



Статистика, учет и аудит, 1(100)2026. стр. 139-149  
DOI: <https://www.doi.org/10.51579/1563-2415.2026.-1.10>

Interdisciplinary research in economics  
SRSTI 06.81.65  
UDC 331.101.3

## METHODOLOGY FOR ASSESSING THE MOTIVATION OF THE TEACHING STAFF IN CONSTRUCTING A UNIVERSITY RATING

N.T. Sailaubekov<sup>1</sup>, G.T. Mynzhanova<sup>2\*</sup>, G.T. Temiralieva<sup>1</sup>, G.R. Dauliyeva<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Kazakh-German University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

<sup>2</sup>Kazakh Ablai khan University of International Relations and World Languages,  
Almaty, Kazakhstan

<sup>4</sup>Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

\*Corresponding author e-mail: [gulzhakan3108@gmail.com](mailto:gulzhakan3108@gmail.com)

**Abstract.** Higher education institutions contribute to increasing the competitiveness of the national economy through the training of high-quality personnel necessary for various sectors of the economy. On the other hand, universities, as subjects of a market economy, want to improve and strengthen their positions in the educational services market. For these purposes, the university management can use various strategies, such as improving the marketing activities, updating the content of educational programs and teaching methods, providing the necessary infrastructure for the educational process, etc. In general, it should be noted that regardless of what strategy the university management has developed to improve its rating, it is impossible to implement them without interested and motivated teachers. The article is devoted to the study of the relationship between the motivation of teachers and the competitiveness of the University. The purpose of the article is to develop a methodology for assessing the motivation of teaching staff in constructing a university rating. This method has been tested using certain motivational factors. The results of the study allow us to conclude that the level of motivation of the teaching staff of a higher educational institution affects its competitiveness.

**Keywords:** competitiveness of the university, teaching staff, university, teacher motivation, motivation factors.

**Main provisions.** Increasing the university competitiveness and holding this position are essential for the university top management. All decisions regarding the ways to increase competitiveness should be considered by the top management in a complex, while the teacher should be in the center of attention, since a qualified and motivated teaching staff will allow the university management to implement the university's missions and objectives at the proper level.

Hypothesis 1. The level of motivation of the teaching staff of a higher educational institution affects its competitiveness.

Hypothesis 2. The level of training of competitive graduates and the improvement of the quality of education also depend on the level of professional training of the teacher.

---

**Cite this article as:** Sailaubekov N.T., Mynzhanova G.T., Temiralieva G.T., Dauliyeva G R. Methodology for assessing the motivation of the teaching staff in constructing a university rating. *Statistics, accounting and audit.* 2026, 1(100), 139-149. DOI: <https://www.doi.org/10.51579/1563-2415.2026.-1.10>



**Introduction.** Higher education institutions contribute to the formation of public consciousness by transferring knowledge and skills, thereby training highly qualified specialists for various sectors of the country's economy. In addition, the contribution of higher education to the functioning of society and the economy, to the economic growth of the country [1], the development of innovations, market development, reduction of unemployment, improvement of the quality of human capital, improvement of research activities and prosperity of each nation is undeniable [2]. The more developed a country is, the more attention it pays to education and its role in economic and social development. At the same time, recipients of educational services constantly test and evaluate their quality[3].

The intensification of competition forces higher education institutions to look for ways and methods to combat competition not only between local universities, but also foreign higher education institutions. In this regard, universities have begun to consider the problem of increasing the competitiveness of higher education institutions as one of the main ones, since a successful solution to this problem allows the university to occupy a worthy niche in the educational services market, ensuring demand for its educational services in the long term. The purpose of the article is to develop a methodology for assessing the motivation of teaching staff in constructing a university rating. At the same time, the effective and rationally using of human resources contribute to the company achieving the desired results.

Thus, given the above considerations, the present research topic is highly relevant in the contemporary context. It should be noted that the problem lies in the fact that the currently existing quantitative tools/mechanisms used to assess the competitiveness of higher education institutions in the Republic of Kazakhstan do not fully take into account the influence of motivation of the teaching staff. Therefore, the purpose of this article is to develop a methodology for assessing the motivation of the teaching staff when compiling a university rating. In accordance with this purpose, the authors of the study set and solved the following tasks: based on the literature reviews, the main motivation factors of the university's teaching staff were identified, which are grouped into certain blocks; information was collected through a survey; estimates were obtained on the introduction of motivational incentives from the university side for each block of motivational factors; The weights of the analyzed blocks and each indicator of the corresponding block are calculated, on the basis of which the final assessment of the performance of the indicators of the block of motivational factors is obtained.

