

CONTENTS

PREFACE TO THE VOLUME BY PROF. NINA BELYAEVA, ACADEMIC DIRECTOR OF BALTIC PRACTICE	7
GREETINGS ON 10 TH ANNIVERSARY OF BALTIC PRACTICE BY ANA PERONA-FIELDSTAD, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE EUROPEAN WERGELAND CENTRE (OSLO, NORWAY)	9
CHAPTER ONE. UNIVERSITY AS RES PUBLICA.....	10
INTRODUCTION OF RESEARCH WORKING GROUP.....	10
<i>NINA BELYAEVA, GILIBERTO CAPANO</i>	
GOVERNING MODERN RESEARCH UNIVERSITY : BETWEEN ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND MANAGERIAL CONSTRAINTS	12
<i>EKATERINA TUPOVA</i>	
“TYPICAL STUDENT” IN RUSSIAN UNIVERSITY : TRANSFORMATION OF THE PUBLIC IMAGE....	30
<i>NICOLAY TELESNIN</i>	
UNIVERSITY AS A SOURCE OF LIBERAL MIND	40
<i>LAURA PETRONE</i>	
DEMOCRATIC CULTURE IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS : COMPARING RUSSIAN AND ITALIAN UNIVERSITIES	45
CHAPTER TWO. BETWEEN RUSSIA AND EUROPE.....	56
INTRODUCTION OF RESEARCH WORKING GROUP.....	56
<i>MILAN ALEKSIĆ</i>	
RUSSIA'S PRESENCE IN THE SHARED NEIGHBOURHOOD.....	57
<i>CARLO DE MARCO</i>	
KALININGRAD IN THE INTERNATIONAL ARENA.....	73
<i>CINZIA TARLETTI</i>	
DO NO HARM : ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF FOREIGN AID IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA....	88
<i>LANA ZEKOVIĆ</i>	
THE EU-RUSSIA “VISA DIALOGUE” : A CRITICAL ASSESSMENT	106
CHAPTER THREE. MODELS OF DEMOCRACY EVALUATION.....	140
INTRODUCTION OF RESEARCH WORKING GROUP.....	140
<i>MARIA SHABANOVA, MIKHAIL KLIMUSHKIN</i>	
DEMOCRACY IN THE WORLD : MODELING MULTIDIMENSIONAL WORLD MAP	142
<i>ELENA SHEETOVA, KRISTINA POPOVA, ANASTASIA NOVOKRESHCHENOVA</i>	
“DEMOCRACY WITH ADJECTIVES” : ANALYZING ALTERNATIVE DISCOURSES.....	156
<i>MARIA KOYSINA, IGOR JUDANOV, NIKITA ROMASHKIN</i>	
FREEDOM OF SPEECH ON RUSSIAN TV : EDITORIAL POLICIES ON FEDERAL TV TALK-SHOWS	165
<i>ANASTASIA NOVOKRESHCHENNOVA AND MARIA SHABANOVA</i>	
WESTERN LEADERS ON DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS IN RUSSIA : AVOIDING THE SUBJECT MATTER	173
CHAPTER FOUR. CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY	185
INTRODUCTION OF RESEARCH WORKING GROUP.....	185
<i>ZOYA BRAGINA</i>	
COMPARATIVE STUDY OF CORPORATE NON-FINANCIAL REPORTING PRACTICES : CASES ON USA, EUROPE AND RUSSIA	187

<i>ELENA DRUZHININA</i>	
BOTTOM OF PYRAMID (BOP) MARKETS : HOW CAN THIS CONCEPT BE USED TO FACILITATE THE ERADICATION OF POVERTY IN RUSSIA AND CIS COUNTRIES	206
<i>MAXIM MARKIN, ELENA NAZARBAEVA, SVETLANA BORISOVA</i>	
COMPETITION AND “COOPETITION” IN RUSSIAN INTERNET RETAILING : NEW FORMS OF CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY	213
<i>LEVYKINA KSENIVA, NACHINKIN DENIS</i>	
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GERMAN MODEL OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE : CASE OF ALLIANZ SE AND PROSPECTS AFTER THE WORLD FINANCIAL CRISIS	222
CHAPTER FIVE. LOCAL GOVERNANCE	243
INTRODUCTION OF RESEARCH WORKING GROUP.....	243
<i>LUCIO PICCI</i>	
REPUTATION-BASED GOVERNANCE AND MAKING STATES “LEGIBLE” TO THEIR CITIZENS	244
<i>JULIA MINAEVA</i>	
IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF MUNICIPAL SERVICE : CASES ON ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS IN THE UK AND SWEDEN	252
<i>SVETLANA TOKUNOVA</i>	
LOCAL GOVERNANCE IN SCANDINAVIAN COUNTRIES : IS THERE A COMMON MODEL ?	258
CHAPTER SIX. LANGUAGE OF PUBLIC POLICY.....	263
INTRODUCTION OF RESEARCH WORKING GROUP.....	263
<i>ANITA SOBOLEVA</i>	
SPEAKING ABOUT HUMAN RIGHTS: WHAT IS THE LANGUAGE WE USE?	264
<i>DILYARA MULYUKOVA</i>	
THE ROLE OF POLITICAL MYTH IN REGIONAL POLITICAL PROCESS IN RUSSIA: CASE OF THE REPUBLIC OF TATARSTAN	275
<i>ALENA PUSTOVALOVA</i>	
METAPHORIC CONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE GLOBAL ECONOMIC CRISIS IN THE RUSSIAN MEDIA	279
<i>MAXIM BOGACHEV</i>	
“SINGING TOGETHER”: USING POP SONGS IN POLITICAL CAMPAIGNING	287
CHAPTER SEVEN. HUMAN RIGHTS	296
INTRODUCTION OF RESEARCH WORKING GROUP.....	296
<i>CLAUDIA LENZ, CAROLINE GEBARA</i>	
BUILDING HUMAN RIGHTS CULTURES THROUGH EDUCATION — THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE EUROPEAN WERGELAND CENTRE.....	297
<i>LOLA SHAMIRZAEVA</i>	
IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF MUNICIPAL SERVICE : CASES ON ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS IN THE UK AND SWEDEN	303
<i>DENIS YURCHENKO</i>	
ELECTORAL RIGHTS AND POLITICAL TECHNOLOGIES : GAINING SUPPORTING VOTES IN THE US	319
<i>NATAL'YA KRAVCHUK</i>	
CHILD’S VIEWS AND CHILD’S RIGHTS: INSURING YOUNG PEOPLE DEMOCRATIC PARTICIPATION.....	327
ABOUT THE AUTHORS	334

Preface by Academic Director

It is a particular pleasure for me to introduce this volume of Baltic Practice Academic papers as this year we celebrate the 10th anniversary of this project. We had started our trips to Baltic Sea in 2001 as a modest initiative of social researchers and civic activists to analyze the situation around Kaliningrad region that was about to be separated from territory of main-land Russia by the two borders of sovereign states — Belarus and Lithuania.

That first year we were only about 30 enthusiasts — mostly my friends from “We, the Citizens!” NGO Coalition and my students from HSE Public Policy Department, — who were then joined by young local researchers — from Association of young Lawyers and Association of young Economists. As we started our daily debates, our team grew further, involving young civic activists from the Kaliningrad region brought together by our partners from Kaliningrad Youth Parliament — the only one in the whole Russia, which was granted the legal right to legislative initiative on the level of Regional Parliament.

The issue that caught our attention on that first trip was quite extraordinary in Russian-European relations: enlargement of the EU and the Shengen zone — which is solely an international issue of the EU — was interfering quite dramatically in the life of citizens of Kaliningrad region, as it was about to be “cut off” from the rest of the territory of Russia. This situation called for immediate action, as the citizens of Kaliningrad area were about to be left alone with their problems, including the increasing costs of life, due to the transportation of major goods from Russia through the borders, difficulties of their own trips to Russia because of crossing the borders, problems of getting the visas and many others.

It was obvious, that there ought to be some serious decisions made at Governmental level, but Russian Government kept silent, leaving people with their worries, while EU was spreading the Shengen zone to Lithuania and cutting whole Kaliningrad region off from normal in-country communication.

It was a kind of situation, that demands citizen’s action. But it was also clear that before any action there is a need of citizen’s expertise and thorough academic analysis of many different factors, involved in this situation. This means, first of all, the need for collection of data, — like the costs of goods transfer and costs of printing many foreign passports and costs for obtaining visas — that was not easily available and more other analysis, including possible different behavior of neighboring countries, as well as reaction of citizens of Kaliningrad, that can cause different scenarios of further events, — before one can suggest any action campaign.

This was more than 10 years ago. But the result of that first “analytical exercise” was very important: we managed to organize creative interaction of experts-practitioners, academic researchers and citizen activists — in developing arguments in search for decision to complex problems. This model of intellectual cooperation for common problem-solving shaped up the major format for Baltic practice activities for a next decade to come.

So, each year after 2001 we were changing countries, experts, participants, topics, subject matters, hosting universities. But the major feature of the Baltic Practice remained unchanged — think and discuss in order to find solutions to complex problems. This involves certain steps: to figure out one of the burning problems in relations of Russia and Europe, identify key issues, as well as key actors in this field and their interests, key issues and their outcomes, collect reliable data, use different research methodology and interdisciplinary approaches, draw out most probable scenarios and suggest decisions that may be beneficial for strengthening and improving Russian-European relationships.

Last three years Baltic Practice Summer schools were held in Sweden (2008), Belgium (2009) and Norway (2010) and we had strongly benefited from the support of Council of Europe INGO Conference project “3-Year Framework Co-operation Programme “Strengthening Civil Society and Civic Participation in the Russian Federation” (2008-2011), that allowed us to invite to our seminars in those countries several distinguished European experts and we are very grateful both to CoE Secretariat and its NGO unit, chaired by by Jutta Gutzkov, who provided the support, and those experts, who contributed their knowledge and experience to our joint work.

In Norway in 2010 we had a particular pleasure to be hosted by CoE partner the European Wergeland Centre, headed by Ana Perona, and CoE experts who joined us in this trip, were Chuck Hirt, Cyril Ritchie, Gerhard Ermischer.

This strong partnership allowed us to take on board the most challenging task: to discuss relations between Russia and the Council of Europe in opened, franc and creative way and focus on solutions, despite many conflicts and arguments voiced out in PACE against Russia, we still think, that there should be topics for COMMON AGENDA for Russia and the Council of Europe.

We worked really hard — both during the visit in Oslo and almost the whole year after this visit through continuous debates in working groups, editing and upgrading our research papers — and here is the volume with our SUGGESTIONS to the question of common agenda, where each suggested topic is formulated in the title of the separate chapter.

So, here is our contribution to the Russia-CoE continued interaction, chapter by chapter. We agreed to begin with the obvious step — continuing with creating common educational space (Chapter 1 “University as Res Publica”), as well as continuing with easing the visa and other transportation problems with European neighbors, including the recognizing “near abroad” and building partnerships with East- European countries (Chapter 2 “Between Russia and Europe”).

Russian-European relations were always circling around the issue of democracy and democratic development. And one of the major problems we had identified is difficulty with understanding democracy and its “quality”, which brings us to the need of “measurement” and creating assessment tools and models, which are dealt with in Chapter 3.

One of the major drivers of Russian-European relationship was always trade, economics and mutual business interests. But the strong obstacle to this is the different understanding of corporate ethics and corporate social responsibility. How to improve this, — has been looked at in Chapter 4.

Another field where Russian authorities would benefit from using European experience, is the local governance and local democracy which is analyzed in Chapter 5.

Completely different issue that we had identified, that is, currently, troublesome but could become a mechanism of recognition and mutual understanding — is the issue of language that we used in political communication. We focused on this issue in Chapter 6.

Finally, what had been agreed to be the most problematic area of Russian — European relations is the issue of Human Rights. We suggest approaching this issue from the point of human rights education and working with youth and children, which we focus on in Chapter 7.

We are very grateful to all those, who contributed to this volume: to authors, to editors and editorial-management and reviewers team and we hope that readers will find it inspiring and will become our authors and participants in the future Baltic Practice seminars.

Nina Belyaeva
Prof., Dr., Chair of Public Policy Department

Greetings on 10th anniversary of Baltic Practice

By Ana Perona-Fjeldstad, Executive Director of the European Wergeland Centre (Oslo, Norway)

On behalf of the European Wergeland Centre, I would like to congratulate the Baltic Practice on its 10th anniversary. This successful initiative has brought together a myriad of students, professors, and experts from Russian universities, the Council of Europe, and the local host countries, giving comprehensive insights on central issues concerning democracy development, social responsibility, academic mobility, entrepreneurship culture and human rights.

In August 2010, the 10th Summer School of Baltic Practice, which is supported by the Council of Europe, was organized in Oslo, Norway, in cooperation with the European Wergeland Centre (EWC). This was also the first summer seminar project at Higher School of Economics which enabled participants to receive ECTS credits to be used in their study plans. It brought together more than 25 undergraduate, graduate and post-graduate students from different parts of Russia.

As mentioned, the EWC was a partner of Baltic Practice. As part of our human rights education activities, the organization and conceptualization of several sessions and workshops was facilitated. The programme included sessions on the current reforms within the CoE and its impact on education, reflection on core concepts of citizenship and democracy, as well as an introduction of some of the main CoE manuals for Education on Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education in Russian.

It was a pleasure for the EWC to welcome Baltic Practice, which was very inspirational for us all, and we especially enjoyed the presentations of students on human rights issues.

We continued good cooperation with Higher School of Economics through online lectures for the course 'Human Rights in Globalizing World' for first-year master students in September 2010, where our experts Caroline Gebara and Gunnar Mandt had an excellent opportunity to exchange different views on human rights education with the students.

In our view, what makes Baltic Practice a unique experience is the students' engagement and motivation not just to get knowledge but also their readiness to act, to change the world they see as imperfect. As many of the students themselves are human rights educators with substantial experience in the field, sharing views and understanding on what human rights makes the debate enriching and exciting.

Once more, congratulations on your anniversary.

Yours sincerely,

Ana Perona-Fjeldstad

Chapter One. University as Res Publica

Introduction of Research Working Group

This chapter presents papers by the participants of the working group “University as Res Publica”. Prof. Nina Belyaeva (Higher School of Economics) and Sjur Bergen (Head of the Education Department of the Council of Europe) have been academic supervisors of the working group and editors of the present chapter.

