UDC 339.138:331.108:37.014.5
DOI: https://doi.org/10.37734/2409-6873-2026-2-40

STAKEHOLDER-DRIVEN HR-MARKETING IN THE EDUCATIONAL ECOSYSTEM: AN INTEGRATED MARKETING FRAMEWORK FOR HUMAN CAPITAL COMPETITIVENESS IN WARTIME UKRAINE

Maryna US
PhD in Economics, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor of the Department of Marketing,
Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4849-0331

Annotation. *Purpose. Develop and substantiate the SEHA (Stakeholder–Ecosystem–HR–Marketing–Analytics) model explaining how stakeholder interactions among education, science, business, and civil society shape system sustainability and human capital competitiveness during wartime in Ukraine.* ***Research methodology*** *based on stakeholder theory, HR-marketing, employer brand, and service-dominant logic; applies stakeholder analysis, marketing analytics, and secondary data.* ***Results.*** *Identifies five regularities of stakeholder marketing interaction: HR-marketing synergy; signal determinism; analytics-navigation effect; trust acceleration; digital communication compensation, systematized within a four-layer SEHA model.* ***Significance of the research results.*** *Provides a framework for stakeholder marketing strategies in crisis and recovery.*

Keywords: *HR-marketing; marketing analytics; marketing communications; educational stakeholders; human capital competitiveness; educational system sustainability; SEHA-model; marketing research; wartime economy; interaction marketing.*

General statement of the problem and its connection with the most important scientific or practical tasks. Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine, launched on 24 February 2022, created unprecedented structural fractures across all social systems. The educational ecosystem experienced particularly severe disruptions: over 43 higher education institutions (HEIs) had been damaged or destroyed by the start of the new academic year [1], hundreds of thousands of students and academics were forcibly displaced, and the labour market underwent radical transformation driven by mobilisation, enterprise destruction, and the emergence of entirely new competency demands linked to defence, reconstruction, and digital service exports [2].

The 3C-model (Communication-Coordination-Culture), developed for coordinating HR-marketing and marketing communications during enterprise relocation [3], demonstrated that effective information exchange and corporate culture alignment are key determinants of organisational stability under transformational conditions. The STEEP+S-analysis framework for HEI stakeholder interaction marketing [4] showed that the security dimension of the external environment has become the defining factor in Ukrainian universities' strategic stakeholder planning. Both contributions point to the need for an integrated model linking marketing instruments to human capital outcomes through stakeholder interaction – the gap this article addresses.

According to the KSE Human Capital Chartbook (2025), unemployment fell from 21.1% in 2022 to 11.5% in early 2025, yet the labour market remains structurally imbalanced due to skills mismatches, mobilisation, and migration [5]. Employment in the IT and digital services sector – characterised by the most developed university-business HR-marketing partnerships – demonstrates the highest resilience. This differential is empirical evidence that stakeholder marketing integration directly affects human capital competitiveness.

The academic marketing literature largely treats education, HR management, and stakeholder governance as parallel, non-intersecting research streams. No integrated framework currently explains how the coordinated deployment of marketing instruments by and across educational stakeholders generates measurable outcomes in human capital competitiveness and educational system resilience. Addressing this gap is the purpose of the present study.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The theoretical foundation of this study spans four intersecting streams. First, stakeholder theory in education. R. Freeman's stakeholder approach [6] establishes the conceptual foundation for analysing multi-actor educational ecosystems. C. Chapleo & C. Simms [7] demonstrated that universities manage complex multi-stakeholder environments requiring differentiated communication strategies. E. Mainardes, H. Alves & M. Raposo [8] empirically

mapped HEI stakeholder salience, identifying business and government as primary influence actors. In the Ukrainian context, O. Rayevnyeva, I. Aksonova & V. Ostapenko [9] developed a methodical approach to the formation and adaptive use of purposive forms of university-enterprise cooperation, identifying both invariant (universal) and innovation-active (specific) interaction forms depending on changes in external marketing conditions.