The methodology developed by the authors for assessing the motivation of the teaching staff has a novelty and can be used by the rating agency in assessing the competitiveness of universities in terms of motivation of the teaching staff. The purpose of the article is to develop a methodology for assessing the motivation of teaching staff in constructing a university rating. The use of the proposed methodology for rating the university's activities by the university management is expected to enhance interest of the teaching staff and enable the university management to make timely decisions in human resource management. This, in turn will lead to improvements in the university's ranking and overall competitiveness.

**Literature review.** Summarizing the well-known definitions of university competitiveness, two main features can be identified that reflect the essence of the concept of "university competitiveness", such as superiority over competitors in a number of determining factors and the ability of an educational institution to adapt in a timely manner to changing environmental conditions [4]. Other researchers believe that competitiveness can be



represented as the process of managing competitive advantages, i.e. the essential strengths of an organization, as well as activities aimed at their creation and management [2].

The competitiveness of the university depends on the quality of educational services is offered, focusing on the needs of recipients of educational services. Therefore, one of the effective ways to increase the competitiveness of the university is to improve the quality of services provided. In order to improve the quality of services, various determinants were studied, but some authors emphasize the support from the teaching staff, noting that this particular determinant had a significant positive impact on the competitiveness of the educational institution[5].

The relationship between the level of competitiveness of higher education and the amount of its financing per student ( $R = 0.895$ ) [6]. At the same time, they revealed a significant direct correlation between the level of competitiveness of higher education and the human development index ( $R = 0.787$ ) and the global competitiveness index ( $R = 0.888$ ). It should also be noted that the competitiveness of the university is related to the training of personnel who can withstand competition in the labor market. For example, [7] proposed to assess the competitiveness of the university using a dynamic normative model, using indicators such as the quality of education, the quality of teaching and the profitability of the university. In order to increase the potential and motivation of teachers, the university management should strive to create an environment conducive to creativity and knowledge development, support their initiatives to improve skills and develop abilities, thereby using the potential of teachers' labor will allow the university to increase its competitive advantage [8]. By analyzing existing theories of motivation, such as the theory of need of Maslau, F.Herzberg's theory of motivation, Porter-Lower's Theory of motivation, motivational theory of goal setting, Vroom's theory of expectation and comes to the conclusion that the theoretical factors influencing motivation and performance of teachers include attitude to the teaching profession, remuneration and compensation, working conditions and professional growth [9]. Some authors recommend paying special attention to non-financial motivation tools and using them to the maximum [8]. However, the condition for achieving the effect of non-financial motivators is the need for university executives to develop high-level interpersonal communication skills, that is, open and encouraging communication skills, creative management skills, positive motivation skills, etc. [1, 10]. Some scientists suggest motivating teachers in order to increase interest in conducting research. Thus, Yanping Li and Lili Xu note three factors (mentoring, working conditions and remuneration) significantly influenced the participation of teachers in research [7, 11]. Creating conditions that enhance teachers' motivation and the university's innovative climate improves educational quality, teachers' professional competence, and university competitiveness, as shown by the model proposed by G. Mynzhanova et al. [12].

**Materials and methods.** In modern conditions, increasing the competitiveness of higher education institutions is one of the main tasks that the university is trying to solve, since the successful solution of this problem provides an advantageous position in the market of educational services in the long term. In this regard, today's universities have begun to pay special attention to improving the quality of educational programs, using their tools to motivate teachers, which affects their competitiveness in market conditions. Our research is quantitative in nature, where a survey might be used to determine feedback from the teaching staff. The primary data analysis according to the proposed methodology would help to identify the level of teaching motivation at a university and its impact to the university competitiveness. The creation of conditions by the university to increase the internal motivation of teachers and improve the quality of the innovation climate at the university [13]



will allow it to search for innovative teaching methods, improve its theoretical knowledge base, form and update the contents of practical assignments in the discipline taught and, thus, enriches the structural and substantive side of the discipline, which leads to an improvement in the quality of educational programs and the organization of the educational process at the university.