What were the main research problems the participants faced? Universities play major role in intellectual support of decision-making in politics, economics, and management. They play a role of major think tanks for government officials, and also serve as a source of innovations and suggestions for effective development in all spheres. The role of universities has always been big and is still growing; as a corporation, universities are one of the oldest (dating to the 11th century in Europe) and the most stable ones. But the importance of universities is being questioned by the dynamic and competitive environment in which they have to function. Universities are a type of corporation that is invisible for the society, and they are affected by the new challenges:

- 1) Internationalization, globalization but, above all, the new technology and information systems which mean:
 - a) The speeding up of new developments in the field of science;
 - b) Changes in the spatial boundaries and temporal limitations to knowledge production;
 - c) Strong pressure for “results”
- 2) Increasing costs under decreasing public funding
- 3) Structural pressure for competition (for students, clients, research funds, etc.)

It results in a shift from academic learning and education to business-like activities and business-like ethics. Universities need to earn money; each division needs to function like a business corporation.

The problem is that the academic community doesn’t have a uniform response to these new challenges, so two different models are suggested:

- Universities should become business-like corporations,
- Universities should deepen academic research and serve the purpose of civic upbringing of the people (Humboldtian tradition), i.e. non-market mechanisms.

The aim of the research project was to explore the models of modern university governance and clarify the role universities should play in the modern society in globalizing world.

This long-term research agenda is opened by Nina Belyaeva, Giliberto Capano “Governing Modern Research University : between academic freedom and managerial constraints”, followed by Ekaterina Tupova in ““Typical student” in Russian

University: transformation of the public image”, Nikolaiy Telesnin in “University as a Source of Liberal Mind” and Laura Petrone in “Democratic Culture in Higher Education Institutions: Comparing Russian and Italian Universities”.

Nina Belyaeva, Giliberto Capano
**Governing Modern University: different models
of responding to Public Needs**

Governing Higher Education- extra problems

Analysing governing in every social field we should be aware of different level of complexity in every such field concerned, but speaking of the field of Higher Education we have to consider additional problems, that are specific to this research field. We need to take into account, that Universities and Higher Education systems are not just “complex”, they are also “loose-coupled”. According to the works of Orton and Weick¹ loose-coupled systems and organizations are characterised by the following features that can be taken as our basic starting points.

First. **Causal indeterminacy.** In Higher Education causal indeterminacy means unclear connections between means- and ends , multiplicity of goals, that are pursued by the different actors in this field, existence of conflicting “academic tribes” that protect and control their territories.

Second. **Fragmented external and internal environment.** As the major activity of diverse actors is to produce and transfer knowledge of different kinds and on different subject matters, that is done either individually or by small collectives, general institutional goals are often been neglected. Only few administrators constantly care about every dimension of institutional or systemic activity.

Third. **Internal variety of the institutional design.** The absence of the universality of the internal structures — that is a deliberate result of the measures to protect variety and diversity — as an environment to ensure academic freedoms . This leads to the result of making it barely possible to register external inputs to the system in the same way and with due accuracy.

Forth. **Behavioural and cognitive discretion.** Cognitive discretion is one of the major characteristics of the “free-minded community”, insuring an “opened environment”, needed for the research creativity. Behavioural discretion is in this case is not an “anomaly” , as in “strong-coupled systems”, but rather a norm of behaviour, as a manifestation of academic autonomy of the actors.

And fifth and last is– **Adaptability of academic institutions,** which is both the consequence of the first four characteristics and a very important feature, allowing them to survive through centuries and successfully adapt to the new societal environment, proving its effectiveness.

The coordination or “governance” of higher education systems is a complex, difficult issue to analyse. Firstly, because the units constituting the system, the universities, are *sui generis* institutions whose inherent nature — the fact they are federations or confederations of academic subjects and niches, ‘academic tribes’ as

¹ Orton and Weick 1990

Tony Becher (1989) described them — has structural implications for their internal dynamics, as it creates endless problems regarding not only their institutional governance, but also, what is even more difficult, for the governance of the overall system. Universities bring together: groups of individuals, each doing a very different job; a considerable number of intertwined decision-making processes; a great variety of institutional outputs. There is an inescapable organizational and functional complexity to universities, and in order to grasp this complexity, some scholars have proposed terms such as ‘multiversity’ (Kerr 1963) or the ‘federal or conglomerate form of organization’ (Clark 1995). As a result of such features, universities have been considered to be a typical example of the loose-coupling organization, or a form of organized anarchy. Universities as loose-coupling institutions are characterized (Orton and Weick 1990) by their causal indeterminacy and their external and internal fragmentation.

From the systemic point of view, the goal of “governance” — as it is differing from the old notion of “governing”, as “driving in a certain direction”, or, even most tough meaning of the word “govern” — as it is used in non-democratic regimes — as a total “control of the Government” — is to bring all the participating parties to the equilibrium of a dynamic consensus about their joint work on collective problem solving in a particular social field. So, in the field of Higher Education this goal is to achieve compatibility and responsiveness of academic institutions, getting universities to behave as ‘responsible institutions’ — vis a vis — other societal institutions, such as governments, businesses, local communities, professional unions and academic associations and the like.

In a wider look, it would be important to consider how much current academic institutions are adequate to the demands of the “public at large”, since this is the necessary prerequisite for ensuring that the higher education system as a whole is **effectively responding to the needs of society** and is working in the public interest.

Here we need to respond to another question: how do we define “public interest”, particularly in the societies with strong authoritarian traditions, such as Russia, where the government and other “public institutions” are not, necessarily, pursue the goals of public good, but, rather, bureaucratic purposes? How do we define in this case the ‘true’ interests and the needs of “public”?

Changing Public and Representation of Public Needs

According to the “classical” definition of Habermas, the “public” can only appear in a “public sphere”- a phenomenon of modern bourgeois society (the public, initially, was understood as those gathering for meal and discussions at bourgeois salons, gathering around newspapers and magazines) [Habermas 1962, 1973]. Habermas had formulated its attitude to the “public sphere” long time ago, when the concept which he described and the level of social development were very different, than today. This circumstance is rarely referenced. Among the few who noted this fact — among Russian researchers — studies we indicate Yury Krasin [Krasin, 2005: 15-32: Public space ... 2008; Public Policy ... 2008].

Recent works of Habermas [Habermas 1997: 105-108; originally published 1989; Habermas 2008] cited less frequently, meanwhile in this works we can see dramatic changes of the original vision of the term “public domain”, which develops with the development of the society.

With the transition to post-modern, information society of mass culture, electronic media (particularly television and advertising), public sphere had not only widened, but also fallen into massive manipulation by those controlling the media-flow, that leads to imitation and simulation of public opinion and participation, that has a growing number of authors writing on this subject [Baudrillard 1981; Holodkovskiy 2009; Belyaeva 2006; Petrov 2009; Kinev & Lubarev 2011]. TV and other mass-media often deprives people from the need to think on their own, as all opinions are pre-formulated, the commentators explain, “what is really going on”, — thus “public opinion” is been “shaped up” — not by the public itself, rather, by media. Owners, that might have their own interest in the subject matter. So, the “public” — as an independent policy actor — might be completely lost .

Information society with new opportunities of forming and manipulating public opinion in its development and movement toward a postmodern also have other trends — new feudalism or “refeudalization”, to a new “synthesis” of private and public spheres, where the new feudal lords, create the public in specific location, city or problem (so-called. territorial and / or problematic binding) on the basis of personal relationships.

Going construction of public spaces, which may overlap, but, nevertheless, there are many of them, so it is correlates with postmodern logic of increased heterogeneity of complex systems, like today's state and society.

At the same time we must not forget that Habermas points directly [Habermas 1997: 105-108], that he deals with modern bourgeois democracy — and furthermore, he works with countries that already established and functioning, “welfare state”, ie “social state”, which largely takes care of the social needs of citizens and have possibility to provide it.

Our understanding of the public, ie society composed from knowledgeable, competent citizens who are able to organize themselves in pursuit of common interests, based on its “classical” interpretations, dating back to the meaning of the term *res-publica*. Namely in accordance with these meanings the public is the foundation of civil society, its activity in concert with other political actors leads to the implementation of the “public interest” and achieving “common good”, to change, if necessary, existing political institutions.

Ability to cooperate, assist “others”, based on solidarity and mutual trust — property of representatives of the public or subjects of civil participation. Since the public — is collection of citizens who have certain qualities — competence, awareness, autonomy — inclusion them in an active political practice, and on a regular basis, establishes the practice as an institution of civic participation. Thus, only the active members of the public by their actions support public institutions or transform them, or destroy the old and create new institutions.

In Russia several governmental initiative of commercialization of school and higher education (the most important — Federal Act #83 — according to it the most part of government founded schools and universities switch to the new system of financing — there will be not state obligatory financing for them) give rise to protests of public and “public associations”: associations of school and universities teachers²,

² http://www.gazeta.ru/education/2010/06/02_e_3379498.shtml; <http://www.novayagazeta.ru/news/814538.html>

associations of pupils and students parents³ etc. After these protests Dmitry Medvedev said that there will not be switch to the commercial basis of contemporary education⁴.

The 2010 UK student protests were a series of demonstrations that began in November 2010 in several areas of the United Kingdom, with the focal point of protests centred in London. The initial event was the largest student protest in the UK since the Labour government first proposed the Teaching and Higher Education Act in 1998⁵. Largely student-led, the protests were held in opposition to planned spending cuts to further education and an increase of the cap on tuition fees by the Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition government. The proposed budget reduction followed a review into higher education funding in England conducted by Lord Browne. Student groups said that the intended cuts to education were excessive and broke campaign promises made by politicians, amounting to "attempts to force society to pay for a crisis it didn't cause". On 30 November, following the third main day of protesting, the Welsh Assembly announced that it would not permit an increase in fees for Welsh students. A reporter from the BBC noted that this meant that if the plans went through in England, "it would mean that an English student at a university in England could pay more than £17,000 more for a three-year degree than a Welsh student on the same course"⁶. A writer in British newspaper The Guardian, writing several hours before the government vote on the topic, noted that "It seems likely the tuition fees bill will pass but I'd still argue that — whatever your view on the merits of the new fees system — the protests have been a success at least in calling politicians to account for broken pledges, something you see rarely these[sic] days"⁷.

Keeping in mind this dramatic change of public sphere due to the mediatisation and existing risks of manipulation of the public opinion in the shaping of policy-making and governance in the field of Higher Education, speaking of the “existing governing policies” we should always look for specific actors, institutes and interest groups, who were pushing for this policies to appear and the interplay of public and private interests that had lead to it, — as this may provide a better answer — to which extend the current governance regimes represent the interest of the key stake-holders on the field of Higher Education : the students, the parents, the teachers, the innovative business, the needs for the society development at large.

This would allow us to make a better judgement, if — and how much — a modern university is, in fact, “**servicing the public**”

Models of Governance in Higher Education

What had been noted, that, despite of a great variety of the level “societal development” and ways of articulation and manifestation of the “societal educational needs”, as well as different institutional designs of the Higher Educational systems in

³ <http://news.rambler.ru/6344477/>;
http://www.svobodanews.ru/archive/ru_news_zone/20100515/17/17.html?id=2043038#ixzz0o1H4mQ00;
<http://news.vtomske.ru/details/20429.html>

⁴ <http://mama.ru/static/view/id/424>

⁵ <http://www.thisislondon.co.uk/standard/article-23896267-thousands-join-london-march-in-protest-at-soaring-tuition-fees.do>

⁶ <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-11877034>

⁷ <http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/blog/2010/dec/09/student-protests-live-coverage?INTCMP=SRCH>

different European countries, there are limited number of recognisable MODELS, in which university governance is organised, in order to respond to those public needs

So, the coordination and governance between loose autonomous elements of higher education systems — including a university as example of such system — had been dealt with — in the last two centuries -by using three ways or models⁸.

The **Continental Model**. This model supposed systemic coordination by State-centred policies. It is not allowed institutional autonomy but implied academic guild power. Faculties and school act as “confederation of Professors”.

The **British Model** in contrary to continental model permit relevant institutional autonomy, collegial academic predominance in conditions of moderate role of the State.

The **American Model** like British model supposed strong institutional autonomy, but in contrary has weak role for academics and instead relevant role of external stakeholders. Talking about the role of the state it considered as “shared governance” when decision-making is a process of interests’ harmonization of different actors.

If we examine the development of universities in the Western world over the course of the last two centuries, we see that the governance problem at the systemic level has been resolved in a variety of different ways, according to the specific national context in question. Several attempts have been made to classify systemic governance within higher education, in order to take account of the structural differentiation underlying the idiosyncratic character of higher education. The best-known such attempt resulted in Clark’s triangle (1983), consisting in the interaction of three mechanisms of systemic coordination: the State, the market and the academic oligarchy. Clark proposed three ideal-types of higher educational systemic governance (namely the Continental European, American and British types). It should be noted here that the basic elements of the Continental European model are: systemic, strongly hierarchical coordination through State-centred policies; no institutional autonomy; the powerful, all-pervasive authority of the academic guilds; and faculties and schools constituting ‘confederations of chair-holders’. The British model, on the other hand, is characterized by: substantial institutional autonomy; collegial academic predominance; the fairly limited role of the state. Finally, the American model consists in: the strong procedural autonomy of universities, which is counter-balanced by substantial public monitoring of the quality of performance and results (for public universities); the important role of external stakeholders (which also means the significant role of public political institutions in the case of public universities); academics’ limited role in determining universities’ strategic objectives, which is counterbalanced, in accordance with the principle of ‘shared governance’, by their more substantial powers when it comes to traditional academic matters (staff recruitment, course content, and so on).

Pressures for change coming from Society

In developed western states tremendous pressures for change in higher education systems (mostly, at universities) are coming from dynamic developing

⁸ Clark 1983

societies This mostly happens on the national level, but also at the international and global levels as well. We can figure out several factors influencing the changes.

First. **Increasing participation in Higher Education** (the long way from elite to mass, and the universal education).

Second. **Increasing diversification in the educational demands.** More and more diverse forms of higher education demanded and supplied: general education, specialized education, life-long-learning, distance learning courses, internationalisation of courses; training to research.

Third. **Strong demands for “knowledge economy”;** for providing training and technology development for community; for generating economic development.

As in this paper we seek to look beyond “Old European Democracies”, such as Great Britain, Germany and Italy, — and to compare the Higher Education Governance in European countries with situation in Russia, it is interesting to note, that the factors named, are also truly important in the Russian environment as well.

But, there are also several additional ones, like the traditional prestige of the higher education, social mobility it provides as well as increasing hope for the opportunities for the international mobility, pursued by Russian students.

In a **changing world** we have other **international factors** but they call for change in higher education too.