Second, HR-marketing as an academic domain. K. Backhaus & S.Tikoo [10] formalised employer brand theory, while C. Theurer et al. [11] confirmed in a meta-analysis the causal pathway from employer brand equity to talent attraction outcomes. V. Bugrov et al. [12] documented the experience of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv as a frontline university, confirming that effective crisis communication and psychological support of the academic community are key HR-marketing competencies of a university in wartime.

Third, marketing analytics and digital transformation. P. Mikalef et al. [13] demonstrated that data-driven marketing capabilities mediate the relationship between organisational resources and competitive advantage. The OECD Economic Surveys: Ukraine (2025) identifies a severe skills deficit as a structural barrier to recovery, underscoring the need for analytics tools to forecast competency demand [14]. N. Berbyuk-Lindström, A. Asatiani & N. Kononova [15] showed, drawing on Ukrainian HEI data, that digital technologies are deployed simultaneously for exploitation (stabilising current operations) and exploration (discovering new educational formats) in wartime conditions.

Fourth, marketing communications in stakeholder networks. S. Vargo & R. Lusch [16], within the Service-Dominant Logic framework, position communication as the primary mechanism of value co-creation among networked actors. M. Mourad, H. Meshreki & S. Sarofim [17] showed that integrated marketing communications significantly influence stakeholder trust and system-level resilience. The ILO's Ukraine Recovery Conference URC2025 in Rome described social dialogue as the "glue" of a functioning labour market [2] – which is precisely the communication function in a marketing sense. Y. Zayachuk [18] demonstrated, drawing on Ukrainian legislation and 2022–2024 reform documents, that quality higher education under wartime conditions critically depends on inter-stakeholder communication.

Formation of the objectives of the article (task statement). The purpose of this article is to develop and theoretically substantiate an integrated conceptual framework – the SEHA model (Stakeholder-Ecosystem-HR-Marketing-Analytics) – that explains the regularities through which stakeholder interactions in the educational ecosystem, mediated by marketing instruments, determine the sustainability of the educational system and the competitiveness of human capital, with particular reference to Ukraine in the period 2022–2025.

The specific research objectives are: 1) to sys-tematise the theoretical foundations connecting marketing instruments with stakeholder interaction patterns in educational ecosystems; 2) to identify and substantiate the key regularities of stakeholder influence on human capital competitiveness drawing on verified secondary statistical data for 2022–2025; 3) to construct the SEHA conceptual model and describe its functional architecture; 4) to formulate practical recommendations for stakeholders based on the proposed framework.

Presentation of the main research material with full justification of the scientific results obtained. The educational ecosystem comprises four primary stakeholder groups whose interaction quality determines system outcomes:

1) educational institutions (universities, vocational schools, research centres);

2) the business sector (enterprises, industry associations, HR departments);

3) the state (ministry of education, employment agencies, regional authorities);

4) civil society (NGOs, professional communities, alumni networks, military-civilian interface organisations).

Each group possesses distinctive marketing competencies and pursues partially divergent goals – yet the overall system outcome, human capital competitiveness, is a joint product of their coordinated actions.

Rayevnyeva, I. Aksonova & V. Ostapenko [8] established, as a pre-war empirical baseline for Ukraine, that university/enterprise interaction forms can be systematised into an invariant core of universal partnership models and a set of innovation-active forms that emerge in response to changes in external marketing conditions. The SEHA model operationalises this insight by positioning the interaction layer (Layer 2) as a dynamic, context-sensitive network whose configuration is driven precisely by such external condition shifts – most dramatically illustrated by the wartime disruption of 2022–2025.

Research paper [4] applying the STEEP+S-analysis instrument developed for Ukrainian HEIs, showed that the security dimension (the additional "S" component) has become a distinct environmental factor shaping universities' stakeholder interaction strategies in the context of digitalisation and war.