The developed methodology includes several sequential stages:

1. Collection and analytical processing of a primary data;
2. Calculation of grades for the introduction of motivational incentives by the university for each block of motivational factors;
3. Calculation of the weight estimates of the analyzed blocks and each indicator of the corresponding block;
4. Calculation of estimates for the performance of indicators for the corresponding blocks of motivational factors, taking into account weight;
5. General assessment of the motivational factors block indicators  $G_k$ ;
6. General assessment of the motivation of a teacher at a university (university rating on the motivation of teaching staff).

For the first stage, the survey results should be used; for the second, the Likert scale and the results of the first stage are used; for the third, the pair comparison matrices; for the fourth, fifth and sixth stages, the authors have developed calculation formulas. This sequence made it possible to ensure the logical completeness of the research and the reproducibility of the methodology for other research objects. The developed methodology is theoretical in nature. The number of blocks used and the factors included in these blocks may vary depending on the preferences of the researchers.

**Results and discussion.** Below is a methodology for evaluating the university's rating on the motivation of teaching staff, which includes the following stages:

**Stage 1.** Collection and analytical processing of initial information.

Collection of the information is done by a survey. It is conducted among the teaching staff of the university. The questionnaires offer answers to questions reflecting the main forms of motivation for the work of a higher school teacher. At the same time, the main forms of teacher motivation consist of  $k$  groups of factors, which are the main motivational incentives for teachers to improve the quality of educational services.

The Likert scale is used in the survey, which allows to identify and evaluate the opinions of respondents using answer options from 1 (I completely disagree) up to 5 (totally agree) [14].

The information obtained during the survey is entered in Table 3 using the Likert scale. At the same time, the number of respondents who rated the corresponding factor with a value of "1" (completely disagree) we enter in column 3 and denote by  $d^{k_{i1}}$ , the number of respondents who rated the corresponding factor with the value "2" (rather disagree) we write in column 4 and denote by  $d^{k_{i2}}$ , the number of respondents who chose the value "3" (rather agree) it is entered in column 5 and denoted by  $d^{k_{i3}}$ , the number of respondents with the value "4" (agree) we add to column 6 and denote by  $d^{k_{i4}}$ , the number of respondents, who evaluated the corresponding factor with a value of "5" (completely agree) we add it to column 7 and denote it by  $d^{k_{i5}}$ . Here and further,  $i$  – is the factor number of the  $k$  block of motivational factors, where  $k=1,2,\dots$

**Stage 2.** Calculation of grades for the introduction of motivational incentives by the university for each block of motivational factors.



This estimate of the indicator  $D_i^k$  for the  $i$  factor from the  $k$ -th block of motivational factors is calculated using the formula:

$$D_i^k = \frac{a_{i3}^k + a_{i4}^k + a_{i5}^k}{\sum_{j=1}^5 a_{ij}^k} = \frac{a_{i3}^k + a_{i4}^k + a_{i5}^k}{N} \quad (1)$$

where,  $j$  - the number of the answer option ( $j=1, 2, \dots, 5$ ).

The maximum value for this estimate is defined within  $0 \leq D_i^k \leq 1$ . We will assume that the threshold value is 0.51, i.e. the majority of respondents (more than 50% agree with this factor). Obtained estimations are entered in column 9 in Table 1.

**Table 1-** Calculation of Estimates for the Implementation of the G1 block factors

№	Factors	The number of respondents who:					Total respondents	Evaluation $D_i^1$
		Totally Disagree	Rather Disagree	Rather agree	Agree	Completely Agree		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	$F_1^1$	$d_{11}^1$	$d_{12}^1$	$d_{13}^1$	$d_{14}^1$	$d_{15}^1$	N	$D_1^1$
2	$F_2^1$	$d_{21}^1$	$d_{22}^1$	$d_{23}^1$	$d_{24}^1$	$d_{25}^1$	N	$D_2^1$
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
I	$F_i^1$	$d_{i1}^1$	$d_{i2}^1$	$d_{i3}^1$	$d_{i4}^1$	$d_{i5}^1$	N	$D_i^1$
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
$m_1$	$F_{m1}^1$	$d_{m1,1}^1$	$d_{m1,2}^1$	$d_{m1,3}^1$	$d_{m1,4}^1$	$d_{m1,5}^1$	N	$D_{m1}^1$