First. Internationalisation, globalisation but, above all, the new technology and information system means the speeding up of new developments in the field of science; changes in the spatial boundaries and temporal limitations to knowledge production; strong pressure for “results”.

Second. Increasing costs for education as public funding is decreasing.

Third. Structural pressure for competition. Universities are forced by administration, state officials and competitive environment struggle for students, clients, research funds, etc.

In conclusion, we can make a point that Universities are pressed to be accountable to Government, Students, Local Community, Private clients, Other stakeholders, Society at large.

And Universities in modern conditions are forced to be accountable for financial and physical resources, Quality in innovation in teaching, Student recruitment, Faculty appointments, Research resources, productivity, and knowledge transfer, Rigour in management and quality assurance, Well-being of students, faculty and staff.

Russia — is affected — in very same way, but, with additional feature, as government push universities into integration with world education system through involvement into Bologna process, modernisation of contemporary and higher education making schools and universities compete with each other for students and other resources, and to raise the level of competitiveness of Russian school in the world⁹. The main governmental initiatives: from 2001 — enactment of United State Exam for all Russian pupils to enrol into universities; from 2003 — including Russia into Bologna process — the system BA\MA was introduced overall Russia in 2009; 2006 — enactment of Act #74 — that gives to schools and universities more autonomy

⁹ Social policy in Russia. 2000s. Independent institute of social policy. M. 2007.

Bure K.S. Reform of higher education: expansion of bachelors and masters. Educational Policy. 2008.

and transparency in their acting; from 2006 — creation of 10 federal universities connected with 10 Russian regions for developing of the economy of these regions¹⁰; from 2009 — creation of 30 national research universities for innovative research and science development in Russia¹¹.

However, the historically rooted models of governance in Western countries, masterfully represented by Clark's ideal-types, have revealed certain limitations when faced with modern-day challenges (Braun and Merrien 1999). Each inherited governance equilibrium has been obliged to change. In the past, universities were never subjected to such pressure to dramatically change their traditional governance practices and equilibria, dating back 100 years or more. In more recent times, society and government have started to take great interest in higher education since the now global, highly-competitive context requires that the quality of human capital be constantly improved, and new technological solutions be found, in order to support economic development (Enders and Fulton 2002; Geiger 2004). At the same time, it should be pointed out that the Welfare State's structural financial crisis has profoundly affected higher education as well. Governments now have fewer resources to invest in higher education, and thus they need to improve the efficiency of their higher education systems.

One of the inevitable consequences of such circumstantial and financial pressure is structural pressure to change the inherited, historically rooted modes of governance. The consequent shift in governance modes initially dates from the 1980s, particularly in the **UK** and the **Netherlands**, and certain highly reputed scholars in the higher education policy field realized its potential implications for further generalized developments (Neave 1988; Kogan 1989; van Vught 1989; Neave and Van Vught 1991). We now have a clearer, more complete picture of what has really happened since the onset of this shift.

The amount of total spending on the higher education in Russian is, still, considerably lower, than in western countries. Costs on one student to the education and research is about 2% (in USA — 21%, in UK — 11%, in France — 11%)¹².

In fact, from the 1990s onwards, governments throughout the West began a course of systematic intervention in the higher education sector, albeit at different times and with differing degrees of energy (this was also the case in the **USA's** public universities — see Leslie and Novak 2003; McLendon 2003a, b; El-Khawas 2005), by reforming the systemic mode of governance, and in Continental Europe, also by modifying the structure of internal governance. Generally speaking, the basic levers of reform can be identified as follows: institutional autonomy and internal institutional governance; funding mechanisms; the quality assessment of research and teaching (Gornitzka *et al.* 2005; Cheps 2006; Lazzaretti and Tavoletti 2006; Maassen and Olsen 2007; Trakman 2008). The basic features of past governance modes in higher education have been re-designed by recent governments, and in doing so they have

¹⁰ http://www.strf.ru/organization.aspx?CatalogId=221&d_no=27726

¹¹ <http://mon.gov.ru/pro/niu/>

¹² Kuz'minov. Education in Russia. What we can do?// Questions on Education. 2004. № 1. P. 8 // <http://www.hse.ru/data/911/784/1228/educationinrussiawhat.pdf>

also changed their role in the steering of the system (Amaral *et al.* 2002; Huisman 2009; Paradeise *et al.* 2009).

In Russia, on the contrary, with the ‘ democratic revolution of the 90-es’ — Government was “ going out of University”. Act of 1992 on Education, establishing “private universities” these allow to state decries their participation in educational policy¹³.

What our general experience of higher education teaches us is that in order to understand the intrinsic logic of governance shifts, we need to focus on the changing role of governments. In order to analyse how this shift has come about, from an empirical point of view using four specific national cases, we need to gain a better understanding of the possible roles governments play in systemic governance modes within higher education.

Conceptualization of governance models in Higher Education

There are several approaches to the conceptualization of the concept of governance, defined as “a minimum of government interference, as corporate management, as the new public management, as “good governance”, or a socio-cybernetic system, a self-organizing network”¹⁴.

Political administration in the style of this new understanding of governance (“joint” or “mutual” control) suggests a new role for government and the state, acting as the moderators of political and administrative process to harmonize and promote the interests of different social groups and political actors competing with each other.

However, in all cases and public policy spheres (in educational policy too) the pivotal dimension is represented by the role of STATE. The policy and policy process even if it understands as governance depend from what and “how” the State/government decides to do or not dot¹⁵.

Understanding these point allow us to figure out four modes of governance in Higher Education (see table 1).

Table 1. Types of governance and modes of governance in Higher Education

	Government specifies the goals to be achieved	Government does not specifies the goals to be achieved	
Government specifies the mean to be used	<i>Hierarchical governance</i> Government substantial regulation: totally earmarked financing in research or in students’ access; numerus clausus for student access	<i>Procedural (Bureaucratic) governance</i> Detailed national regulation on the procedures regarding recruitment, student access; curricula etc	State control governance models

¹³ Lukov V. Educational reform. // Knowledge. Understanding. Skills. 2005. № 3. P. 217-219.

¹⁴ Rhodes, 2008: 51-74

¹⁵ Van Vught 1989, Becher and Kogan 1982, MCDaniel 1996, Braun and Merrien 1999.

Government does not specify the means universities should has to use	<i>Managerial governance</i> Financial incentives; quality evaluation; contracts; benchmarking; legislation regarding institutional governance; mergers, departmental grading	<i>Voluntary (or market or self-) governance</i> participation, persuasion, negotiations, partnerships, competition; sponsorships, loans, natural selection, self-accreditation, subject numbers determined by consumer choice	Steering at a distance governance models
--	--	---	--

Higher education policy fits into this picture perfectly since ‘government’ has the inescapable task of defining what governance is, or can be. So while government’s role in higher education is inescapable (whereas this may perhaps not be the case in other policy fields), and government is in charge of designing the existing sectional governance modes, government may decide to model systemic governance modes through its choice of the degree of freedom to be afforded to other policy actors with regard to the goals to be pursued, and the means with which they are to be achieved.

For example, within the field of higher education, government may decide that an increased rate of participation in higher education is a systemic goal, and then choose which means are to be adopted (strict regulation or financial incentives) to achieve that goal; moreover, governments are always in charge of deciding whether institutional differentiation is to be systemically pursued, and if so how to go about this (through regulation or by means of competitive mechanisms). Governments design the systemic modes for the governance of higher education through a combination of strategic goals and means, and then establish the nature of those policy instruments to be adopted for the pursuit of said goals. The dichotomization of the role of government in establishing which goals are to be pursued and the means to be adopted, enables us to formulate a typology of systemic governance modes within higher education, the spatial representation of which is given in **table 1**.

Hierarchical governance and procedural governance represent the two traditional governance modes in which the State plays a pivotal commanding and controlling role. In the case of hierarchical governance, the command and control strategy covers both goals and means, through those detailed directives that establish precisely which goals are to be pursued, and the means to be employed to achieve this. Government is a hegemonic actor, and as such it directly coordinates all aspects of policy-making. The hierarchical governance of higher education is typified by those situations in which the State imposes its goals and methods on the universities (which means that the universities have very limited procedural or substantial autonomy, assigned funding is completely targeted by the State, and there is little or no quality assessment). This is the case of earmarked funding (for technological research, for example), or that of a set number of students allowed to enrol for a specific subject.

In the second of the presented governance modes, the one defined as **procedural**, the actors involved (regardless of whether they are public or private) are free to choose their own goals, but in order to pursue those goals they are obliged to abide by the procedural regulations issued, controlled, and enforced by public institutions. The prevailing actor in such cases is **central bureaucracy**, and very often this gives rise to privileged relationships with the most important sectorial interest

groups (which in the field of higher education are the academic guilds and the academic subjects themselves). In higher education, procedural governance exists when the State imposes rigid procedural rules on universities, but leaves them substantial autonomy (that is, they can do what they want, but in doing so they have to follow those procedural rules established by the centre of the system). For example: in many continental European countries, the State obliges universities to follow rules governing academic staff recruitment and promotion, student tuition, curricula, and so on. The procedural quadrant perfectly fits what Burton Clark (1983) has defined as the Continental model of systemic university governance. It has to be said here that the procedural and hierarchical modes may overlap. In fact, it is clear that the hierarchical mode also absorbs the policy instruments of the procedural mode, although there is a substantial difference in the working logic of these two forms of direct government intervention: the procedural mode is characterized by room for substantial decisions to be made at the bottom-up level. In fact, the procedural mode gives the academic oligarchies of universities freedom to choose the contents of academic business. This freedom of choice is considerably limited under the hierarchical mode for the simple fact that this mode imposes substantial constraints upon the nature of decisions. Furthermore, in both types of governance mode, the direct role of government profoundly constrains universities' capacity to act as corporate bodies.

The **steering-at-the-distance** and **self-governance** modes represent the two models in which governmental influence is of an indirect nature. In higher education, these modes are generally characterized by considerable institutional autonomy and by the systemic assessment and evaluation of universities' performance. However, there are a number of substantial differences between these two types.

In the **steering-at-the-distance mode**, government is strongly committed to the pursuit of collective targets, but nevertheless leaves policy actors enough free to choose the means by which to reach those targets. In doing so, however, government adopts certain specific policy strategies designed to encourage policy actors to comply with governmental objectives (for example, increasing student numbers or investing in applied research). In this mode of systemic governance, government plays no direct role, and policy coordination is guaranteed by a complex set of regulations and, very often, by the presence of a public institution (agency or authority) acting as broker. Government tries to influence institutional behaviour not by issuing direct commands, but by applying soft rules, providing financial incentives and evaluating performance. In such cases, government may directly intervene in order to re-design the internal institutional government of public higher education institutions, depending on the nature of national trajectories and traditions. The steering-at-a-distance mode assumes that both sides of systemic governance — the government and the individual universities — act in a responsible and accountable way. Governments are supposed to make clear their systemic goals and the nature of incentives and constraints which the universities are to take into consideration when planning their actions. Universities are supposed to establish their own institutional strategy in a rational way, that is, by trying to identify the best point of equilibrium between governmental input, their own internal resources, and the socio-economic context in which they operate.

In the **self-governance mode**, on the other hand, government chooses to leave the policy arena almost completely free. It is assumed that the fundamental criterion of sectorial coordination is based on the institutionalization of relations between

participants. However, it is clear that government reserves the right to intervene when it deems this to be necessary, thus changing the governance mode and policy tools. The self-governance model in higher education is, to put it simply, the situation in which institutions are left free to choose what they want to do, and how to do it. Contrary to what one may imagine, this is not a marginal model, since the British and American forms of systemic governance, as proposed by Clark, fit (or rather, fitted) perfectly within this quadrant.

It is clear that according to the logic of the aforementioned typology, while governmental influence is exerted directly in the two models above the horizontal axis, in the two governance modes located below this axis, such influence is not absent but is of an indirect (steering-at-a-distance model) or latent (self-governing model) variety. Thus the latter two models, although shaped differently, both fall under the 'shadow of hierarchy'.

Analysing shifts in Higher Education Governance in four countries

Analysing the Governance shifts we have to take into consideration not only institutional changes (changes in the distribution of powers and responsibilities) but changes in governance arrangements.

In order to illustrate the utility of the abovementioned typology in describing governance shifts in higher education, we are now going to present four national cases, each characterized by a different tradition and inherited system within the field of higher education. The four cases in question are England, Germany, Italy and Russia.

In order to provide evidence of the quality and characteristics of the said shifts, I shall focus on the changes made to three specific features of higher education governance which specialized studies have deemed to be the most important from the comparative perspective, namely: institutional autonomy and governance; funding mechanisms; the assessment of research and teaching.

England: the managed system

Nowadays, higher education in England is strongly managed and market driven (Ferlie and Andresani 2009), and from an institutional point of view, universities have less freedom than they had in the past to choose their own institutional goals. As Shattock (2008, p. 183) has pointed out: 'once regarded as an example of British exceptionalism within Europe because of its independence from the state, is now subject not just to "State steering" but to state micro-management on a scale comparable to other European systems. The institutions themselves may still retain legal autonomy and a freedom of decision-making that is qualitatively different from the experience of institutional autonomy in most European countries, but the individual policy choices are heavily constrained by policies initiated in the heart of Whitehall'.

Germany: increasing institutional autonomy

The shifts in the **German system** have been characterized by a clear move away from the previous procedural mode, towards a new system in which universities are granted increased, albeit not excessive, institutional autonomy, and where

government tries to steer the system from a distance through financial incentives and negotiated contracts, although it has preserved certain attitudes linked to the pre-existing procedural tradition. The power of the State and of governments remains strong within Germany's higher education system, although the expression of this power has been modified in recent years (Bleiklie and Lange 2010), meaning: fewer regulations but greater influence over systemic goals; and greater institutional autonomy, but also increased competition for funding.

Italian case: many reforms, confusing results

Italian case thus shows that despite the many changes pursued by government in all three areas, government action has failed to match the announced goals and plans. In fact, the new 'steering-at-a-distance' strategy seems incapable of ridding governance of the conventional ex-ante evaluation, or of the continuous adoption of procedural constraints on universities behaviour with regard to the teaching function. National research assessments have not been institutionalized yet. So in the Italian case, the reform of governmental modes in higher education really seems to have taken the form of a kind of 'primordial broth' from which to fish out something merely on the basis of contingent political needs and the fashion of the day.