Researcher [3] developed an integrated organisational-analytical model and the 3C-model (Communication-Coordination-Culture) for synchronising HR-marketing and marketing communications during enterprise relocation – a direct practical analogue of the processes under study in the educational ecosystem. The study [3] demonstrated, in the context of

enterprise relocation, that synchronising HR-marketing and marketing communications through the 3C-model showed retention rates of up to 78% of personnel compared to an industry average of 52% when all three dimensions (Communication, Coordination, Culture) are aligned.This finding has direct applicability to the educational ecosystem: a university implementing an integrated marketing strategy in partnership with business and civil society demonstrates higher adaptability under crisis conditions.

The SEHA (Stakeholder-Ecosystem-HR-Marketing-Analytics) model describes the mechanism through which marketing instruments are transformed into human capital outcomes through stakeholder ecosystem mediation. The model comprises four layers.

Layer 1 – Input Layer (marketing instruments). Four instruments enter the ecosystem: HR-marketing (employer brand building, talent attraction and retention, bilateral career partnership programmes); marketing analytics (labour market data analysis, competency gap modelling, STEEP+S environmental scanning [4]); marketing communications (inter-stakeholder signalling, integrated channel management, 3C-principle Communication-Coordination-Culture [3]); and marketing research (competency demand forecasting, stakeholder satisfaction assessment, educational market analysis).

Layer 2 – Interaction Layer (stakeholder ecosystem). The four stakeholder groups receive and process marketing inputs through their interaction network. The quality of this layer is determined by three measurable parameters: interaction intensity (frequency and depth of stakeholder contacts); communication alignment (the degree to which messaging across stakeholders is mutually reinforcing); and trust capital (accumulated relational equity enabling rapid coordination). The typology of purposive forms of university-enterprise cooperation established in [9] – distinguishing invariant universal forms from innovation-active specific forms – provides the structural taxonomy for mapping interaction intensity within this layer. CEDOS launched in 2024 a study of educational system resilience in Eastern European countries precisely in this dimension [21]. The ILO's Local Employment Partnership programmes, implemented in four Ukrainian regions [2], illustrate how coalitions built on prior institutional capital achieve significantly higher retraining and labour market integration outcomes.

Layer 3 – Context Layer (mediation). The transformation of stakeholder interactions into outcomes is mediated by contextual conditions. Ukraine's wartime and transitional recovery context of 2022–2025 operationalises this layer empirically. Real wages fell by 11% in 2022, recovered by approximately 4% in 2023, and grew by 14% in 2024 [14] – this trajectory reflects progressive contextual stabilisation. The Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine's October 2024 Resolution enabling HEIs to grant professional qualifications without a corresponding professional standard [20] represents the first legislatively anchored mechanism for rapid market-signal translation into educational programmes.

Layer 4 – Output Layer (outcomes). The model generates two primary outputs: educational system sustainability (measured through institutional continuity, programme relevance maintenance, stakeholder engagement durability, and recovery speed after disruption); and human capital competitiveness (measured through graduate employment rates, competency alignment indices, wage premium for educated workers, and international labour market positioning). The integration of a feedback mechanism ensures that output performance informs the adjustment of input parameters, facilitating the ecosystem's self-regulation in marketing tool allocation.

The conducted research identified and substantiated five key regularities of the SEHA model, which are detailed below.

Regularity 1: HR-Marketing synergy effect. When universities deploy employer branding logic symmetrically – positioning themselves as developers of talent rather than merely as credential-granting institutions – and when this positioning aligns with the HR-marketing strategies of partner employers, a synergy effect amplifies graduate employability outcomes. IOM Ukraine (2024) data record an employment rate of 67% among the general working-age population (18–60 years) in August 2024, against an unemployment rate of 15% among internally displaced persons [19] – a differential partially explained by unequal access to HR-marketing stakeholder networks. The 3C-model [3] demonstrated analogous retention differentials in the enterprise context, confirming the broader applicability of this regularity.

Regularity 2: Communication signal determinism. The quality and frequency of inter-stakeholder marketing communications directly determines the accuracy of competency demand signals transmitted from business to educational institutions. The ILO at URC2025 in Rome identified strengthening social dialogue as a central recovery priority [2] – effectively legitimising the communication function as critical educational infrastructure. The October 2024 Cabinet of Ministers reform enshrined the mechanism of market-signal translation into curricula at the legislative level [20], confirming this regularity at the level of state policy.