Note: compiled by the authors

Here  $F_1^1, F_2^1, \dots, F_{m1}^1$  are the factors of block  $G_1$ ;  $D_i^1$  – are the estimates for the fulfillment of the  $i$  labor motivation factor for block  $G_1$

By analogy with Table 1, the calculation of estimates for the performance of factors for an arbitrary  $G_k$  block is shown in Table 2.

**Table 2-** Calculation of Estimates for the Fulfillment of Factors for the  $G_1$  block

№	Factors	The number of respondents who:					Total respondent	Evaluation $D_i^k$
		Totally Disagree	Rather Disagree	Rather agree	Agree	Completely Agree		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	$F_1^k$	$d_{11}^k$	$d_{12}^k$	$d_{13}^k$	$d_{14}^k$	$d_{15}^k$	N	$D_1^k$
2	$F_2^k$	$d_{21}^k$	$d_{22}^k$	$d_{23}^k$	$d_{24}^k$	$d_{25}^k$	N	$D_2^k$
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
I	$F_i^k$	$d_{i1}^k$	$d_{i2}^k$	$d_{i3}^k$	$d_{i4}^k$	$d_{i5}^k$	N	$D_i^k$
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
$m_k$	$F_{mk}^k$	$d_{mk,1}^k$	$d_{mk,2}^k$	$d_{mk,3}^k$	$d_{mk,4}^k$	$d_{mk,5}^k$	N	$D_{mk}^k$

Note: compiled by the authors



Here  $F_1^k, F_2^k, \dots, F_{m_1}^k$  – are the factors of the  $G_k$ ;  $D_i^k$  – are the estimates for the fulfillment of the  $i$  labor motivation factor for the  $G_k$  block.

**Stage 3.** Calculation of the weight estimates of the analyzed blocks and each indicator of the corresponding block.

To assess the weight of each block, the method of expert assessments is used which allows, based on the preferences of the interested party, to rank the degree of importance of blocks of factors motivating the work of university teachers [13, 110].

The experts were asked to consider the above blocks of factors motivating the work of teachers to rank the degree of importance of these blocks. The results of the expert analysis are as follows:

$$G_1 \succ G_2 \succ \dots \succ G_k \dots \succ G_s \quad (2)$$

where:  $G_k$  is the  $k$  block of motivational factors;  
 $\succ$  - a sign of preference.

Based on preferences (2), a matrix of paired comparisons for blocks of work motivations is constructed (Table 3). At the same time, the cells of the matrix of paired comparisons are filled in according to the following formula:

$$m_{kj} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } G_k \succ G_j \\ 0, & \text{if } G_k \prec G_j \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where  $k$  – is the row (block) number,  $j$  – is the column number.

The comparison values are summed by row and entered in column 8. The weight of the corresponding block of factors that motivate teachers is determined by the formula:

$$\mu^k = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^s m_{kj}}{\sum_{k,j=1}^s m_{kj}} \quad (4)$$

Calculations using the formula (4) are entered in the corresponding cells of Table 3, column 6.

**Table 3 - Matrix of Paired Comparisons of Work Motivation Blocks**

Factor Block (G)	Group	$G_1$	$G_2$	...	$G_k$	...	$G_s$	Amount	Block weight, $\mu^k$
1		2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
$G_1$		1	1	...	1	...	1	S	$\mu^1$
$G_2$		0	1	...	1	...	1	s-1	$\mu^2$
...		...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
$G_k$		0	0	...	1	...	1	s-k-1	$\mu^k$
...		...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
$G_s$		0	0	0	0	0	1	1	$\mu^s$
Amount								$\frac{(1+s)s}{2}$	1



Next, to determine the weight of each factor, we use the following formula:

$$\mu_i^k = \frac{\mu^k}{m_k} \quad (5)$$

where:  $\mu_i^k$  – is the weight of the  $i$  factor from the  $k$  block,  $m_k$  – is the number of factors in the  $k$  block.