In Russia: move into Bologna process

The shift in Russia is characterized by lack of government regulation in 90s and when government come back in 2000s with a system of goals (modernization and innovations in education) and means how to achieve them (increase in state funding and regulation). Russia very actively were included in Bologna process (the BA/MA system implemented by 2009). According to reform in 2009-2011 — Few autonomy in academic standards for few universities (that get special status of federal universities and national research universities) were established with stable overall government control. If in 90s it was allowed to open private universities, government gave freedom to universities in issue curriculum and textbooks through accreditation process in 2000s only for Universities with special status (federal and national research) is given autonomy to have their own academic standards.

The empirical evidence that emerges from our comparison clearly points to an overall a shift (albeit of varying entity) from the procedural and self-governance modes towards those quadrants situated to the right of the abovementioned typology, and in particular towards the quadrant occupied by the steering-at-a-distance mode of governance.

Within a University: strong call for the centralisation

Talking about effects at the institutional level a common trend (even in countries where the pre-existent institutional government structures have been not changed): the environmental pressures (coming from society governments, needs of economic system etc.) and especially the changes in the systemic modes of governance are shifting the balance of power and authority within universities. There is a common trend towards the centralisation of authority. This means, for instance:

1. The strengthening of the role of individual leaders (Presidents, Rectors, Vice-Chancellor, Deans).
2. The reinforcing of the role of central administration and management.
3. The strengthening of power of Governing Board (in the Anglo-Saxon system and in the reformed European systems).
4. The power of academic voice and guilds in institutional decision-making is declining (or is conflicting and resisting the centralisation trends). This creates a structural risk of stalemate in the internal decision-making.
5. The introduction of new management tools as strategic plans, budgeting and financial management, internal audit and quality assessment system.
6. External stakeholders are assuming a relevant role in governance also in UK system and in Continental Europe
7. In Southern European countries a stronger role for local authorities is emerging.
8. Tendency to institutional differentiation (ranking of universities, different missions, etc.).

Conclusion

In conclusion, we can figure out several facts and problems.

First. Degree of changes varies between countries. For instance in France, Germany, and Italy, the above-sketched process is going slower by a strategy iper-incrementalist. In New Zealand, UK, The Netherlands processes listed above are going faster and more radical.

Second. Academic self-governance is the main loser. Even if it can be the case of coexistence of strong leadership with strong professoriate, as in the case of U.S. Research Universities.

Third. The governance shift in higher education is characterized by a relevant and strategic role of State at the systemic level and by an evident process of verticalization at the institutional level.

Forth. Individual academic's influence and power has weakened as well as the formal collective power of academics in internal decision-making. But if the evaluation and assessment of research is well done and well-institutionalised this could develop an elite of academics....(we are going to a strong internal stratification)

Fifth. Governments are pressing to differentiate universities into those that have different status and, as a result, functions — research universities, teaching universities, local universities, international universities and so on.

Sixth. Too many universities have an “amateurish” system of management. It is necessary that University leaders (rectors, presidents, deans, etc.) should have management skills in addition to academic ones; External stake-holders belonging to the Boards should have real interest and the right skills to be strategic policy-makers.

References

Amaral, A., J. Glen and K. Berit (eds). 2002. *Governing Hgher Education: National Perspectives on Institutional Governance*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Analytical communities in Karelia. Ed. Kakabadze Sh. Moscow, 2011 // Collection of articles of series “Regional analytical communities in Russia development” Ed. Belyaeva N.

- Analytical communities in Saratov region. Ed. Kakabadze Sh. Moscow, 2010 // Collection of articles of series "Regional analytical communities in Russia development" Ed. Belyaeva N.
- Analytical communities in Tatarstan. Ed. Kakabadze Sh. Moscow, 2011 // Collection of articles of series "Regional analytical communities in Russia development" Ed. Belyaeva N.
- Baudrillard J. *Simulacra and Simulation*. 1981
- Becher, T. 1989. *Academic Tribes and Territories*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Becher, T. and M. Kogan. 1992. *Process and Structure in Higher Education*. London: Routledge, 2nd edition.
- Belyaeva N. (Ed.) *Constitutional development in Russia: goals of institutional designing*. Collection of articles Moscow. 2007.
- Belyaeva N. (Ed.) *Public Policy in modern Russia: actors and institutions*. Moscow, 2006.
- Belyaeva N. *Public Policy in Russia: strength of environment*. Polis. 2007. № 1. P. 22-32.
- Berdahl, R. 1990. 'Academic Freedom, Autonomy and Accountability in British Universities', *Studies in Higher Education*, 15, 2, 169–80.
- Berdahl, R. 1999. 'Universities and Governments in the 21st Century: The US Experience', in B. Dietmar and M. Francoise-Xavier (eds), *Towards a New Model of Governance for Universities?: A Comparative View*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Bevir, M.R. and R.A.W. Rhodes. 2003. *Interpreting British Government*. London: Routledge.
- Bladh, A. 2007. 'Institutional Autonomy with Increasing Dependency on Outside Actors', *Higher Education Policy*, 20, 3, 243–59.
- Braun, D. and M. Francoise-Xavier. 1999. 'Governance of Universities and Modernisation of the State: Analytical Aspects', in B. Dietmar and M. Francoise-Xavier (eds), *Towards a New Model of Governance for Universities?: A Comparative View*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Bure K.S. *Reform of higher education: expansion of bachelors and masters*. Educational Policy. 2008.
- Cheps. 2006. *The Extent and Impact of Higher Education Governance Reform Across Europe*. Final Report to the Directorate General for Education and Culture Of European Commission, <http://ec.europa.eu/education/>.
- Clark, B. 1995. 'Complexity and Differentiation: The Deepening Problem of University Integration', in D. Dill and B. Sporn (eds), *Emerging Patterns of Social Demand and University Reform: Through a Glass Darkly*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Cohen, M.D. and J.G. March. 1974. *Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College Presidency*. New York: Mc Graw-Hill.
- Cohen, M.D., J.G. March and J.P. Olsen. 1972. 'A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17, 1–25.
- De Boer, H., J. Enders and L. Leisyte. 2007. 'Public Sector Reform in Dutch Higher Education: The Organizational Transformation of the University', *Public Administration*, 85, 1, 27–46.
- Eberlein, B. and D. Kerwer. 2004. 'New Governance in EU: A Theoretical Perspective', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 42, 1, 121–42.
- El-Khawas, E. 2005. 'The Push for Accountability: Policy Influences and Cctors in American Higher Education', in A. Gornitzka, M. Kogan and A. Amaral (eds), *Reform and Change in Higher Education*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Table 1 Changes between 1999 and 2009 in England, the Netherlands, Germany and Italy

	England before 1999	England in 2009	Germany before 1999	Germany in 2009
Structure of academic curricula	Complex system with different tracks leading from secondary school to HE. Bachelor/Master system (3+1/2).	Structure unchanged except for the introduction of the 'foundation degree' (a 2-year intermediate vocational degree)	Binary system (universities and Fachhochschulen). Academic curriculum based on the typical long-lasting degrees leading to a master equivalent title. Twotier system legally introduced on a trial basis since 1998.	The BA/MA system should be fully implemented by 2010. Accreditation process for degrees has been introduced.
Institutional autonomy and accountability	University as selfgoverning bodies based on different juridical basis (except for the pre-1992 polytechnics, whose internal governance is established by law). Strong governmental pressure since the early 1980s leading to competition and differentiation.	Reinforcement of the 1990s dynamics. Strong institutional managerialism	Low institutional autonomy. Power exerted by academic guild and LaËnders' governments	More institutional autonomy (in finance, organization and recruitment) recognized by LaËnder. New boards of governors instituted in many cases with the power to appoint the Rector/ president. More institutional variation but also persistence of self-academic governance style
Quality assurance	1997 Quality Assurance Agency. Evaluation of teaching and research through the Higher Education Funding Council. Institutional self-evaluation	Continuity with the inheritance of the past decade. Reluctance in endorsing the European system of quality assurance. Institutional audit preferred to accreditation system.	Not an issue.	Establishment of the Central Accreditation Council and of system of accreditation agencies. Regional procedures for teaching evaluation.

Italy before 1999	Italy in 2009	Russia before 1999	Russia in 2009
<p>Long-lasting degrees (4, 5 or 6 years) leading to a master equivalent title. Formal legal equality of all universities and all degrees. Little autonomy in determining the content of degrees.</p>	<p>First implementer of the Bologna process (law approved in 1999, deadline for full implementation in 2001, law corrected in 2004). Greater institutional autonomy to design the content of curricula.</p>	<p>General 5 year degree for all. The BA/MA system was established in advanced Universities (like HSE)</p>	<p>The BA/MA system implemented.</p>
<p>Typical continental governance structure based on the power of academic guilds and central ministry. Institutional autonomy of universities recognized in 1989 but used in an irresponsible way by universities precisely because this model of governance is foreign to the continental tradition.</p>	<p>No changes. Dramatic financial situation of universities also because of their way to govern themselves. A new governmental bill has been presented to the Parliament in December 2009 (it has been approved at the end of 2010 and provides some new regulations on the institutional governance. Not clear if it will produce real change).</p>	<p>Continental governance structure, state control hierarchical governance model. After 1992 a short period of lack of governmental control started.</p>	<p>No change. According to reform in 2009-2011 — Few autonomy in academic standards for few universities (that get special status of federal universities and national research universities) with stable overall government control</p>
<p>In the mid of 1990s the Internal Audit Units and the National Evaluation Committee for universities have been established as advisory bodies. Very ineffective in the decision-making.</p>	<p>More decision powers given to the Internal Audit Units. A National Committee is now in charge of the accreditation of degrees. Formal establishment of a National Agency for the Evaluation of Research and Teaching still not working.</p>	<p>Government control before 1992. Law of Education 1992 allow to open private universities give freedom in issue curriculum and textbooks through accreditation process</p>	<p>Only for Universities with special status (federal and national research) is given autonomy to have their own academic standards</p>

- Enders, J. and O. Fulton (eds). 2002. *Higher Education in a Globalising World*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Geiger, R. 2004. *Knowledge and Money: Research Universities and the Paradox of the Marketplace*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- Gornitzka, A., M. Kogan and A. Amaral (eds). 2005. *Reform and Change in Higher Education*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Habermas J. 1962, trans. 1989. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Cambridge.
- Habermas J. 1973. "The Public Sphere" in Seidman, S. (ed.). — *Jurgen Habermas on Society and Politics*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas J. 1993. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere. An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Cambridge, Mas.: The MIT Press.
- Habermas J. 1997. *The Public Sphere*. — *Contemporary Philosophy* (Ed. by E. Goodin and Philip Pettit). Oxford Blackwell.
- Holodkovskiy K. About political system in Russia // http://www.politstudies.ru/fulltext/2009/2/2.htm#_ftnref30.
- Huisman, J. (ed). 2009. *International Perspectives on the Governance of Higher Education*. London: Routledge.
- Kehm, B. and U. Lansendorf. 2006b. 'Germany — 16 Lander Approaches to Reform', in B.M. Kehm and U. Lansendorf (eds), *Reforming University Governance — Changing Conditions for Research in Four European Countries*. Bonn: Lemmens.
- Kennet P. 2008. *Governance, Globalization and Public Policy*. Chentelhem, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc.
- Kerr, C. 1963. *The Uses of University*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Kinev, Lubarev. *Partiers and elections in modern Russia: evolution and devolution*. Lederal Foundation. 2001
- Krasin Y. *Public sphere and public policy in Russia*. Moscow, 2005.
- Kuz'minov. *Education in Russia. What we can do?* // *Questions on Education*. 2004. № 1. P. 8 // <http://www.hse.ru/data/911/784/1228/educationinrussiawhat.pdf>
- Lanzendorf, U. 2006. 'Austria — from Hesitation to Rapid Breakthrough', in B.M. Kehm and U. Lansendorf (eds), *Reforming University Governance — Changing Conditions for Research in Four European Countries*. Bonn: Lemmens.
- Lasswell Harold D. 1930. *Psychopathology and Politics*. Chicago.: University of Chicago Press.
- Lazzaretti, L. and E. Tavoletti. 2006. 'Governance Shifts in Higher Education: A Cross National Comparison', *European Educational Research Journal*, 5, 1, 18–36.
- Leslie, D.W. and R.J. Novak. 2003. 'Substance Versus Politics: Through the Dark Mirror of Governance Reform', *Educational Policy*, 17, 1, 98–120.
- Lukov V. *Educational reform*. // *Knolege. Understanding. Skills*. 2005. № 3. P. 217-219.
- Maassen, P. and J. Olsen. 2007. *University Dynamics and European Integration*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- McDaniel, O.C. 1996. 'The Paradigms of Governance in Higher Education Systems', *Higher Education Policy*, 9, 2, 137–58.
- McLendon, M. 2003a. 'Setting the Governmental Agenda for State Decentralization of Higher Education', *Journal of Higher Education*, 74, 5, 479–515.
- McLendon, M. 2003b. 'State Governance Reform of Higher Education: Patterns, Trends, and Theories of the Public Policy Process', *Higher Education Handbook of Theory and Research*, 27, 57–143.

- McLendon, M. and J.C. Hearn. 2009. 'Viewing Recent US Governance Reform Whole: 'Decentralization' in a Distinctive Context', in J. Huisman (ed), *International Perspectives on the Governance of Higher Education*. London: Routledge.
- Musselin, C. and C. Paradeise. 2009. 'France: From Incremental Transitions to Institutional Change', in C. Paradeise et al. (eds), *University Governance. Western European Comparative Perspectives*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Neave, G. and F. Van Vught. 1991. *Prometheus Bound*. London: Pergamon Press.
- New Models of Governance in the Global System. Exploring Publicness, Delegation and Inclusiveness (ed. by M.K.Archibugi, M.Zurn). 2006.
- Originally published in *Jürgen Habermas on Society and Politics*, ed. Steven Seidman. 1989. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Paradeise, C. et al. (eds). 2009. *University Governance. Western European Comparative Perspectives*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Petrov N. Political mechanism of Russian power: substitute against institute // Public opinion. #4. Levada Centre.
- Schimank, U. 2005. 'New Public Management and the Academic Profession: Reflections on the German Situation', *Minerva*, 43, 361–75.
- Shattock, M. 2008. 'The Change from Private to Public Governance of British Higher Education: Its Consequences for Higher Education Policy Making. 1980-2006', *Higher Education Quarterly*, 62, 3, 181–203.
- Social policy in Russia. 2000s. Independent institute of social policy. M. 2007.
- Trakman, L. 2008. 'Modelling University Governance', *Higher Education Quarterly*, 62, 63–83.
- Trow, M. 1974. *Problems in the Transition from Elite to Mass Higher Education*. Paris: Oecd.
- Van Vught, F. (ed). 1989. *Governmental Strategies and Innovation in Higher Education*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Wallace H., Young A. (ed.). 1997. *Participation and Policy-making in the EU*. Oxford.
- Weick, K.E. 1976. 'Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21, 1–19.
- Yang, R., L. Vidovich and J. Currie. 2007. 'Dancing in a Cage: Changing Autonomy in Chinese Higher Education', *Higher Education*, 54, 4, 575–92.