Regularity 3: Analytics-navigation effect. Marketing analytics, applied to labour market data, graduate outcome tracking, and skills gap measurement, functions as a navigation instrument directing educational trajectory adjustments in response to market signals. The KSE Human Capital Chartbook [5] found that employment growth is occurring exclu-

sively in the public administration and defence sector (+27%) – a structural imbalance indicator that requires analytically grounded programme revision. The STEEP+S-analysis instrument [4] provides a concrete analytical tool implementing this regularity: the security dimension captures wartime-specific external drivers that traditional PESTLE/STEEP analyses miss, enabling more accurate strategic planning of HEI stakeholder interaction.

Regularity 4: Institutional trust acceleration. The speed at which educational systems adapt to crisis conditions is strongly moderated by the pre-existing level of institutional trust among stakeholder groups. O. Rayevnyeva, I. Aksonova & V. Ostapenko [9] showed that the effectiveness of university-enterprise interaction forms is contingent on the accumulated relational capital between partners – the invariant core of cooperation forms functions precisely because it is built on stable, long-term trust. V. Bugrov et al. [12] document that Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv mobilised stakeholder support within the first weeks of the invasion precisely because of well-developed trust relationships built before the war. The ILO LEP programmes in Odesa and Mykolaiv [2] achieve higher outcomes in communities with prior coalition interaction experience – direct empirical confirmation of this regularity.

Regularity 5: Digital communication compensation. Under conditions of physical stakeholder network disruption, digital marketing communication channels assume a structural compensation function, partially reconstructing the information flows previously mediated by physical proximity. Data on online learning in Ukraine in 2025 reveal a contradictory effect: at the regional and national levels, distance learning is recognised as less effective, yet coverage remains critically important for displaced populations [20]. This confirms the necessity of hybrid communication strategies rather than full digital replacement – a conclusion consistent with findings on digital technology use in Ukrainian HEIs [15].

The five regularities identified above are supported by verified secondary data from authoritative international and national sources. According to the KSE Human Capital Chartbook (2025), unemployment declined from 21.1% in 2022 to 11.5% in early 2025, while total employment reached approximately 10.5 million persons – yet the worker-to-pensioner ratio has fallen to 1:1, reflecting the structural demographic challenge facing human capital development [5]. Employment growth is confined to public administration and defence (+27%), while production sectors record declines – a structural imbalance demanding analytically driven educational programme reorientation [5].

IOM Ukraine (2024) documents that the employment rate among working-age respondents aged 18-60 was 67% in August 2024, with internally displaced persons recording unemployment rates of 15% compared to 6–8% among the non-displaced population [19]. This 7–9 percentage point gap reflects structurally unequal access to stakeholder HR-marketing networks and confirms Regularity 1.

OECD Economic Surveys: Ukraine (2025) reports that average wages tracked on Ukraine's largest employment platform (work.ua) rose by 20% in the year to March 2025, with the largest gains in construction and IT – sectors with the highest defence activity and the lowest mobilisation-induced labour force reduction [14]. This sectoral wage differential reflects the analytics-navigation effect (Regularity 3) at work: sectors with stronger data-driven stakeholder marketing integration show faster competency-demand alignment.

The ILO Ukraine Recovery Conference URC2025 in Rome (July 2025) identified Ukraine's highly educated workforce combined with modernised vocational and digital education as the foundation for recovery [2]. The signed Memorandum of Understanding between the Government of Ukraine and social partners on social dialogue reform represents institutional codification of Regularity 4 (trust acceleration) at the level of national strategy.