Using formula (5), we obtain the following weight estimates for the  $i$  factor of the  $k$  block. When calculating the weight of each factor of the corresponding block, we assumed that these factors have the same weight inside the block.

**Stage 4.** Calculation of estimates for the performance of indicators for the corresponding blocks of motivational factors, taking into account weight.

The assessment of the performance of indicators for the  $i$  factor of the  $k$  block of motivational factors, taking into account ( $K_i^k$ ), is determined by the following formula:

$$K_i^k = \mu_i^k * D_i^k \quad (6)$$

Using formula (6), we obtain estimates for the performance of indicators for the  $i$  factor of the  $k$  block of motivational factors, taking into account the weight ( $K_i^k$ ), which are entered in Table 4, column 5.

**Table 4** - Calculation of Estimates for the Fulfillment of the Factors of the  $G_k$  Motivational Factors Block, Taking into Account its weight

№	Factors	Weight of factors, $\mu_i^k$	$D_i^k$	Assessment of factors based on weight, $K_i^k$
1	2	3	4	5
1	$F_1^k$	$\mu_1^k$	$D_1^k$	$K_1^k$
2	$F_2^k$	$\mu_2^k$	$D_2^k$	$K_2^k$
	.....	...	...	...
I	$F_i^k$	$\mu_i^k$	$D_i^k$	$K_i^k$
	...	...	...	...
$m_k$	$F_{mk}^k$	$\mu_{mk}^k$	$D_{mk}^k$	$K_{mk}^k$
The final assessment of the block				$K^k$

**Stage 5.** General assessment of the performance of the indicators of the motivational factors block  $G_k$ .

The calculation of the  $K^k$  score for the performance of indicators for the blocks of motivational factors  $G_k$  is performed using the following formula:

$$K_i^k = \sum_{i=1}^{m_k} K_i^k \quad (7)$$

The values calculated by formula (7) are entered in column 5 in Table 4.

**Stage 6.** General assessment of the motivation of a teacher at a university (university rating on the motivation of teaching staff)

The general assessment of work motivation at the university or the university's rating on work motivation of the teaching staff is calculated using the formula:



$$R = K^1 + K^2 + \dots + K^k \quad (8)$$

Formula (8) determines the rating assessment of the motivation of university teachers and takes into account the importance of a group of indicators by introducing weight indices to differentiate the assessment in accordance with the threshold values of the assessments. The values of the labor motivation ratings of the analyzed university will fall into the range [0,1]. We define the threshold value at 0.51 points.

We propose the following classification of the university rating based on teacher motivation, which divides the above interval into a number of intervals (Table 5).

**Table 5-** Classification of the University Ranking by Motivation of the Teaching Staff

Class		Condition	Rating value	The value of threshold estimates
A	A+	Best	0.81-1.0	0.95-1.0
	A			0.91-0.95
	A-			0.81-0.9
B	B+	Average	0.51-0.80	0.71-0.80
	B			0.61-0.70
	B-			0.51-0.60
C	C	Worst	0-0.50	0-0.50

Source: The author's elaboration

**Conclusion.** To achieve operational and strategic goals in the higher education system, the implementation of human resource management functions involves a combination of administrative, economic, and socio-psychological methods. Under modern conditions, priority should be given to the use of economic methods, as this approach promotes increased engagement, responsibility, initiative, and more active involvement of the academic staff in university activities, thereby enabling the achievement of set goals and the implementation of the university's strategy. One of this method is the motivation of teaching staff. This research paper developed a comprehensive methodology for evaluating university teachers' motivation and for determining a university's rating based on teacher motivation. The methodology assesses the performance of motivational factors while taking their weights into account. Based on these results, the current university rating in terms of teaching staff motivation can be determined, which in turn influences the assessment of its competitiveness in higher educational service market conditions. This methodology has practical significance and can be used by a rating agency in assessing the competitiveness of universities in terms of motivation of teaching staff.

The above methodology for evaluating the motivation of university teachers was tested for values  $s=3$  (number of blocks of motivational factors),  $m_1=8$ ,  $m_2=m_3=9$  (number of factors in each block) according to the data obtained during the survey among teaching staff of Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages. These data were grouped into the following three blocks: the first block - material, monetary factors of motivation; the second block - material, non-monetary factors of motivation; the third block - non-material factors of motivation.



