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The transition period of 1991-2000s (since the fall of the USSR) has brought major changes to the Russian higher education. It is not easy to identify which have become reflections of global process and which could be traced to the local context. The unique national framework with a centralized political and educational system, comparatively low development of institutions of civil society, inertia of social institutions, strong shadow economy, numerous economic barriers contribute to the understanding of the transformations of the recent decades.

All the changes in the higher education system and the entire country have inevitably had an enormous impact on the Russian academic profession. Relatively unattractive working conditions and remuneration, the decreased prestige of the profession, limited opportunities for research, and scarce research funding have fostered “the drain” from the profession (moving abroad or to other sectors of the economy) and definitely weakened it. The previous studies encompassed general deterioration of working conditions, lack of younger and middle generations of academics, feminization of the professoriate; however, some basic changes in the patterns of academic work of Russian academics, faculty productivity, differentiation, internationalization and participation in university governance have not received an appropriate attention.

This paper addresses to the important trends in international higher education: the growing managerialism and internationalization in faculty work, the issues which have never been studied in Russia. This became a part of the larger project dealing with the transformation of the academic profession in Russia, with the fieldwork realized in 2006. The results were published in a number of papers, however the themes of the managerialism and internationalization presented in this paper have not been covered yet. Can we see any manifestation of the managerialism and internationalization in the Russian academic profession?

Theoretical/conceptual frameworks

The change of the academic profession has been discussed internationally. With the massification of higher education, the academic profession has expanded as well, have become

---

1 This project was supported by the Fulbright New Century Scholar program (IIE) in 2005-2006.
more mass and diversified. Deteriorating working conditions and erosion of the profession are observed even in most developed countries, where higher education institutions are in a more advantageous position (Altbach, 2004). Loss of status and prestige, less attractive salaries are the most notable changes in many countries (Altbach 2000, 2002; Enders 2001). Global market-driven development of higher education is increasingly interfering in key patterns of academic life and reshaping the academic profession towards increased accountability, reduced autonomy, and declining self-regulation. A decrease of tenure-track positions and relying on part-time and full-time non tenure-track faculty result in a lack of security and radically change the traditional concept of the academic profession. Marketization also contributes to increasing differentiation of academics by income, working conditions, and research opportunities.

Growing emphasis on research, pressure to publish in the framework of marketization of higher education, accountability, and fighting for institutional and individual prestige and financing have a negative impact on teaching in general and increasingly diversify the academic profession, dividing faculty into those with higher teaching loads and fewer opportunities for research, and those with lower teaching loads and more research opportunities (see, for instance Dill, 2003; Bok, 2003; Finkelstein, 2001; Fogg, 2004). As a result, in many parts of the world the academic career is becoming less attractive to pursue. Those developments are transforming the academic profession and affecting the perspectives of higher education in a society of knowledge.

Meanwhile, in Russia despite recent developments in the higher education reforms in 2000s, the policy underestimates a critical role of faculty and keeps overlooking their needs. For instance, average wage in higher education sector still comprised 91.5 per cent to the average wage in the national economy (2010); but even in Moscow institutions of higher learning an average wage comprised 22500 rubles a month (about 750 USS) (Klyachko 2011) that implies substantially lower remuneration in the regions. Annual monitoring of economics of education shows that the proportion of the faculty who get supplemental jobs have not changed during 2006-2009 and comprised 67 per cent (Monitoring ekonomiki obrazovania).

The available research encompasses certain issues of academic staff: the change of socio-demographic and professional (by position and qualifications) characteristics of faculty, their motivation, working conditions, multiple employment, and growth of part-time employment (Dubitskii, 2004; Kokorev & Nikolyyukina, 2000; Levin-Stankevich & Saveljev 1996; Nazarova, 2004; Romankova, 2000a, 2000b; Sheregi et al., 1997; Sheregi, 2001; Sheregi et al., 2002; Smolentseva, 2003; Tambovtsev, 2004; Vasenina & Sorokin, 2002). Generally, research data on the academic staff of Russian higher education institutions was scarce at the moment of the fieldwork. Among national surveys there are only a few: a survey done in the framework of a Carnegie international project on the academic profession, limited in its sample (Levin-Stankevich & Saveljev 1996), and data from Ministry of Education surveys (Sheregi et al., 1997; Sheregi, 2001; Sheregi et al., 2002).

In a few works, the implications of internationalization for the Russian academic body are briefly mentioned, namely increasing international mobility (where poor foreign language skills might function as an obstacle), a possible cutback of academic personnel while transitioning to the new module system (a block of interrelated courses composed of a subset of courses within a curriculum comprising a certain number of credit units), a passage to part-time faculty and a threat for full-time employment, an increase of the teaching load, and a need for faculty retraining for the module system (Nechaev & Sharonova, 2004; Shestakov, 2004; Tsoi, 2003).