Ekaterina Tupova
**“Typical students” in Russian University:
transformation of the public image**

Introduction

The topic I have chosen is very complicated. In a way, it includes the transformation of stereotypes about Russian scholars. Students and youth seemed to be the most active part of the society in the XX century, but student image models varied across times. It is the common knowledge that youth and students are associated with modernization power. Nowadays the image of a typical student is not taken as a serious power of any kind.

My main purpose is to show the evolution of student image in the following aspects: social life, political activeness, academic achievements and self-realization.

I looked back in history of Russia to create understand the historical background. I used the method of comparing popular “myth” characters. The links were: “History of Seaman Vasilij Kariotskiy and the Beautiful Princess Iraklia”¹, “The student”² by Griboedov, “Fathers and Sons”³ by Turgenev, “Crime and Punishment”⁴ by Dostoevsky, “The Cherry Orchard”⁵ by Chekhov, “My Universities”⁶ by Gorky, “Diaries 1949-1956”⁷ by Shcheglov, the report “British Students Visit Moscow”⁸ by a delegation of foreign students, movie “Shurik's Adventures”⁹, and play «Przewalski Horse»¹⁰ by Shatrov.

From very beginning

Looking back at the history of Russian education, I should note that higher education in the country was largely influenced by Western experience.¹¹ First Russian universities appeared later than in Western Europe, and first Russian scholars were educated abroad, in Germany and Italy. Education in this period was a privilege of churchmen, which caused a problem: educated people had big authority but the source of their erudition seemed suspicious because of the close attachment with Catholic culture. Russian Orthodox church was afraid of Western influence, so it wasn't very interested in sending students abroad or coping Western model of education.

At the end of the XVII century, many heresies appeared, and the moment came when the Russian church got quite preoccupied about education.

So, Kyiv-Mohyla Academy was started in 1632. It had the aim of preparing people with «true faith» and right way of thinking.¹¹ In 1687, based on the same principles, Slavic Greek Latin Academy was launched in order to strengthen the Orthodox Church. In this period students (if we can call so those educated at Russian religious and cultural centers) were loyal to the authorities.

The country was developing, and the need in secular education increased. As a result, at the beginning of the XVIII century education became more open for people of all rank and status.²

The tendency is shown in “History of Seaman Vasiliy Kariotskiy and the Beautiful Princess Iraklia” (early XVIII century). Kariotskiy is a social actor and a progressive man. He doesn’t protest, his views are a result of changes that Peter the Great brought to Russia. For him, Self-realization is a part of state's success, while academic achievements don’t really matter: only material success is a goal.

In 1720, three fourths of all Kyiv-Mohyla Academy students became translators or continued education in engineering, mathematics, or in medical schools; only one fourth of graduates was ordained .

However, there was lack of specialists in applied sciences, such as maths and engineering, not of comprehensively educated theoreticians. So the main emphasis was put on primary and secondary education. Another very important step was done: Saint Petersburg University was founded together with the Academy of Sciences. At the beginning, people still feared foreigners (since most professors were usually invited from abroad), and most of the students were children of visitors.

After grants for scholars were introduced, the number of students increased: there were some who paid for their education, while others were supported by the government. The second type of students included people of different social status; some of them were even peasants (like Lomonosov, who later founded Moscow State University). One by one, new educational centers started to appear: Moscow State University in 1755, Medical School within the Main Public College in Saint-Petersburg (which later transformed into Medical University) in 1783. The main result of all the educational reforms was that the system became clearer and more unified, and universities took their place on top of the hierarchy. At the beginning of the XIX century universities started to play a role of powerful institutions. Kazan University and Kharkov University were founded. New university regulation granted autonomy to Moscow State University in 1804. The spirit of freedom became part of everyday university life. The rector’s autonomy in both administration and academic planning were important for the development of science and for the formation of the future generation of the Decembrists.

These were the times when students became an active social group. This process had several reasons. For example, it became necessary for young gentlemen to be highly educated in order to be accepted into social life. The Myravyov reforms included taking obligatory exams for ranks of collegiate assessor or councilor of state. That is why the sons of noble families became part of the student community. The Trubetskoys, the Volkonskies, the Aladyanu, the Vsevolzhskies, and the Raevskies — all of these noble names can be found in student registry lists. Some students also were formed clergymen. As D. Sverbeev wrote in his memoires, “In our times students were divided into two groups: post-gymnasium students or seminarians, who shaved beards, and us, aristocrats, who didn’t even have bloom on our cheeks. While the commons were studying, we were just having fun.”

Benevolsky, the main character of the famous comedy “The Student” by Griboedov, appeared as a parody to this kind of students. He just imitates being socially active and having liberal views for his own purposes.

This separation appeared because of the different level of requirements in entrance examinations for people coming from different social background. The commons had to take entrance exams seriously, while for the nobles it often was a formality. Some of the aristocratic “students” were 13 or even 11 years old. It was a common practice because at the age of 16-17 they had to start working and have high rank at the same time. As a result, we can talk about two kinds of students¹².

Aristocrats, who paid for their education, were a diversified group in which individuals usually followed their family’s standards of life and behaviour. In contrast, people supported by the government really studied at university. They didn’t have a lot of money to spend, and they lived quite poor. The beginning of the XIX century was when the first images of a “typical student”, close to our current understanding², appeared. They lived in hostels, 10-15 people in one room; they couldn’t go out after 10 o’clock. Young people invented different excuses to avoid this rule: they would say they were visiting some friends for dinner due to lack of money. It usually caused troubles when at night, being drunk, such students left the hostel and started to make noise. Such practice wasn’t rare as we can see from memoirs of different people. University gave them grants: of 150-200 rubles, and also often provided them with food, just like in secondary schools. Still, they were seeking for extra-money and sometimes had part-time jobs usually as private tutors or translators. University performance was very important for a career. They were “struggling” for social status; they were “fighting” for excellent marks and money for living.

For young aristocrats, their future rank and place of work depended mostly not on their knowledge of Latin but on family power. They had more free time and more freedom. The ideas of Western philosophy excited them. So, a large part of students formed little groups, usually started as close a circle of friends, and sometimes grew into communities with political programs.

It is important to mention that image of a student who is politically active emerged in this time and was connected mostly with liberal (but not radical) young aristocrats.

Students often had meetings, and the main topics discussed were literature, art and philosophy. Voltaire’s ideals seemed realistic and, as the Decembrist revolt showed, they were ready to fight for them. After this event, new stricter regulation regarding universities were adopted. The government tried to make higher education a privilege of the nobles and to cut out commons. Uvarov with his famous formula “Orthodoxy, Autocracy, and Nationality” practically tried to revive image of XVII-century students. Just like before the reforms of Peter the Great, main emphasis was made on religious knowledge. Independence of universities and professors was diminished; even students’ everyday life was under control. All this had the goal to bring up people with strong faith in “true government”. The Decembrists caused changes in the Russian education system but the government couldn’t stop the time and only became an enemy in eyes of an average student.

Two very interesting images appeared later in the form of Bazarov (from “Fathers and Sons”) and Raskolnikov (“Crime and Punishment”).

Bazarov is a commoner and has a very specific view on every issue. He believes that all achievements are made through work and hard studying. He is represented with sympathy as a serious and complicated character. He has a lot of

knowledge in science and knows how it works in practice. Being a nihilist, he thinks that everything traditional should be destroyed.

In this period students had reasons for fighting, and the nature of their protest was becoming more and more radical; even the “thaw” period of Alexander the Second couldn’t stop this process. As a result, “typical student” of the early XIX century was a noble with the ideas of spiritual freedom or hard-working person with mostly radical views and with the perception of the government as an enemy.

Raskolnikov’s example shows how in such a situation the idea of self-realization leads to destruction. He doesn’t work, he is trying to help some people in difficult situations but doesn’t see the way of social injustice overcoming. Not really interested in politics, he behaves and thinks in an oppositional way. He can’t continue studying because of lack of money, neither does he see any interest in life except for the realization of his “idea”.

History repeats twice

*« History repeats twice: first time
As a tragedy, second as a farce »
Hegel*

The beginning of the XX century brought instability to Russia’s political life. A Soviet historian while talking about students in this period used Lenin’s words. In 1903 he wrote what they were the most responsive part of intelligentsia. We have plenty of information about the nature of student movements in this period.

In literature, we can see the image of Trofimov, who speaks a lot about the future of society. We know that he had problems at university because of his progressive ideas. Chekhov sees in him the voice of the future but doesn’t take him seriously. Trofimov is not a power of change or a man of future.

Revolution of 1905 year satisfied a large part of intelligentsia. There were some positive changes for the system of higher education: new, democratic university admission rules were accepted.

After communists came to power in 1917, students were diversified, just like the other parts of the society, but political activeness remained one of the most important features of this group.

Images of students in “My Universities” by Gorky are not very representative. The main character of this book takes education in the “university of life” but he also meets some real students. They are poor and are trying to make their living. Mostly they are radical revolutionists who have no time for studying, they see the revolution and building a new country as a way of self-realization.

The communists tried to break the “bourgeois culture” and to create a new student image: a man or woman, from workers or peasants, whose knowledge should be both practical and politically oriented on Marxism-Leninism. Universities of “red professors” (that is — revolutionary-oriented) and groups of communist universities were created. The aim was to take down the old generation of lecturers, who seemed to be dangerous for new regime, and introduce new “politically reliable” ones. Again the independence of universities was decreased.

The discrimination on admission for former aristocrats was stricter than that for the commoners in the XIXth century. The main requirement for students was their

social background, not knowledge. Milyukov quotes one teacher who said, "Selection basing on talent criterion is unacceptable. That will mean closing doors for the proletariat and peasants."

The implementation of government initiatives was aggressive and powerful. New scholars were faithful followers of communism, and most of them had romantic illusions about the Soviet state and communist future. Moral qualities, such as activeness and initiativeness, became more important than academic achievements. Students from "workers' faculties" were usually people whose educational level was near to primary school basics. At the time, entrance exams for workers and peasants were abolished, and virtually any young worker could become a student.

As the political system grew more stable, exams came back, and academic knowledge became the most important thing in higher educational. But the idea of pro-communist education stayed and was developing. Students had to be members of Young Communist League, be builders of the new state. The government's position was that without the communist revolution, such youth would never have gained access to higher education. Students were used as labour force; they had to participate in collectivization and industrialization. During the Second World War, a lot of them left universities in order to fight against the Nazis. Afterwards, 30,000 veterans of were enrolled in universities.

The idea of all Soviet higher education was that students didn't have to fight for their rights (the party gave them all they needed) and could, instead, work for the benefit of the society. Scheglov in the "Diaries 1949-1956" appears as an ideal image of a Soviet student. He is very satisfied and inspired by the opportunity to receive education. Academic achievements are the most important thing for him; success and wealth are not his aims. He is also well socialized and has a lot of friends among fellow students.

Another interesting period is Khrushchev's False Spring. Stereotypes about students of that period can be found in the book titled "British Students Visit the Soviet Union".⁸ It demonstrates not only data about living standards for students but, what is more interesting, the features of a "typical student". The book says, "Soviet students seem to believe that it is not possible for an organization to exist without a political object".⁸ Soviet students apparently believed that "the absence of student exchange between countries was the fault of the British government and were surprised when told of the amount of foreign travel done by British students.

"They were well acquainted with our classical authors but their knowledge of our present day life was extremely distorted. This picture of life in Britain is so firmly believed that they found it difficult to accept many of our remarks concerning our country. They were unwilling to compare their hostel conditions (four or five to a room) with ours. Again it was difficult to convince them that the works of Dickens and Galsworthy gives little indication of the present day life of our country. Some students even cited the Eatanswill elections in Pickwick Papers as an example of British elections.

"The students seemed incredulous at anything strange to them. Our formal meeting at Moscow University club was punctuated with laughter. The apolitism of NUS was almost beyond their comprehension. They were extremely nationalistic. Revering everything soviet; soviet policy and leadership were always correct."

Soviet government tried to present a “typical student” as a communist who was ready to fight for peace and communism in the whole world. They tried to emphasize that there were no more reasons for struggling for these young people: the number of men and women was approximately equal, 52 nationalities were represented, most of students received state grants or personal scholarships (standard cost of hostel was 15 rubles per month, cost of food 8-10 rubles per day, and the average grant was 350 rubles per year).

But of course the situation with student accommodation wasn't perfect, and the Soviet government couldn't hide crowded dorms from foreign delegations. The British wrote about Agricultural Academy: “Both the exterior and interior were in a poor state of repair”, “the corridors were bare and gloomy and this effect was intensified by their length and the poor illumination from a window at each end”.

The propaganda and ideology worked for the myth and the image of an average student was associated mostly, as it has been mentioned, with pro-government social activeness. Numerous examples of “typical student” were shown in Soviet films, and this played a great role in forming the so-called “Soviet mythology”. The character of Shurik from “Shurik's Adventures” is the collection of stereotypes about the youth. He is shown with humor, a romantic and activist. He works and communicates a lot, he isn't interested in politics.

Speaking about the 1960s and 1970s, we can note that while ideology still was strictly communist, real social flow changed its way. The generation of pro-government romantic communists was in the past, and the new youth who had never seen the war became tired of political pressure and obligatory social life. We can see it in “Przewalski Horse” by Shatrov. Social life, communication and recreation were very important for students; they were inspired by Western youth culture but didn't really protest against the regime. They believed that personal happiness didn't harm collective work.

The image of a “Soviet student” in this period was unnaturally supported by the government. However, such tactics were ineffective — just like those of Uvarov in the XIX century. Like the rest of the society, young people were looking for a way out of the system. One more time instability again students an anti-government power, and again the reason for struggle was thirst for spiritual freedom.