## Literature cited

1. Тлеппаев А.М., Зейнолла С.Ж., Ажибаева А.А., Тюлюбаева Д.М. Стратегии повышения качества высшего образования и их влияние на экономику Казахстана//Статистика, учет и аудит. –2024. – №3(94). – С. 17-27. DOI: 10.51579/1563-2415.2024.-3.02.
2. Dimitrova G., Dimitrova T. Competitiveness of the universities: measurement capabilities// *Trakia Journal of Sciences*. –2017. – Vol. 15. – Suppl. 1. – P. 311-316.
3. Stimac Helena, Simic Mirna Leko. Competitiveness in higher education: a need for marketing orientation and service quality // *Centre of Sociological Research*. – 2012. – №5 (2). –P. 23-34.
4. Минажева Г.С., Садырова М.С. Пути повышения конкурентоспособности высших учебных заведений Казахстана//*Journal of pedagogical sciences*. – 2019. –№59(2). – С. 68–83.
5. Cheng Ling Tan, Yen Nee Goh and Hon Seng Chan. The determinants of competitiveness in quality: a study among the Malaysian private higher education institutions//*Problems and Perspectives in Management*. – 2015. –№13 (2). –P.371-379.
6. Olha Hryhorash, Dmytro Bocharov, Maxim Korneyev, Tatyana Rudyanova and Tetiana Hryhorash. The quality of higher education and its funding in countries with different levels of socio-economic development//*Knowledge and Performance Management*. – 2022. – №6 (1). – P. 49-61. DOI: 10.21511/kpm.06(1).2022.05.
7. Sailaubekov N.T., Kirichek O.V. Bagitova S. Rating assessment of the quality of education based on a dynamic normative model //*Actual problem of economy*. – 2013. – № 12(150). –P. 492-499.
8. Martina Blaskova, Rudolf Blasko, Irena Figurska, Aneta Sokol. Motivation and Development of the University Teachers' Motivational Competence, *Procedia // Social and Behavioral Sciences*. – 2015. – №182. – P. 116-126. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.746.
9. Shikalepo, E. E. The role of motivational theories in shaping teacher motivation and performance: A Review of Related literature // *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*. – 2020. – Vol. 4. - № 4.- P. 64-76.
10. Charles Mushabe, Might Kojo Abreh, Clara Araba Mills. Reconceptualizing faculty workload as a measure of human resource motivation and performance in higher education.// *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*. – 2022. – №6 (1). DOI: 10.1016/j.ssaho.2022.100279.
11. Yanping Li, Linlin Xu. Exploring the influence of teachers' motivation, self-efficacy, and institutional support on their research engagement: A study of Chinese university EFL teachers//*System*. – 2024. –№121. – e.103272. DOI: 10.1016/i.system.2024.103272.
12. Mynzhanova G., Sailaubekov N. and Kunanbayeva D. The role of university faculty motivation in human resources development and university competitiveness growth// *Problems and Perspectives in Management*. – 2018. – 16(3). – P. 92-101. DOI: 10.21511/ppm.16(3).2018.08.
13. Mushtaq A. Sajid, Imrab Shaheen. Factors responsible for High and Low motivational level of University Academicians // *International Journal of Sciences and research*. – 2013. 2(2). –P. 603-608.
14. Bhandari P. What Is Qualitative Research? Methods & Examples [Electronic resource]. 2023. - URL: <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/qualitative-research/> (accessed 16.01.2025).