Objectives the study

3 However, it should be noted that more recent papers on the motivation and research of Russian faculty were published after this project was done (see Roshchina 2010, Roshchina & Yudkevich 2009).
The goal of this study is to analyze and measure the “managerial” and “international” component in the faculty work. Any measurement requires a yardstick, and for our goal the measurement could be realized by the comparison of those characteristics in three different points: faculty self-esteem, their perceptions of a successful academic career in Russia and in the West. It might be supposed that Russian faculty know little about academics in developing countries as well as do not have a profound knowledge about an academic life in any particular country. What was measured about a Western faculty is rather a stereotype, but it reflects the concepts of Russian academics about the academic profession.

Thus, the study realizes the following tasks:
- to identify characteristics which describe “managerial” and “international” dimensions of faculty work;
- to analyze those characteristics in the framework of current faculty work, a notion of a successful academic career in contemporary Russia and in the West;
- to identify the differences and gaps between the perceptions of a successful career in Russia and in the West, between self-evaluations and successful (ideal) careers in Russia and the West.

Data and Methods

This research is based upon qualitative and quantitative researches conducted in 2006. For this study eight fields were selected: four in sciences and four in social sciences/humanities, also presuming some fields to be more marketable and others less marketable. Marketability here means an ability of the field to attract funding outside the traditional budget of a public university. The list of fields includes math, physics, biology, information technology, history, philology, economics, and sociology.

The qualitative part of the study involved 19 interviews with faculty at the universities of Moscow (11), a major city Nizhniy Novgorod (6), and a small town Arzamas (2), a small town near Nizhniy Novgorod. Respondents were selected to represent various positions, fields, and institutional size. Interviews were recorded, transcribed and coded. A theoretical framework for this work is based upon grounded theory (Strauss & Corbin, 2001).

The quantitative part of the study included 703 structured interviews with faculty using a questionnaire either self-administered or administered by an interviewer in seven regions of Russia. The research was focused on three of the most established types of institution in Russia: classical universities, technical universities, and pedagogical universities (former institutes), which have long-standing traditions of higher learning in Soviet and pre-Soviet education. Unlike narrowly focused institutions, they provide training in a variety of fields. The idea behind the sampling was to involve different kinds of regions and institutions to represent the diverse higher educational system in Russia. The data set has been weighted to correct a geographical bias between Moscow and the regions.

The quantitative and qualitative research allowed to collect a variety of data on the transformation of the academic profession in Russia. Assuming the goal of this particular paper, for this study, I use only a part of the received empirical data.

The concept of a “successful” faculty member derives mostly from Blackburn and Lawrence study (1995), who made a comparison of characteristics of “valued faculty” (professional skills, beliefs/attitudes/values and personal qualities) and self-evaluation.

For this study, it was necessary to identify how Russian faculty members perceive successful academic careers in Russia and in the West. During the qualitative part of this project the respondents were asked about their perceptions of a “successful” faculty career in Russia.

---

4 The geography of the study included different types of cities in different regions: Moscow, Nizhniy Novgorod, Belgorod, Barnaul, Penza, Tula, Kurgan.
today, in Soviet period and in the West. The most important characteristics for the interviewees became the recognition and respect by peers and students, numerous publications, having apprentices or a “scholarly school” (usually such informal “schools” were formed around established scholars). The qualitative study showed that a successful career is perceived mostly in terms of scholarly achievements and personal characteristics (like “hard-working”), leaving out the “managerial” and most of “international” dimensions. That is a result itself; however the ultimate goal was to approach “managerial” and “international” aspects, and the list of characteristics was expanded accordingly.

For a quantitative study, 18 professional and personal characteristics in national and international dimensions were included into a questionnaire:

- respected by colleagues and students,
- recognized by colleagues in one’s own country,
- recognized by international colleagues,
- intensively involved in research,
- having apprentices/a “scholarly school”,
- publishing extensively in one’s own country,
- holding an administrative position,
- obtaining grants,
- able to find an external funding,
- a good manager,
- regularly publishing abroad,
- maintaining regular contacts with international colleagues,
- proficient in foreign languages,
- worked/studied abroad,
- an effective team-player,
- hard-working,
- proactive,
- self-organized.

The method required respondents evaluate the strength of various professional and personal qualities for the proposed types of academics and evaluate themselves on these scales. The independent variables include a university type (classical, technical, pedagogical university), academic position, academic field, residence (Moscow vs. regions), gender.