Nowadays

What was the effect from political changes? “In the post-Soviet era, the system of higher education has undergone a more drastic transformation than the primary and secondary systems. Authority has moved from the center to agencies in local and sub national jurisdictions. About 14 percent of institutions of higher learning are located in the twenty-one republics of the federation. Under the new system, each higher education institution can determine its own admissions policy and the content of its academic programs. These institutions also have their own financial resources and statutes of operation.”¹³

Russian students gained freedom from obligatory Marxism- Leninism in their academic program and obligatory pro-government activeness. They also got more freedom in their professions. “The Soviet Union concentrated its vocational training resources in areas such as space and military technology. It lagged behind the West in

technical and vocational training in other sectors because of the practice of ending students' preparation in these areas at the secondary level. In Russia vocational schools traditionally have had a poor image; only in the early 1990s was comprehensive vocational education introduced for postsecondary students.”¹³

On the other hand, while the country was in a financial crisis, the system of higher education experienced insufficient funding. State universities had to compete commercial universities for students, and the latter were sometimes ready to enroll students just for money. In other places money was a limiting factor, similar to a “right” social background. This had impact on forming the image of students. TV shows like “University” or “Club”, which are running on TV nowadays, also are a product of such events.

Of course the youth are not a mass, and a wealthy young man who does nothing but partying isn't the only image of student now. For example we can see the image of a hard-working student in the movie “Black Strike”. We are virtually witnessing the return of noble student vs commoner students images now.

What about students' beliefs and priorities?

I have found some interesting notes about Russian students at the beginning of 21 century in an online magazine.¹⁴ The author is a German student who came to Russia to study. It is interesting that he didn't mention in his notes the popularity of any social organizations or political activeness. But he noted a very important trend: students who are interested in studying usually don't work, because working conditions aren't flexible enough. This factor may form the reason for struggle in the times of crisis.

Today we rarely hear about students who struggle for politics and ideas but, as we can see on example of Saint Petersburg students who protested against low wages and demanded higher grants, the situation is changing.

“Education Minister Vladimir Kinelev visited Saint Petersburg on November 1st, three days after several thousand students and teachers rallied on Palace Square to demand higher grants and wages,” *Smena* reported. “Representatives of the city's 43 higher education institutions took part in the 29 October meeting, which culminated in a march to the statue of Mikhail Lomonosov by the Saint Petersburg State University building on Vasilievskii Island.”¹⁵

The reasons for protesting were clear: “Students have to rely on family and their own earnings to make ends meet. In a recent Moscow poll, 69% of female students and 74% of male students said they had a job of some kind.”¹⁵

Why don't we see any outstanding images of students in mass media? To my mind, it is a direct consequence of a progressing extinction of civil initiative. As one young Russian writer, Pavel Danilkin, noted in his book “New Youth Policy. 2003-2005”¹⁶, the beginning of the XXI century predicted growth of youth movements in already powerful political organizations.

From 18 youth political structures, information about which is available from their official web-sites¹⁷, just one isn't part of a bigger party (“DA” — Democratic Alternative). All of the 20 “non-political youth public associations” are sponsored by the government Agency of Youth Policy. The aim of the Agency is “the implementation of state youth policy”.¹⁸

There is a trend: most famous and large-scale projects, which have youth target audience, are made with governance participation, for example Seliger.

In Russia there are just five “student youth unions”, three of them are limited to one region (Pskov, Idgersk and Moscow), and only two called themselves all-Russian. The “Russian organization of students unions” has contacts in 328 high education institutions. Is that much? Yes, relatively: there are 2909¹⁹ universities in Russia today.

Some experts, for example, journalist and editor-in-chief of Russian magazine “Afisha” Yuri Saprikin, think that political powers try to make a deal with Russian young activists. In his article “Why Government Needs Modern Art”²⁰, he says: “They tell us, ‘Take fashionable shops, and art festivals and art house movies. You see, politics and social questions are boring and banal.’”

And the government doesn’t make any secret of that. In the report “Resources of Innovative Strategy in Youth Development”²¹, which presented the goals of youth policy for 2009-2012, it is said that one of them is the introduction of behavior strategies which should be based on the perception of self-success as a part of the country’s success.

The report goes that, “In every place where more than 100 young people can meet there should be a specialist who has direct understanding of what is efficiency and what Russia is as a country now, what are its interests and principles, and what strategies of self-realizations can be presented to the youth”.²² The leaders, they write, can’t appear in our society by themselves, that is why “the government should do research and bring up young leaders”.

The statistics given in the report draw the image of youth with fears and desires connected mostly with wealth. 54% of youth were frightened by the prospect of poverty. 64% of young respondents and 70% of adults characterized young generation as “moral relativists” and “cynics indifferent to everything”.

What is more frightening, the responsibility for public moral young people is put on the government. 76% of youth thought that the maintenance of public moral is a direct government responsibility, against 66% in 2005.

The report was published in 2008; did the situation change in 2010?

Olga Kamenchuk, communications director of the Russian Public Opinion Research Center, wrote that in age group of 18-24 the part of politically loyalists is bigger than in others. The activities of the president are approved by 73-79%, of prime minister — by 76-83%. On the other hand, the part of people who are ready to protest is getting bigger too (25% of youth and 21% in all age groups). But, as Kamenchuk noted, it is words, not actions.¹³

Young people tend to personalize power and are less informed about alternatives: they don’t remember the Soviet Union and don’t dream about the freedoms of the 1960s.

As a result, 42% of young Russians under 24 say they are mostly satisfied with state policy (across all age groups the share is 32%); 14% aren’t (19% of people in the whole country). Interests of the youth are mostly recreation and communication. 37% of young people think that the biggest power in life is money.

Conclusion

If we analyze the structure of student images, we may divide them into groups and see what models were mostly presented. The priority of self-organization stands out among other characteristics. Academic achievements and political protest went together with social activism of different kinds. It appears that the most common model is characterized by social activism and academic achievements without the priority of self-organization and political protest. Scheglov, Shurik and the typical student in British students report represent this group.

As I mentioned in my work, some trends are repeating themselves. There were times when student image included fighting from pro-government positions, and times when struggle against the government was typical for students. Some people can say that today's students are not idealistic and don't want to struggle for anything except, maybe, better economic conditions.

Characters of Bazarov from "Fathers and Sons", Shurik from "Shurik's Adventure", and heroes of popular youth TV shows were indicators of real changes in the system of Russian higher education. What image will be popular next? That is still a question but I hope that a new image of students will appear in media and in life, and that it will be an independent and initiative leader.

References

1. История о российском матросе Василии Кориотском и о прекрасной царевне Ираклии Флоренской земли. //E-course: <http://vidimfigu.ru/?05477565917918720032#0:0>
2. Грибоедов А.С. Студент: комедия в трех действиях. // E-course: <http://vidimfigu.ru/?015195609611164401701#0:0>
3. Тургенев И.С. Отцы и дети // E-course: <http://vidimfigu.ru/?02429651122447970349#0:0>
4. Достоевский Ф. М. Преступление и наказание // E-course: <http://vidimfigu.ru/?03276154214412541994#0:0>
5. Чехов А.Н. Вишневый сад // E-course: http://bookz.ru/authors/4ehov-anton/sad_chehv/1-sad_chehv.html
6. Горький М. Мои университеты // E-course: <http://vidimfigu.ru/?04333395578147885093#0:0>
7. Щеглов М.А. Дневники 1949-1956 //Любите Людей: дневники, статьи, письма // E-course: http://www.belousenko.com/wr_Shcheglov.htm
8. British Students Visit the Soviet Union. London: Chiswick Press London, 1951.
9. Приключения Шурика //Библиотека видео файлов yandex.ru // E-course: <http://video.yandex.ru/search.xml?text=%D0%9F%D1%80%D0%B8%D0%BA%D0%BB%D1%8E%D1%87%D0%B5%D0%BD%D0%B8%D1%8F%20%D1%88%D1%83%D1%80%D0%B8%D0%BA%D0%B0.%20%D1%81%D0%BC%D0%BE%D1%82%D1%80%D0%B5%D1%82%D1%8C&where=all>
10. Моя любовь на третьем курсе: по мотивам пьесы М.Шатрова «Лошадь Пржевальского»/видео-файл // E-course: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8yrqjIV9nrI>
11. Andreev A.U. Russian Universities 18-Early 19th Century in the Context of European Universities History. — М: Znak, 2009.-P 134-156
12. Andreev A.U. Moscow University In Social And Cultural Life Of Russia Of The Early 19th century. -M: Languages of Russian Culture, 2000, — P 207-250
13. High Education in Russia. (E-resource) // access mode: [Http://Www.Englishlesson.At.Ua/News/2009-07-11-31](http://Www.Englishlesson.At.Ua/News/2009-07-11-31)

14. Annemarie F. Student Life In Germany Just Isn't The Same As In Russia. (E-resource) // access mode: [Http://Www.Visitor.Ru/Journal/Detail/3425/](http://Www.Visitor.Ru/Journal/Detail/3425/)
15. Morvant P. St. Petersburg Student Protest Attracts Government Attention // Opposition Victories "Party of Power" Troubled by Regional Election Results/ Compiled by Laura Belin. // (e-resource) // access mode: [Http://Sartraccc.Ru/I.Php?Oper=Read_File&Filename=Pub/Rrr961106.Htm](http://Sartraccc.Ru/I.Php?Oper=Read_File&Filename=Pub/Rrr961106.Htm)
16. Danilkin P. New youth policy. 2003-2005.-M; Europe, 2006.-292 p.
17. E-unity of Russian libraries, working with youth // access mode: <http://vmo.rgub.ru/policy/act/project.php>
18. Regulation for Russian Agency of youth policy // e- source of Russian agency of youth policy // access mode: <http://www.fadm.gov.ru/docs/331/>
19. All Russian high schools. Directory (e-source) // access mode: <http://abitur.nica.ru/>
20. Saprikin Y. Why government needs modern art // e-magazine «Afisha» // access mode: <http://www.afisha.ru/article/7370/>
21. Resources of innovative strategy in youth development: report // ¹e-source of Russian agency of youth policy // access mode: <http://www.fadm.gov.ru/agency/reports/733/>
22. *Kamenchuk O.* Not children and not adults yet // e-source of Russian public opinion research center // access mode: http://wciom.ru/arkhiv/tematicheskiiarkhiv/item/single/13556.html?no_cache=1&cHash=752fbf56f7

Nikolay Telesnin
University as a source of liberal mind

Sine Qua Non Element

Let's look at the world as we know it: with loud cities and global economy, reign of democracy and the rule of law; at the world which is completely permeated by electronic networks, connecting countries and continents. This world is the triumph of reason itself and entirely, from its foundation to the uppermost, is created on various innumerable achievements of science. It's not simply part of our life, it's a key to development of our civilization, by virtue of which we can save our way of life, adapting to challenges of time.

The impact of science can be hidden and we sometimes take it for granted, so we often forget that there is a great scientific basis behind any technical or social invention. Thousands and thousands of graduates have been working for many decades in order to advance the science ahead, making great and little scientific breakthroughs for society. But even such a huge and immense phenomenon as science needs a solid foundation, bearing and nourishing a mountain of scientific thought. It needs an instrument of accumulating, saving and retranslating a huge amount of knowledge and experience of previous generations necessary for sustainable development. This instrument is the most important innovation of the European culture, and this instrument is universities. They are the true ground of our world, and their significance is even higher than democracy or industry.

For more than ten centuries universities have been supplying people with brand new concepts and ideas, elaborating innovations that frequently are ahead of their time. Today, the role of higher education institutions is merely growing: complication of production and public relations need well-educated staff not only to move scientific progress forward but also to support our civilization at the present level. What would happen if the world lost experts on nuclear energy and mining of oil, network administrators and strategic managers? Most likely, it would collapse and plunge into the Stone Age, even if people find a way to domesticate all the lost knowledge for the second time, because knowledge is not all what professionals need and universities give.

Unlike other education institutions, teaching one or another volume of knowledge, universities transfer to students a special culture of thinking. It's a freer, more organized and more complicated system of thinking.

Drastic Changes

Throughout the long history of humankind, there were quite a lot of thinkers and philosophers saying separate liberal minds about private individuals and society in general, however, their words remained without adequate attention. The vast majority

of ancient people imagine an ideal social order as a reign of a harsh but fair dictator with absolute power to punish offenders and reward law-abiding citizens.

Nevertheless, the pitcher goes often to the well but is broken at last, and during the Middle Age, particular movement in social consciousness has occurred. Distinct liberal ideas have suddenly got a promotion, developed them to the sterling theories of social structure. Moreover, they found support in ruling circles. Precisely during the Middle Age we can see first progress of society on the way to gradual liberalization and democratization, and not many events of that period can be regarded as causes of such changes. There weren't any collisions between the Western countries and civilizations, superior by level of development; there weren't any ardent supporters of liberalism among the monarchs and popes, kept the main political power, or revolutions, revising general principles of law and policy; in one word — there was nothing that could change existing order. Nothing except one thing.

In contrast to other civilizations that fought one another, the Europeans didn't destroy existing the achievements of the Romans and gained from the spiritual values and scientific achievements of fallen Empire. After a few centuries, when studying of ancient legacies became wide-spread, the world witnessed the birth of a completely new community type called *universitas* and uniting scientists, teachers and students, fully concentrated on education and science, had appeared and risen to full height. Exactly at that time it happened a coming of European liberal thought that indicates universities as cradles of liberal way of thinking, which has spread not only among intelligent people, who directly contacted with writings of ancient scholars and sages, but also among all more or less educated people.

But it's not important; after all, those ideas have been appearing every time and everywhere. It's more important to answer the question why they got a promotion exactly in that time and there, despite the harsh environment of the Middle Age. The reasons of this unique phenomenon and its unusual circumstances of uprising awaken my scientific interest to university communities and sets my research goal, which is to consider the reasons of rising universities as liberators of medieval world.

Today there are a lot of discussions about democratic development in Russia, its methods and ways of implementation. Now, every farsighted politician recognizes its necessity but at the same time, many specialists discuss the peculiarities of Russian political reforms and development in general. Sometimes they show real misunderstanding of future prospects; sometimes they hide the authorities' reluctance to put them at a disadvantage, but anyway, it definitely stops Russia's development. Maybe, addressing the already existing institutions could solve this problem without artificial intervention to political and social systems, eventually, taking Russia out of stagnation.

Universities are more than anything else suitable for the role of such an institution because of their involvement in the life of Russian state and society. University diploma in Russia is something that proves adequacy of a particular person and every prestigious and highly paid job requires it, even if the applicant's professions isn't connected with his or her potential future job. I also think that the historical experience of liberalization by universities could prove invaluable for our country in the sphere of political and social modernization.

If we were able to create a right environment around universities, Russia (which has already proven to be a good imitator, capable to catch up in the short term

with the leading world powers) would make a leap forward to re-gain its lost positions in the world. Not directly, due to successes in educational sphere, but step by step, through whole generations of people, thinking more progressively than their predecessors. In this case it doesn't matter who exactly comes to rule because anyway it will be someone with a liberal disposition, clever enough not to slow down social and political evolution.