Conclusions from these problems and prospects for further research in this area. This article develops the SEHA (Stakeholder-Ecosystem-HR-Marketing-Analytics) conceptual model as an original integrated framework explicating the mechanisms through which marketing instruments mediate stakeholder interaction effects on educational system sustainability and human capital competitiveness. The model's principal theoretical contribution lies in the identification and substantiation of five empirically grounded regularities – HR-marketing synergy, communication signal determinism, analytics-navigation, institutional trust acceleration, and digital communication compensation – that collectively constitute a coherent explanatory architecture for how coordinated stakeholder marketing generates human capital outcomes under crisis conditions.

The SEHA model emerges from a coherent body of the author's research connecting enterprise-level marketing integration with institutional stakeholder dynamics in higher education. Its four-layer architecture – spanning marketing instruments, stakeholder interaction, contextual mediation, and human capital outcomes – provides a structured analytical lens through which the complexity of educational ecosystem governance can be both theorised and operationalised. The five identified regularities are not isolated observations but interdependent mechanisms: HR-marketing synergy creates the talent pipelines that analytics navigates; communications transmit the signals that trust accelerates; and digital channels compensate when physical networks fail. Together they form a systemic logic that explains why some educa-

tional ecosystems sustain human capital competitiveness under crisis conditions while others fragment.

The empirical validation of the model, grounded in verified secondary data from authoritative international sources, demonstrates that the differential in human capital competitiveness outcomes across sectors and regions is substantially explained by the pre-existing depth of stakeholder marketing integration. Ukraine's wartime and transitional recovery context serves as a critical stress-test of the model's crisis-mode dynamics, confirming that digital marketing communication channels and analytics capabilities function as resilience infrastructure precisely when physical stakeholder networks are disrupted.

The practical utility of the SEHA model manifests across three levels of application. For higher education institutions, the model prescribes a strategic reorientation from recruitment-focused marketing toward bilateral stakeholder value co-creation, elevating HR-marketing and marketing analytics to the status of core institutional competencies rather than support functions. For business stakeholders, formalised data-sharing and communication protocol agreements with university partners constitute strategic investments in long-term talent pipeline resilience. For the state, educational policy instruments should explicitly incentivise stakeholder marketing integration through shared analytics platforms and inter-stakeholder communication infrastructure – a direction which the SEHA model provides the conceptual grounding to systematise and scale across Ukraine's post-war educational recovery.

Directions for further research include: empirical quantitative testing of the SEHA model using primary survey data from Ukrainian stakeholder groups; development of a composite Stakeholder Marketing Integration Index enabling cross-regional benchmarking; extension of the model to post-war reconstruction and EU accession contexts; and comparative analysis of stakeholder marketing integration patterns across conflict-affected educational systems in other countries.

REFERENCES

1. CEDOS. (2022). Vplyv povnomasshtabnoho vtorhnennia na vyshchu osvitu v Ukraini [Impact of the full-scale invasion on higher education in Ukraine]. CEDOS. Available at: https://cedos.org.ua/events/vplyv-vijny-na-vyshhu-osvitu-v-ukrayiny-vyklyky-ta-perspektyvy/ (accessed 01.04.2026). [in Ukrainian].

2. ILO. (2025). Labour reforms take spotlight at Ukraine recovery conference. International Labour Organization. Available at: https://www.ilo.org/resource/news/labour-reforms-take-spotlight-ukraine-recovery-conference (accessed 01.04.2026).

3. Us, M. I. (2025). Intehratsiia HR-marketynhu ta systemy marketynhovykh komunikatsii u protsesi relokatsii pidpryiemstva: orhanizatsiino-analitychnyi pidkhid [Integration of HR-marketing and the marketing communications system in the process of enterprise relocation: an organisational-analytical approach]. *Herald of Khmelnytskyi National University. Economic Sciences,* no. 346(5), pp. 87–92. DOI: https://doi.org/10.31891/2307-5740-2025-346-5-11 [in Ukrainian]

4. Kononova N. V. & Us M. I. (2025). STEEP+S-analiz yak instrument marketynhu vzaiemodii zakladiv vyshchoi osvity zi steikkholderam v umovakh tsyfrovizatsii [STEEP+S-analysis as a tool of interaction marketing of higher education institutions with stakeholders in the context of digitalisation]. *Ekonomika ta suspilstvo,* no. (78). DOI: https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0072/2025-78-90 [in Ukrainian]

5. Markuts Y. & Studennikova I. (2025). Ukraine Human Capital Chartbook May 2025. KSE Institute. Available at: https://kse.ua/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/Ukraine-Human-Capital-Chartbook-2025.pdf (accessed 03.04.2026).