## References

1. Tleppaev, A., Zejnolla, S., Azhibaeva, A., Tyulyubaeva, D. Strategii-povysheniya kachestva-vysshego-obrazovaniya-i-ikh-vliyanie-na-ehkonomiku-Kazakhstan [Strategies for increasing the quality of higher education and its impact on the economy of Kazakhstan]. *Statistika, uchet i audit*, 2024, 3(94), ss.17-27. DOI: 10.51579/1563-2415.2024.-3.02 (in Russian).
2. Dimitrova, G., Dimitrova, T. Competitiveness of the universities: measurement capabilities. *Trakia Journal of Sciences*, 2017, 15, Suppl. 1, pp. 311-316.
3. Stimac Helena, Simic Mirna Leko. Competitiveness in higher education: a need for marketing orientation and service quality. *Centre of Sociological Research (NGO)*, 2012, 5(2), pp. 23-34.
4. Minazheva, G., & Sadyrova, M. Puti povysheniya konkurentosposobnosti vysshih uchebnykh zavedenij Kazhstana [Ways to Improve the Competitiveness of Higher Educational Institutions of Kazakhstan]. *Journal of pedagogical sciences*, 2019, 2 (59), ss. 69-81(in Russian).
5. Cheng Ling Tan, Yen Nee Goh and Hon Seng Chan. The determinants of competitiveness in quality: a study among the Malaysian private higher education institutions. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 2015, 13(2), pp. 371-379.
6. Olha Hryhorash, Dmytro Bocharov, Maxim Korneyev, Tatyana Rudyanova and Tetiana Hryhorash. The quality of higher education and its funding in countries with different levels of socio-economic



development. *Knowledge and Performance Management*, 2022, 6(1), pp.49-61. DOI: 10.21511/kpm.06(1).2022.05.

7. Sailaubekov, N., Kirichek, O. Bagitova, S. Rating assessment of the quality of education based on a dynamic normative model. *Actual problems of economy*, 2013, 12(150), pp. 492-499.

8. Martina Blaskova, Rudolf Blasko, Irena Figurska, Aneta Sokol. Motivation and Development of the University Teachers' Motivational Competence. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2015, 182, pp. 116-126. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.746.

9. Shikalepo, E. E. The role of motivational theories in shaping teacher motivation and performance: A Review of Related literature. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 2020, 4(4), pp. 64-76.

10. Charles Mushabe, Might Kojo Abreh, Clara Araba Mills. Reconceptualizing faculty workload as a measure of human resource motivation and performance in higher education. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 2022, 6 (1). DOI: 10.1016/j.ssaho.2022.100279.

11. Yanping Li, Linlin Xu. Exploring the influence of teachers' motivation, self-efficacy, and institutional support on their research engagement: A study of Chinese university EFL teachers. *System*, 2024, 121, e.103272. DOI: 10.1016/i.system.2024.103272.

12. Mynzhanova, G., Sailaubekov, N., Kunanbayeva, D. The role of university faculty motivation in human resources development and university competitiveness growth. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 2018, 16 (3), pp. 92-101. DOI: 10.21511/ppm.16(3).2018.08.

13. Mushtaq A. Sajid, Imrab Shaheen. Factors responsible for High and Low motivational level of University Academicians. *International Journal of Sciences and research*, 2013, India, pp 603-608.

14. Bhandari P. What Is Qualitative Research? Methods & Examples. 2023. Available at: <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/qualitative-research/> (accessed 16.01.2025).

## УНИВЕРСИТЕТ РЕЙТИНГІСІН ҚҰРУДАҒЫ ПРОФЕССОРЛЫҚ-ОҚЫТУШЫЛЫҚ ҚҰРАМДЫ ЫНТАЛАНДЫРУДЫ БАҒАЛАУ ӘДІСТЕМЕСІ

**Н.Т. Сайлаубеков<sup>1</sup>, Г.Т. Мынжанова<sup>2\*</sup>, Г.Т. Темиралиева<sup>1</sup>, Г.Р. Даулиева<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Қазақстан-Неміс Университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан

<sup>2</sup>Абылайхан атындағы Қазақ халықаралық қатынастар және әлем тілдері университеті,  
Алматы, Қазақстан

<sup>3</sup>Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ Ұлттық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан

**Түйін.** Мақалада университет басшылығының оқытушыларды ынталандыру шараларымен университеттің бәсекеге қабілеттілігі арасындағы байланыс зерттелген. Мақаланың мақсаты- университет рейтингіне әсер ететін профессорлық-оқытушылық құрамды ынталандыруды бағалау әдістемесін жасау. Бұл әдіс белгілі бір мотивациялық факторларды қолдану арқылы сыналды. Зерттеу нәтижелері жоғары оқу орнының профессорлық-оқытушылық құрамын ынталандыру деңгейі оның бәсекеге қабілеттілігіне әсер етеді деген қорытынды жасауға мүмкіндік береді.