According to this practical aim, we should appeal to origins of universities, their internal atmosphere and external environment around them, which can illuminate the optimal conditions for appearance of liberal ideas. Their adaptation of politics and economics for modern realities is a key to optimal conditions for evolution of minds today.

Under Restrictions

It's hard to think freely and think about freedom without freedom itself. Meanwhile, in the Middle Ages, the concepts of ancient Greek and Roman philosophers, who had called freedom "the most important value", were understood literally. Liberty, as any other value, was not only valued, but priced, too, and priced highly by the strong Church and powerful feudalists. Freedom (as autonomy) could be obtained by those who could offer something valuable in return, and first university communities were among the few who could do that.

It has already been said that *universitas* had a deal with heritage of Roman Empire, but what's more important, those studies weren't distant from medieval reality and needs of medieval humanity. Doctors, lawyers, theologians, engineers and all the other important specialists were part of an emerging university brotherhood and they were too necessary to be not free. Through those members of academic commonwealth, universities were accumulating considerable power, enough for getting a particular autonomy from the rest of society. That put them a step up from the others, leading thus out at the head of social progress. This predetermined the further development of universities in the key guiding star of civilization behind which people walked, evolving in line with the ideas that formed inside the university environment.

However, it would be incorrect to think about feudal order as about something that must be (and could be) run away from. Being influenced by feudal social structure, universities hadn't lost their autonomy and even gained more freedom, than it would be possible in other political surrounding, because there was no engine to control students and professors in conditions of the absence of centralized national states. Thus, university authorities decided themselves what they should teach, avoiding direct interference of state and Church. The situation was supported by students themselves.

Most of them were of noble origin, inasmuch as sciences of that time were yet very far from practice and there was no opportunity or need in universal education, respectively, the majority of the students represented the privileged strata of society able to afford education. So, the students' social status served as some kind of shield for their Alma Mater, distancing them further from external influence and giving more opportunities for free development.

But just being prone to external influence are not enough for a radical change of mind in a liberal way. People need to be completely free from all the routine and immerse themselves into intellectual activities.

People first got such an opportunity at universities: they lived in university, they studied in university, they also taught younger students. Every day, every moment of their life was occupied with science, which made it possible to go deep into the essence of their subject, making an independent judgment of life. That was the main success of universities, their reward for creating an autonomous community, which was able to bring the world brand new ideas, discoveries and inventions. Specific culture of thinking and researching makes the mind of scientists more open to rational ideas and arguments and this openness gave birth to new social concepts of liberal nature. They were spread through law and policy, sociology and economics, through the spirit of science itself, inexorably and deeply changing the world.

Conclusion

There is no doubt that universities, as they appeared in Xth century, had all chances to become cradle of liberal ideas, which would eventually grow into modern democratic institutions, absorb unusual academic spirit of liberty and concept of freedom as essential part of life. For less than five hundred years small groups of people, armed not with swords and guns but with intelligence and knowledge, were doing a really impossible thing: they subjugated the whole world and changed its outlook, making it play by their own rules and principles. Ideology of autonomy from public interests for all and everyone engulfed western civilization and determined its development for many years.

It was enough of a power to change a whole civilization, so it suggests that universities are capable of changing one more country, even if it's large and diverse as Russia. So, what kind of actions such a modernization requires? I'll try to suggest some measures.

First of all, universities need serious attention from the government. Many problems in the sphere of state administration could be escaped, if officials had listened to professionals instead of relying on their own knowledge. It doesn't look better when long and expensive research papers commissioned by the government are kept in cold storage; such state policy of cooperation with universities is simply hypocritical. However, it's not right to run to extremes and wait that when the world faces an absolutely new problem, university scholars and researchers will be able to immediately propose a decision. Academic knowledge is not perfect and will never be but even the wisest scientists sometimes can't come to consensus about important problems and take off the burden of responsibility from the officials, making us speak about their professionalism as a necessary condition for the modernization of Russia. In the other words, political elite has to be appropriately educated and university personalities have to be appropriately empowered to have an influence in important issues.

This way is not simple but it has demonstrated its effectiveness, so I suppose that it will be optimal solution for further modernization and liberalization of Russia.

References

Rüegg, Walter. *A History of the University in Europe, Vol. I: Universities in the Middle Ages*. NY: Cambridge University Press, 1992;

Rüegg, Walter. *A History of the University in Europe, Vol. II: Universities in Early Modern Europe*. NY: Cambridge University Press, 1996;

Röhrs, Hermann. "The Classical idea of the University — Its Origin and Significance as Conceived by Humboldt". *Tradition and Reform of the University under an International Perspective*. P. 13-27. NY: Berlag Peter Lang, 1987;

Rothblatt, Sheldon. "The Writing of University History at the End of Another Century". *Oxford Review of Education*, Vol. 23, No. 2, "Writing University History" (Jun. 1997), P. 151-167;

Rudy, Willis. *The Universities of Europe, 1100-1914*. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, Inc., 1984.

Laura Petrone

***Democratic Culture in Higher Education Institutions:
comparing Russian and Italian Universities***

Introduction

Should universities play any role with respect to democracy promotion in modern societies? If yes, how can they achieve that, namely how can they ensure that values such as human rights and rule of law are truly assimilated by students, beyond the mere teaching activities?

These are some of the crucial questions shaping the current debate about democratic citizenship within HEI, which has gained momentum since the last decade mostly due to research projects and seminars sponsored by the Council of Europe, such as the Forums on Higher Education Governance. Yet, now that an unformed “European Higher Education Area” is emerging as result of the Bologna Process, it is even more worth addressing such an issue with a comparative perspective in order to grasp the differences and similarities in university’s role among countries.

As a matter of fact, the move towards a mass education system as occurred in the last decades has brought about a series of structural changes which needed to be faced at an international level: firstly, the rise in numbers in university enrollment has required a deep transformation of governance mechanisms in order to make universities real autonomous institutions with an internal, coherent decision-making process (Capano 2006). At the same time governance became a crucial element in assessing the quality/performance of higher education system, implying the formulation of valid objectives and the development of suitable instruments to achieve them. Secondly, HEIs’ capacity to adapt to new demands of socio-economic system is of great significance: the rapid expansion of global economy in market and finance strongly presses on universities to act as private enterprises delivering services to students “consumers”. The question about the sustainability of HEIs’ “marketization” is hardly debated but what here should be stressed is the increasing university’s responsibility in providing students with a adequate preparation for the labor market.

Against this general background stands the discourse about the promotion of democratic culture by HEI as one of the basic conditions for a good governance and as additional mission to be accomplished by universities in the XXI century: encouraging the active participation of all individuals in democratic life at all levels alongside the learning about democracy in school and university life, including participation in the decision-making process and the associated structures of students and teachers.

What is relevant for the present research is that the idea of university as a place of democratic citizenship, far from being a mere slogan, has become extremely important for those European international organizations with a normative connotation (Council of Europe, European Union and OSCE) in their broader strategy of

promoting democracy institutions and values among member States. Particularly, the Council of Europe “Project on Education for Democratic Citizenship” (EDC) launched in 1996 represents the most structured attempt to define the concept of “university as *res publica*”, that is university as a crucial actor in modern society who greatly contributes in developing democratic practice; as well as to provide a wide comparison among different European higher education systems in order to ascertain the main results and limits in this respect¹.

Research Topic

The present work intends to contribute to the research field on University’s main challenges in XXI century especially focusing on the conditions favoring the development of democratic learning and culture within HEIs. The main research questions are: which factors can be considered as conducive or detrimental in promoting the concept of “university as *Res Publica*”? How the traditional role of university as provider of teaching relates to the relatively new mission of promoting democratic practice? To what extent the cultural and political factors affect the pursuit of this mission at a national level?

I will try to provide some explanations to these questions by considering two different higher education systems, namely the Russian and Italian ones: although Russia and Italy have started reforms in this policy area at different times and within very different cultural and historical contexts, they face common problems in transforming old, deeply rooted higher education systems: namely the adoption of more autonomous and efficient institutional arrangements which would make universities competitive on a global scale. In my view their experiences compared offer interesting insights to better understand the potential suitability of such an approach (university as *res publica*) in contexts hardly resilient to changes and adaptation as well as offer useful lesson for those countries which have only recently reformed their higher education systems.

Considering these main subjects and goals the work will be structured as follows:

- brief analysis of each of two countries’ historical and political background where are operating the recent reforms implementing the requirements of “Bologna Process”
- analysis of formal provisions about higher education governance as established in each country’s national legislation, with special focus on students representation in these structures.
- analysis of actual students participation in universities’ structures, including the elective bodies and associations
- analysis of each university’s mission and priorities in teaching activities

Methodology and the Choice of Case Studies

The work will use secondary data obtained firstly from the main contributions in literature and the general Russian and Italian legislation on this matter; secondly,

¹ Sjur Bergan (ed.), ‘University as *Res Publica*. Higher Education Governance, student participation and the university as a site of citizenship’, Council of Europe Higher education series, No. 1, 2004.

two universities for each of the two countries will be analyzed, using information collected from official websites, semi-structured interviews and other available reports.

Particularly, the following universities will be examined: the Moscow State Institute for International Relations (MGIMO) and The State University — Higher School of Economics of Moscow for the Russian case, the University of Bologna and the Bocconi University for the Italian case. They are all leading universities in their own countries with a strong international orientation, which allows us to assume that each of them has largely invested in conforming its functions and activities to international standards. As for Russia, while SU-HSE is well known for its liberal, Western-oriented approach (European Union has been one of its original sponsor), MGIMO is close to the current Russian establishment, particularly to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and has, supposedly, a more conservative viewpoint. As for Italy, this liberal/conservative opposition has not much sense, whereas both University of Bologna and Bocconi University have a strong reputation in promoting independent research and teaching; yet, while the former is a public university mostly funded by the State, the latter is a private, self-financing entity. This basic difference allegedly should be reflected in their respective governance structures and student activities.

Particularly, this selection of case studies intends to highlight the main differences both among the countries and transversal to them along three principal dimensions:

- University disposition in promoting democratic values and practices: Is democratic culture considered part of the university's mission, together with its traditional role in providing education?
- Teaching activities contribution in developing civic responsibility: To what extent does university allow dissent and minority viewpoints both from the professors' and students' side? Are there any courses related to democracy and human rights?
- Student participation in governance structures: Is elections of students representatives a common practice? How popular are student associations variously engaged?

These three dimensions can be considered together as forming a sort of index of “democratness” in HEIs, which can be taken as reference in each case study to assess both the university's capabilities in encouraging democratic culture and the willingness and possibility of students to actually realize these practices.

Russia

Higher education reform represents a great challenge to be addressed in Russia in order to increase its international competitiveness, as it is stated in official speeches and documents². The national priority project “Образование” sponsored by the Ministry of Education and Science of Russian Federation defines «the accelerate modernization of higher education institutions (HEIs) as its main goal», as well as the forming of new financial and managerial mechanisms in Russian universities³.

² See President Medvedev's speech to the Federal Assembly on 12 November 2009.

³ See in particular “Support to leading Higher Education Institutes”, <http://mon.gov.ru/pro/pnpo/vuz/>.

The current university renewal in Russia can be inserted into the broader administrative reform strategy, aimed at regaining managerial control over the public sphere, which was largely lost during the 1990s: in this perspective two main aspects of the restructuring process as implemented in the last decade worth attention, namely the merge of public establishments to form “National Research Universities” and a rationalization of public financing destined to most profitable universities, capable of withstanding competition at international level: while the latter should encourage universities to attract private funds through investments, the former intends to constitute university complexes as “centers of excellence” through the merger of regional universities in federal ones. In this configuration the state plays a key role in allocating funds, which results in a tight competition among universities to be selected as major grantees⁴. In addition, the reform has implied a restructuring of university governance according to international standards, especially the “New Public Management” model, with a division of tasks among three main actors: the Ministry of Education and Science, with principal decision-making competences, the agencies responsible for allocating funds, and the agencies charged to control quality in the services provided as well as the conformity of procedures to the law⁵.

Alongside this structural reorganization, the participation of Russia in the European education area has meant the conformity to specific educational standards, as those sponsored by European Union, the Council of Europe, World Bank and OECD: since Russia is embedded in global networks it needs continuously to confront with these supranational organizations which influence domestic processes in projecting and implementing policies, including higher education ones.

In this respect, the approach adopted in the last decade by the Russian administration has been quite multifaceted: from one side emerges the willingness to fully implement the prescriptions of the Bologna process, in order to assure comparable curricula and the universal recognition of diplomas. Accordingly, the main achievements, considered the three ‘pillars’ of education modernization, have been the following:

- introduction of a Unified State Examination (USE) to replace high school final exams and individually administered university admission tests
- introduction of a new financing scheme, GIFO (state individual financial obligation), regulating the education system by consumer and market demand rather than administrative measures
- implementation of Bologna Declaration signed in 2003
- development of higher education system on the basis of the bachelor-master level to replace the previous three levels of undergraduate studies cycle
- introduction of the ECTS system and the diploma supplement
- creation of mechanisms for the recognition of Russian and international educational credentials

⁴ See “Federal’nyy zakon Rossiyskoy Federatsii ob avtonomnykh uchrezhdeniyakh”, No. 174-FZ, 3 November 2006, Russian Federal Law on “Autonomous Institutions.

⁵ For more detailed see Sigman C., ‘The Impact of New Public Management on Russian Higher Education’, *Russie.Nei. Visions*, Russia/Nis Center, No. 30 (2008), www.ifri.org/downloads/ifri_Sigman_ANG_education_sup_avril2008.pdf.

- facilitation of academic mobility of students and professors

The progresses which have been made in this respect are quite satisfactory, considering the deep transformations they have brought about to the Russian higher education system⁶.

Yet, what interests here is the way the country confronts itself with the idea of universities as site of democratic education launched by the Council of Europe. In this respect, it is worth remind the Recommendation of the COE on education for democratic citizenship (EDC), in which it is wished ‘to strengthen the capacity of member states to make EDC a priority objective of educational policy-making and implement sustainable reforms at all level of the education system (Rec. 2002, 12).