6. Freeman R. E. (1984). Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach. Pitman.

7. Chapleo C. & Simms C. (2010). Stakeholder analysis in higher education institutions. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education,* no. 14(1), pp. 12–20. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/13603100903458034

8. Mainardes E., Alves H. & Raposo M. (2013). Identifying stakeholders in a Portuguese university: a case study. *Revista de Educación,* no. 362, pp. 429–457. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4438/1988-592X-RE-2012-362-167

9. Rayevnyeva O., Aksonova I. & Ostapenko V. (2018). Formation interaction and adaptive use of purposive forms of cooperation of university and enterprise structures. *Innovative Marketing,* no. 14(3), pp. 44–56. DOI: https://doi.org/10.21511/im.14(3).2018.05

10. Backhaus K. & Tikoo S. (2004). Conceptualizing and researching employer branding. *Career Development International,* no. 9(5), pp. 501–517. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430410550754

11. Theurer C., Tumasjan A., Welpe I. & Lievens F. (2018). Employer branding: a brand equity-based literature review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews,* no. 20(1), pp. 155–179. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12121

12. Bugrov V., Gozhyk A., Starostina A., Bilovodska O. & Kochkina N. (2023). Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv: Navigating education as a frontline during times of war. *Problems and Perspectives in Management,* no. 21(2-si), pp. 162–171. DOI: https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.21(2-si).2023.19

13. Mikalef P., Boura M., Lekakos G. & Krogstie J. (2020). Big data analytics and firm performance: findings from a mixed-method approach. *Journal of Business Research,* no. 114, pp. 261–286. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.04.017

14. OECD. (2025). Fostering macroeconomic stability and a sustainable recovery: OECD Economic Surveys: Ukraine 2025. OECD Publishing. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1787/940cee85-en

15. Berbyuk-Lindström, N., Asatiani, A., & Kononova, N. (2024). Exploitation and Exploration of Digital Technologies in Times of War: Experiences of Ukrainian Higher Education Institutions. Proceedings of the 32nd European Conference on Information Systems (ECIS), Paphos, Cyprus. Available at: https://aisel.aisnet.org/ecis2024/track20_adoption/track20_adoption/10/

16. Vargo S. L. & Lusch R. F. (2016). Institutions and axioms: an extension and update of service-dominant logic. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science,* no. 44(1), pp. 5–23. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-015-0456-3

17. Mourad M., Meshreki H. & Sarofim S. (2020). Brand equity in higher education: comparative analysis of functional and emotional brand building strategies. *Studies in Higher Education,* no. 45(3), pp. 209-231. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2019.1582012

18. Zayachuk Y. (2025). Ensuring quality higher education in Ukraine in times of war. *Higher Education Research & Development.* DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/14779714241270254

19. IOM Ukraine. (2024). Employment, mobility and labour market dynamics in Ukraine. *International Organization for Migration.* Available at: https://ukraine.iom.int/sites/g/files/tmzbdl1861/files/documents/2025-01/iom_ukr_employment_november-2024_-1.pdf (accessed 04.04.2026).

20. Eurydice. (2025). National reforms in higher education: Ukraine 2022–2025. *European Commission.* Available at: https://eurydice.eacea.ec.europa.eu/eurypedia/ukraine/national-reforms-higher-education (accessed 06.04.2026).

21. CEDOS. (2025). Shchorichnyi zvit 2024 [Annual report 2024]. *CEDOS.* Available at:https://cedos.org.ua/en/cedos-annual-report-2024/ (accessed 08.04.2026). [in Ukrainian].