**Түйінді сөздер:** университеттің бәсекеге қабілеттілігі, профессорлық-оқытушылық құрамы, университет, оқытушыны ынталандыру, ынталандыру факторлары.

## МЕТОДИКА ОЦЕНКИ МОТИВАЦИИ ПРОФЕССОРСКО-ПРЕПОДАВАТЕЛЬСКОГО СОСТАВА ПРИ СОСТАВЛЕНИИ РЕЙТИНГА УНИВЕРСИТЕТА

**Н.Т. Сайлаубеков<sup>1</sup>, Г.Т. Мынжанова<sup>2\*</sup>, Г.Т. Темиралиева<sup>3</sup>, Г.Р. Даулиева<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Казахстанско-Немецкий университет, Алматы, Казахстан

<sup>2</sup>Казахский университет международных отношений и мировых языков  
имени Абылай хана, Алматы, Казахстан

<sup>3</sup>Казахский национальный университет имени Аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан



**Резюме.** Статья посвящена исследованию взаимосвязи между мотивацией профессорско-преподавательского состава и конкурентоспособностью университета. Целью исследования является разработка методики оценки мотивации преподавателей при формировании рейтинга вуза. Методика была апробирована с использованием различных мотивационных факторов. Результаты исследования подтверждают, что уровень мотивации профессорско-преподавательского состава оказывает влияние на конкурентоспособность высшего учебного заведения.

**Ключевые слова:** конкурентоспособность университета, профессорско-преподавательский состав, университет, мотивация преподавателя, факторы мотивации.

**Information about the authors:**

**Nurlan T. Sailaubekov** - doctor of economic sciences, the Kazakh-German University, Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: sailaubekov@rambler.ru, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5004-746X>

**Gulzhakan T. Mynzhanova\*** - PhD, Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages, Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: gulzhakan3108@gmail.com, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0322-3619>

**Gulnara T. Temiraliyeva** - candidate of physico-mathematical sciences, the Kazakh-German University, Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: temiraliyeva@dku.kz, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-3699-2443>

**Galiya R. Dauliyeva** - candidate of economic sciences, professor, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: dauliyeva@gmail.com, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8233-9830>

**Авторлар туралы ақпарат:**

**Сайлаубеков Нурлан Турсынбекович** - экономика ғылымдарының докторы, Қазақстан-Неміс Университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан, e-mail: sailaubekov@rambler.ru, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5004-746X>

**Мынжанова Гүлжәқан Тлесовна\*** - PhD, Абылай хан атындағы Қазақ Халықаралық Қатынастар және Әлем Тілдері Университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан, e-mail: gulzhakan3108@gmail.com, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0322-3619>

**Темиралиева Гүлнара Турсынхановна** - физика-математика ғылымдарының кандидаты, Қазақстан-Неміс Университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан, e-mail: temiraliyeva@dku.kz, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-3699-2443>

**Даулиева Галия Рахметовна** - экономика ғылымдарының кандидаты, профессор, Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ Ұлттық Университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан, e-mail: dauliyeva@gmail.com, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8233-9830>

**Информация об авторах:**

**Сайлаубеков Нурлан Турсынбекович** - доктор экономических наук, Казахстанско-Немецкий университет, Алматы, Казахстан, e-mail: sailaubekov@rambler.ru, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5004-746X>

**Мынжанова Гүлжәқан Тлесовна\*** - PhD, Казахский Университет Международных Отношений и Мировых Языков имени Абылай хана, Алматы, Казахстан, e-mail: gulzhakan3108@gmail.com, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0322-3619>

**Темиралиева Гүлнара Турсынхановна** – кандидат физико-математических наук, Казахстанско-Немецкий университет, Алматы, Казахстан, e-mail: temiraliyeva@dku.kz, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-3699-2443>

**Даулиева Галия Рахметовна** - кандидат экономических наук, профессор, Казахский национальный университет имени Аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан, e-mail: dauliyeva@gmail.com, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8233-9830>

Received: 12.05.2025

Accepted: 17.06.2025

Available online: 31.03.2026