From a formal point of view, Russian legislation actually mentions some of the principles sponsored by the COE in its priorities: Russian Federal Law on Higher and Professional Education No. 125 of 1996 envisages among the tasks of HEIs “the formation of a civic attitude in the spirit of the contemporary civilization and democracy” (art. 11, par. 8)⁷. Yet, as for the norms regulating students participation in higher education governance, Russian legislation is rather general in wording this aspect. Formal provisions which state young people right to assemble and participate can be found both in Constitution and in some Federal Laws (Law of Education of 1992, Law of Social Organizations, Law on Trade Unions, etc.): the Law on Education, last updated in 2009, states that “students of HEIs have the right to discuss and decide about relevant issues regarding HEIs’ activity, including participation in social organizations or in governance structures” (art. 16, par. 4)⁸. However, further details on this matter have to be traced in each university statute and regulations, which mostly regulate its internal organization responding to the principle of academic autonomy. sian education as a whole, some scholars have pointed out that while integrating the country educational system into the European area, the Russian political leadership appears concerned about stressing a uniform national identity in educational policies with emphasis on national priorities and interests. Actually, the “Strategy on state youth politics in Russian Federation” promoted by the Ministry of Education and Research in 2006, goes exactly in this direction: as stated by A. A. Levitskaya, Director of Department on youth politics of the Ministry of Education and Research, the initiative is aimed at “developing youth potential in the interests of State and at ensuring young citizens’ participation in formulating, evaluating and implementing youth policies”⁹.

For what higher education is concerned, up now there is not any formal Charter on students’ rights and duties where students participation in university governance can be officially recognized. Nevertheless, within the aforementioned

⁶ For a detailed analysis of the main achievements in Russian educational modernization see T. Gounko, W. Smale, ‘Modernization of Russia higher education: exploring paths of influence’, “Compare: a Journal of Comparative and International Education”, Vol. 37, No. 4, pp. 533-548.

⁷ http://russia.edu.ru/information/legal/law/fz/125_fz/2892/. See also A. N. Kozyrina, “Kommentariy k Federal’nomu zakonu ‘O vysshem i poslevuzovskom professional’nom obrazovanii’”, Federal’nyi tsentr zakonadatel’stva, Tsentri publichno-pravovykh issledovaniy, 2009.

⁸ The text of the Law is available on <http://mon.gov.ru/dok/fz/obr/3986/>.

⁹ See “Molodyezhnaya politika. Natsional’nyy prioritet Rossii”, http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/youth/Source/Resources/Forum21/Issue_No9/N9_YP_Russia_ru.pdf

‘Strategy’ and under the leading role of the “Russian Youth Union” (Rossiyskiy Soyuz Molodezhi), a project finalized at working out student self-governance (studencheskoe samoupravlenie) in HEIs is envisaged with ambitious goals: “to improve social activism of students, and “to build truly active body of student self-organization in HEIs”,¹⁰.

Finally, it is worth noting that the Russian constitutional law prohibits activities of political organizations on campus, a feature common to many other post-communist countries which can be interpreted as a reaction to the past indoctrinate youth in communist ideology.

Italy

Italian higher education system has undergone a radical transformation over the last twenty years and, like in Russia, as part of a broader administrative reform greatly inspired by the New Public Management paradigm, focusing on results evaluation and institutional accountability. In particular, the Law 168 of 1989 represents the very first attempt to reform the governance model within universities responding to the principle of autonomy activity: namely the possibility for HEIs to adopt their own statutes. Starting from that, a series of mechanisms have been introduced, aimed at ensuring universities greater institutional autonomy as well as forcing them to be more accountable in teaching, research and self-financing. Among the most relevant changes there are the following:

- the introduction of provision tying part of State funding to an evaluation of the institutional performance
- the establishment of a commission for the evaluation of universities’ performance
- the universities’ freedom of choice in recruiting its staff, both academic and non academic
- greater freedom for universities to decide their curricula and teaching activities
- the creation of a Student National Council
- a major role played by the National Association of University Rectors in national policy-making processes.

Yet, Italian universities have proved to be quite inertial in introducing reforms in a model of governance for a long time characterized by “informal bargaining process”, where individual professors and not democratically elected governing bodies controlled the decision-making process (Capano 2008). Thereby, it was the traditional Italian academy, dominated by small groups, that ended up orienting implementation of reforms: in this conditions the principle of ‘steering at a distance’ (more autonomy and self-responsibility for institutions) borrowed from other countries, proved difficult to achieve in a coherent manner.

As in Russia, higher education reform in Italy are partly the results of driving forces external to the system, especially the EU: the assimilation of the principles of

¹⁰ Details of the project, carried out in cooperation with the Ministry of Education and research and the Federal Agency on Education are available on the site of the Russian Youth Union, <http://www.studorg.ru/abouts/studorg>.

the Bologna process in domestic legislation has occurred quickly, considering that Italy, together with France, Germany and UK, was the first to commit itself to harmonizing the architecture of the European higher education system signing the Sorbonne declaration in 1998.

As for students participation in university governance, the reforms towards university autonomy that have been implemented over the last decades and the consequent profound changes in academic environment raised the urgent question of formalizing students' rights and recognize a sort of "student citizenship". The Charter of students' rights and duties adopted in 2007 represents a crucial step in this direction: particularly, art. 8 deals with students' democratic representation in university decision-making which has to conform to fundamental principles of Constitution and of Universal declaration of human rights, while art. 7 focuses on the students' right to association and collective organization in universities, in accordance to the law and the principles of tolerance and pluralism¹¹.

Case Studies

After discussing the principal provisions existing in each country's legislation on education, let's focus on the four selected universities in order to understand what are the principal differences and similarities in students' participation. Firstly, universities' Statutes will be examined in order to ascertain the way in which university conceives its own mission and the rights officially assured to students. In particular, we want to verify in which cases the "civic" mission of university education as developed by the Council of Europe has been internalized; secondly, we are interested in checking provisions on students' participation in governance structures.

Table 1 shows that among the four cases only one, namely the SU-HSE, envisages in its own Statute what can be understood as a 'democratic mission' among the various tasks («to rise a civic awareness among students and an aptitude to work and live in the contemporary civilization and democracy»). Broadly speaking, the main goals common to all the four universities are the grantee of freedom in teaching and research from any external influences and the contribution to the diffusion of culture in society: undoubtedly, these aims can be considered "civic" as well and inserted in the broader conception of university as 'res publica'. Yet, what it should be stressed here is the explicit reference to the teaching of a democratic aptitude as a major task to be accomplished by university.

With regard to provisions on students' participation, the analysis of Statute shows that all the cases considered except one, University of Bocconi, explicitly list students' rights, including the right to representation in governance bodies within universities. While University of Bocconi does not provide this specific provision, it envisages the Union of students as an advisory body which coordinates student representatives' activity. Thereby, at least formally, all cases recognize students representation in universities bodies and set up additional regulations on students elections in governing structures.

¹¹ The approval of the document has been sponsored by the then Minister of Education with the active participation from the National Student Council:
www.miur.it/Miur/UserFiles/Notizie/2007/Statuto_studenti.pdf

Table 1: Statute provisions about a “civic” mission and students’ representation in university governance

University	Statute Provisions	
	Democratic Practices as Mission	Student Participation in Governance
SU-HSE	university’s tasks: «to rise a civic awareness among students, aptitude to work and live in the contemporary civilization and democracy»	Students have the rights to representation in governance bodies through university student organizations
MGIMO		Students have the right to take part in decision about important issues of university through students’ unions and governance bodies
University of Bologna		The university recognizes and values the contribution of individual students and associations in achieving the university aims Rules about elections of students’ representative are provided by specific regulations
Bocconi University		no specific provisions about students’ rights the student Council is envisaged as an advisory body which coordinates students representatives’ activity

What about the effective students’ activism and representation? To better understand how universities work with respect to these dimensions, student associations and participation will be analyzed, taking as reference mostly documents and other materials from universities’ official websites.

A comparison among the four universities shows that the opportunity to build up associations within universities is widely recognized by the four universities’ Statutes. Actually, in all cases students appear to use this opportunity to different degrees by associating themselves: particularly, Bologna University has the highest number of associations (36 registered), followed by SU-HSE (22), MGIMO (20), Bocconi University (15). However, considering the total number of organizations does not have much sense since we are talking about very different universities as for number of students enrolled and number of faculties. It is sufficient to mention that Bologna University counts 84.000 enrolled students in 2009/2010 and 23 faculties, and Bocconi University only 2500 students, 5 schools and 7 departments.

Instead, what is worthwhile is the kind of activity promoted by the associations: the classical idea of civic activism, embodied in the famous concept of social capital, includes organizations of various sort, from fraternal to sport and cultural ones, all supposed to share ‘norms of reciprocity’ and to encourage social trust¹². From this perspective, all the four case studies are characterized by a great heterogeneity in the type of associations (sport, cultural, business, scientific, etc.) and seem to reflect the classical notion of civic activism; nonetheless, what emerges from a closer examination is the low interest toward truly political activities in the two Russian universities: this can be explained considering the aforementioned Russian constitutional provision which prohibits political organizations in campus. The Italian universities are conversely more active in politics, though there is a certain difference between the two: in Bologna University about a third of associations are politically engaged while in Bocconi University 2 up to 15 associations define ‘political’ their own activity (Table 2).

It should be noted that the term ‘political’ here means not only that these type of associations identify themselves with a specific political position, as ‘Sinistra universitaria’ in Bologna University with a left wing orientation and ‘Milton Friedman Society’ in Bocconi University with a right wing profile; but also that they try to affect somehow the election in representative students’ bodies and sometimes even to establish a dialogue with local institutional and social actors.

The last dimension to be analyzed with regard to effective democratic practice is the students participation in governance structures representing their interests at national and at university level. Here a stark contrast emerges between the Italian and the Russian cases: in Italy since 1997 the National Council of University Students (CNSU) has been legally recognized as an advisory body of the Ministry of University and Research elected every three years. It basically issues opinions and proposals to the Ministry concerning university life (reforms implementation, funding, right to education)¹³.

The last elections of the Italian CNSU were held in May 2010 with a 13% turnout: 200.894 students expressed their vote out of 1.5 millions of enrolled students¹⁴. The data show a quite low participation rate and, arguably, a high disinformation or lack of interest regarding the Council. The same trend can be observed at single university level, where during last elections of the internal Councils of Students the turnout has been of 10,9% in Bologna University and 7% in University of Bocconi.

In Russia a similar elected national Council is up to now missing. In addition, the analyses of the 2 Russian case studies has shown the lack of representative students’ bodies within each university.

¹² See R. Putnam (1993), *Making Democracy Work. Civic Tradition in Modern Italy*, Princeton University Press.

¹³ <http://www.cnsu.miur.it/>

¹⁴ <http://www.universita.it/dati-ufficiali-elezioni-cnsu-2010/>

Table 2: Effective students activism and participation

University	Effective Democratic Practice	
	Student Associations	Student Participation in Elections
SU-HSE	More than 20 organizations mostly engaged in sport, culture, theatre, science, business	Lack of an elected body representing students at a national level Non elected Student Council operates discontinuously
MGIMO	Various cultural, sport, and other associations with the leading role of the MGIMO Students' Union	Not elected Student Council which does not make decisions about relevant issue of university: mostly cultural activity
University of Bologna	36 organizations officially registered with about one third politically engaged associations	2010: 10,4% student local elections 2010: 16,9% national elections of C.N.S.U. (National Council of University Students) http://www.unibo.it/Portale/Ateneo/Amministrazione+generale/Aree+amministrative/81380/81381/elezionistud2010.htm
Bocconi University	15 officially registered associations. Main typologies: business organizations and career-oriented, but also some political organizations	2010: 7% turnout in CNSU election http://www.studenti.it/universita/rappresentanti/risultati-elezioni-studentesche-maggio-2010.php

Main Findings

Comparing Russian/Italian Legislation:

1. democratic mission of university seems not be widely mentioned in both countries' legislations on HEI
2. students participation in university governance is very generally regulated in both country's national legislations
3. Italy has recently adopted the Charter of university students, recognizing a sort of 'students' citizenship'
4. in Italy since 1997 the National Council of University Students (CNSU) has been legally recognized as an advisory body of the Ministry of University and Research and elected every three years

Comparing university Statutes:

1. with the exception of HSE, none of the four examined universities' Statutes include democratic learning and practice among its priorities or tasks

2. the right to be represented in HE governance is recognized by all the universities (Bocconi does not mention it as a specific right, but it envisages a student council)

Comparing students' practices:

1. in all the case studies variously engaged students associations operate
2. Italian student associations appear to be more politicized than Russian ones → in Russia Constitution prohibits activity of political organizations in campus
3. in Russian cases the election of students representative bodies is practically non existing
4. though Italian HE system provides a Student Council elected at national level every 2 years, electoral turnout for its election are quite low
5. in Italian cases elections for the student council at university level do occur but with a low participation rate

Providing some explanations:

1. legal and statutory framework turns out to be very important in determine the parameters that university must work within in encouraging democratic education; yet formal arrangements are a necessary but not sufficient condition for ensuring effective democratic participation
2. widespread lack of interest and apathy prevail in Russian case, if we assume that the lack of student representative bodies depends on students disinterest itself: disinterest is largely spread in Italian universities as well → historical and cultural legacy do count but to a certain degree
3. in the different permeability to EDC the political context seems to be relevant especially in Russian cases: MGIMO mainly reproduces the establishment's official viewpoint training the future political cadre, SU-HSE a conceives a broader mission involving the education for a democratic citizenship.

References

- Balzer H. D., Plan to Reform Russian Higher Education, in A. Jones (ed.) *Education and Society in the New Russia*, M. E. Sharpe Inc., New York, 1994.
- Belyaeva N. Y. (ed.), *Russia and Germany. Cooperation in the EU context: Case-Studies in Five Fields of Special Interest*, Seventh International HSE Summer School "Baltic Practice", Witten-Herdeke, 29 July-06 August, 2007.
- Bergan S. (ed.), *The University as Res Publica. Higher Education Governance, student participation and university as a site of citizenship*. Council of Europe, 2004.
- Capano G., 'Looking for serendipity: the problematical reform of government within Italy's Universities', *Higher Education*, 55 (2008), pp. 481-584.
- Hemsley-Brown J. & Oplatka I., 'Universities in a Competitive Global Marketplace: a Systematic Review of the Literature on Higher Education Marketing', *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, Vol. 19, No. 4 (2006), pp. 316-338.
- Sanz N., Bergan S., *The Heritage of European Universities*, Council of Europe Higher Education Series No. 7, 2nd edition.
- Sigman C., 'The Impact of New Public Management on Russian Higher Education', *Russie.Nei.Visions*, Russia/Nis Center, No. 30 (2008), www.ifri.org/downloads/ifri_Sigman_ANG_education_sup_avril2008.pdf.