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. CEDOS. Вплив повномасштабного вторгнення на вищу освіту в Україні. Київ: CEDOS, 2022. URL: https://cedos.org.ua/events/vplyv-vijny-na-vyshhu-osvitu-v-ukrayiny-vyklyky-ta-perspektyvy/ (дата звернення: 01.04.2026).

2. ILO. Labour reforms take spotlight at Ukraine recovery conference (URC2025). Rome: International Labour Organization, 2025. URL: https://www.ilo.org/resource/news/labour-reforms-take-spotlight-ukraine-recovery-conference (дата звернення: 01.04.2026).

3. Ус М. І. Інтеграція HR-маркетингу та системи маркетингових комунікацій у процесі релокації підприємства: організаційно-аналітичний підхід. *Herald of Khmelnytskyi National University. Economic Sciences.* 2025. Том 346, № 5. С. 87–92. https://doi.org/10.31891/2307-5740-2025-346-5-11

4. Кононова Н. В., Ус М. І. STEEP+S-аналіз як інструмент маркетингу взаємодії закладів вищої освіти зі стейкхолдерами в умовах цифровізації. *Економіка та суспільство.* 2025. № 78. https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0072/2025-78-90

5. Markuts Y., Studennikova I. Ukraine Human Capital Chartbook May 2025. Kyiv: KSE Institute, 2025. URL: https://kse.ua/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/Ukraine-Human-Capital-Chartbook-2025.pdf (дата звернення: 03.04.2026).

6. Freeman R. E. Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach. Boston: Pitman, 1984. 276 p.

7. Chapleo C., Simms C. Stakeholder analysis in higher education institutions. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education.* 2010. Vol. 14, No. 1. P. 12–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603100903458034

8. Mainardes E., Alves H., Raposo M. Identifying stakeholders in a Portuguese university: a case study. *Revista de Educación.* 2013. No. 362. P. 429–457. https://doi.org/10.4438/1988-592X-RE-2012-362-167

9. Rayevnyeva O., Aksonova I., Ostapenko V. Formation interaction and adaptive use of purposive forms of cooperation of university and enterprise structures. *Innovative Marketing.* 2018. Vol. 14, No. 3. P. 44–56. https://doi.org/10.21511/im.14(3).2018.05

10. Backhaus K., Tikoo S. Conceptualizing and researching employer branding. *Career Development International.* 2004. Vol. 9, No. 5. P. 501–517. https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430410550754

11. Theurer C., Tumasjan A., Welpe I., Lievens F. Employer branding: a brand equity-based literature review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews.* 2018. Vol. 20, No. 1. P. 155–179. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12121

12. Bugrov V., Gozhyk A., Starostina A., Bilovodska O., Kochkina N. Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv: Navigating education as a frontline during times of war. *Problems and Perspectives in Management.* 2023. Vol. 21, No. 2 (spec. issue). P. 162–171. https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.21(2-si).2023.19

13. Mikalef P., Boura M., Lekakos G., Krogstie J. Big data analytics and firm performance: findings from a mixed-method approach. *Journal of Business Research.* 2020. Vol. 114. P. 261–286. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.04.017

14. OECD. Fostering macroeconomic stability and a sustainable recovery: OECD Economic Surveys: Ukraine 2025. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2025. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1787/940cee85-en

15. Berbyuk-Lindström N., Asatiani A., Kononova N. Exploitation and Exploration of Digital Technologies in Times of War: Experiences of Ukrainian Higher Education Institutions. Proceedings of the 32nd European Conference on Information Systems (ECIS). Paphos, Cyprus, 2024. URL: https://aisel.aisnet.org/ecis2024/track20_adoption/track20_adoption/10/

16. Vargo S. L., Lusch R. F. Institutions and axioms: an extension and update of service-dominant logic. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science.* 2016. Vol. 44, No. 1. P. 5–23. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-015-0456-3

17. Mourad M., Meshreki H., Sarofim S. Brand equity in higher education: comparative analysis of functional and emotional brand building strategies. *Studies in Higher Education.* 2020. Vol. 45, No. 3. P. 209-231. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2019.1582012

18. Zayachuk Y. Ensuring quality higher education in Ukraine in times of war. *Higher Education Research & Development.* 2025. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/14779714241270254

19. IOM Ukraine. Employment, Mobility and Labour Market Dynamics in Ukraine. November 2024. URL: https://ukraine.iom.int/sites/g/files/tmzbdl1861/files/documents/2025-01/iom_ukr_employment_november-2024_-1.pdf (дата звернення: 04.04.2026).

