliability and reliability were found to be higher in younger people. This result supports the research of R. Cansoy and S. Turan [1] and does not support the research of M. Sutter and M. Kocher [19].

It was found that the characteristics of the students who participated in the study differ statistically from the class variables in terms of their ability to trust and to be reliable and to decide on the sub-
dimensions of youth leadership. According to this result, 1. by showing confidence and becoming reliable students in the class with a higher participation of this substance, and decision-making skills decision-making skills of High students in the first class of the variables can be said to be safe and secure.

There was no statistically significant difference in the number of siblings of the children involved in the study. This result of the research supports R. Cansoy and S. Turan [1] research.

The characteristics of the students who participated in the study were found to differ statistically from the mother’s learning level variables and the desire to struggle from the sub-dimensions of the youth leadership characteristics. According to this result, students who graduate from their mothers are more successful in showing their goals and wishes. These findings support some studies and do not support others. In S. Açı̇k’s [17] study, there was no difference between the problem solving sub-dimension and the parent education level. Similarly, the decision-making behaviour of the university students in Gürçay’s [20] study does not change according to the level of education of parents (Yiğit, [21]; Saygılı, [22]).

The characteristics of responsibility and responsibility of the students who participated in the study were found to differ statistically from the level of the father’s learning variables. In a similar study, communication skills vary positively depending on Father education level (Dalkılıç, [23]) and as the mother education level increases, positive communication can be established with children and democratic attitude increases (İnceoğlu and others, trf. Dalkılıç, [23]). Especially at this age, individuals make their decisions with social content in a more friendly environment (Bednar and Fisher, [24]).

There was no statistically significant difference between the number of books and the monthly family income of the participants in the study.

It was found that the responsibility and responsibility characteristics of the students who participated in the study were statistically different from the family attitude variables. According to this result, it can be argued that the students who are confident in their behaviour and whose ideas are given importance are more effective in showing leadership characteristics and have a positive role in developing youth leadership characteristics.
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ЗАСОБИ ФОРМУВАННЯ ПОТРЕБОВО-МОТИВАЦІЙНОГО КОМПОНЕНТА КОНКУРЕНТОСПРОМОЖНОСТІ МАЙБУТНЬОГО ФАХІВЦЯ МУНІЦИПАЛЬНОЇ ЕКОНОМІКИ

У статті проаналізовано процес формування компонентів конкурентоспроможності майбутніх економістів під час навчання в ЗВО, зокрема потребово-мотиваційного, когнітивно-операційного й рефлексивно-організаційного компонентів, що входять до змісту цієї конкурентоспроможності. Встановлено докладно роль і значення потребово-мотиваційного компоненту в навчанні майбутнього фахівця муніципальної економіки в технічному університеті. Зазначено, що принципи формування кожного з компонентів конкурентоспроможності у межах теоретично обґрунтованої системи було визначено на засадах студентоцентрованого навчання; впливу на когнітивну, афективну, психомоторну сферу особистості, а також актуалізації зазалючних компетенцій майбутнього фахівця. Виявлено, що формування потребово-мотиваційного компоненту конкурентоспроможності майбутніх фахівців муніципальної економіки, запропоновано вправи з активізації мотиваційного потенціалу особистості, представлено організаційні форми їх формування зазначеного компонента (методи і засоби, зокрема аудіовізуальні й автоматизовані тощо).

Ключові слова: конкурентоспроможність; потребово-мотиваційний компонент; принципи формування конкурентоспроможності; студентоцентроване навчання; внутрішня мотивація.

Постановка проблеми. Концепт «конкурентоспроможність» спосібно майбутніх фахівців муніципальної економіки залежних вищої освіти дозволяє зорієнтуватися на формуванні конкретних компонентів, що входить до його змісту, а саме: потребово-мотиваційного, когнітивно-операційного й рефлексивно-організаційного. На основі характеристик цих компонентів розроблено науково-методичну систему формування зазначеного утворення, до якої віднесено множину взаємопов’язаних елементів.