20. Eurydice. National reforms in higher education: Ukraine 2022–2025. European Commission, 2025. URL: https://eurydice.eacea.ec.europa.eu/eurypedia/ukraine/national-reforms-higher-education (дата звернення: 06.04.2026).

21. CEDOS. Щорічний звіт 2024. Київ: CEDOS, 2025. URL: https://cedos.org.ua/en/cedos-annual-report-2024/ (дата звернення: 08.04.2026).

Ус М. І., *Харківський національний економічний університет імені Семена Кузнеця.* ***Стейкхолдер-орієнтований HR-маркетинг в освітній екосистемі: інтегрована маркетингова модель забезпечення конкурентоспроможності людського капіталу в умовах війни в Україні.***

Анотація. Мета дослідження. *В процесі дослідження розроблено інтегровану маркетингову концептуальну модель SEHA (Stakeholder-Ecosystem-HR-Marketing-Analytics), що розкриває закономірності впливу взаємодії стейкхолдерів освіти, науки, бізнесу та громадянського суспільства на стійкість освітньої системи та конкурентоспроможність людського капіталу в умовах воєнного часу та відновлення в Україні.* ***Методика дослідження.*** *У роботі застосовано системний підхід до аналізу стейкхолдерної взаємодії в освітньому просторі, методи маркетингової аналітики та статистичного аналізу верифікованих вторинних даних міжнародних та національних організацій. Теоретичну основу становлять: теорія стейкхолдерів; концепції HR-маркетингу та бренду роботодавця; логіка домінування послуг; маркетингова аналітика як джерело конкурентних переваг; методичний підхід до формування форм взаємодії університету та підприємств. Зазначені теоретико-методичні інструменти застосовано для побудови авторської концептуальної моделі SEHA та виявлення закономірностей впливу маркетингової взаємодії стейкхолдерів на конкурентоспроможність людського капіталу.* ***Результати.*** *Виявлено та теоретично обґрунтовано п'ять ключових закономірностей стейкхолдерної маркетингової взаємодії: ефект HR-маркетингової синергії між університетами та бізнесом; детермінуюча роль маркетингових комунікацій у формуванні сигналів попиту на компетенції; навігаційна функція маркетингової аналітики для коригування освітніх траєкторій; прискорювальний ефект інституційної довіри у подоланні кризових розривів; компенсаторна функція цифрових маркетингових комунікацій в умовах руйнування фізичних стейкхолдерних мереж. Побудовано чотирирівневу модель SEHA, яка включає: інструментальний рівень (Input Layer), інтеракційний рівень (Interaction Layer), медіаційний рівень (Context Layer) та результативний рівень (Output Layer).* ***Практична значущість результатів.*** *Модель SEHA надає університетам, державним органам управління освітою та бізнес-асоціаціям практичний інструментарій для побудови ефективних маркетингових стратегій взаємодії зі стейкхолдерами в умовах тривалої кризи та повоєнного відновлення. Результати є основою для розробки дорожньої карти маркетингової інтеграції стейкхолдерів освітньої екосистеми в контексті євроінтеграційних реформ України.*

Ключові слова: *HR-маркетинг; маркетингова аналітика, маркетингові комунікації, стейкхолдери освіти; конкурентоспроможність людського капіталу; стійкість освітньої системи; SEHA-модель; маркетингові дослідження; воєнна економіка; маркетинг взаємодії.*

Дата надходження статті: 09.04.2026
Дата прийняття статті: 04.05.2026
Дата публікації статті: 22.06.2026