First, at the Table 1 one can see the means of variables for 18 characteristics, which are also presented at the Diagram 1 below. The data shows that the most important characteristics to describe the images are respect by colleagues and students, peers’ recognition inside the country, research activity and also personal skills (hard-working, self-organized, proactive).
Table 1. The means of 18 characteristics for three images and differences between them ("successful" academic career in Russia, "successful" academic career in the West, self-esteem)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>characteristics</th>
<th>“successful”</th>
<th>“successful”</th>
<th>self-esteem</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Western</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rus-West</td>
<td>Rus-self</td>
<td>West-self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respected by colleagues and students</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognized by colleagues in one’s own country</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognized by international colleagues</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td><strong>-0.48</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.16</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.98</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intensively involved in research</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>having apprentices/a “scholarly school”</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td><strong>1.41</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.58</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publishing extensively in one’s own country</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obtaining grants</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td><strong>1.21</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.65</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>able to find an external funding</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a good manager</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td><strong>-0.60</strong></td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holding an administrative position</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regularly publishing abroad</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td><strong>-0.53</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.22</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.75</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintaining regular contacts with international colleagues</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td><strong>-0.59</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.23</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.82</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proficient in foreign languages</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td><strong>-0.46</strong></td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worked/studied abroad</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td><strong>-0.60</strong></td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an effective team-player</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard-working</td>
<td><strong>3.52</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.5</strong></td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proactive</td>
<td><strong>3.48</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.57</strong></td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-organized</td>
<td><strong>3.47</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.60</strong></td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Last three columns present the gaps between the images, the most serious of which are related to the international dimension of the academic work (publications in international accounts, maintaining contacts with international colleagues, command of foreign languages, work/study abroad) and grant activity.

Diagram 1 demonstrates the profiles of three images. We can see that profiles of a successful academic in Russia and the West do not differ much in many characteristics, however the Western faculty member is usually assessed higher than the Russian one in most aspects. What is striking is the gap between the images of “successful” faculties and the self-esteem of the respondents.
The gap is the widest in the above mentioned aspects: international dimension of the academic work: recognition by international colleagues, publications in international accounts, maintaining contacts with foreign colleagues.

In order to decrease the number of dimensions used to study the images, factor analysis with Varimax rotation was employed. Table 2 demonstrates the rotated component matrix. Four clusters were extracted, they explain 67% of the variation.
Table 2. Factor analysis of 18 characteristics. Rotated component matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Analysis</th>
<th>Factor 1 “established scholar”</th>
<th>Factor 2 “global scholar”</th>
<th>Factor 3 “hard-working, proactive”</th>
<th>Factor 4 “manager able to get funding”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>recognized by colleagues in one’s own country</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>having apprentices/a “scholarly school”</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognized by international colleagues</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publishing extensively in one’s own country</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intensively involved in research</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regularly publishing abroad</td>
<td>.594</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respected by colleagues and students</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worked/studied abroad</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proficient in foreign languages</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintaining regular contacts with international colleagues</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>.654</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proactive</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard-working</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-organized</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td>.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an effective team-player</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.639</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holding an administrative position</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a good manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>able to find an external funding</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obtaining grants</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
Rotation converged in 11 iterations.
Cronbach’s alpha for 18 variables=0.922.

The first factor involved the following variables: recognized by colleagues in one’s own country, recognized by international colleagues, intensively involved in research, having apprentices/a “scholarly school”, publishing extensively in one’s own country. The factor encompasses a number of various characteristics related to recognition in the one’s own country and abroad, publications and research and could be labeled as an “established scholar”.

Second factor included variables measuring international aspects of the faculty work: contacts with international colleagues, command of foreign languages, work/study abroad (“global scholar”).

Unfortunately, the variable “regularly publishing abroad” did not worked well as it refers to two factors: the “established scholar” as well as “global scholar”.

Third factor describes personal job-related characteristics of faculty: hard-working, proactive, self-organized.

The fourth factor involves variables dealing with managerial and fundraising functions of academics: able to find an external funding, get a grant, a good manager, holding an administrative position. Interestingly, “managerialism” correlates with the administrative position in the perceptions of faculty.
Thus, the study resulted in an extraction of four interpretable factors which describe various dimensions of the academic work. Using the means of the regression scores for various independent variables we can analyze the perceptions of faculty of various ranks, institutional types and fields. One-way ANOVA confirmed statistically significant differences across variables (sig≤0.001 for all variables).

However, the professional characteristics, not the personal ones, describe the profession, so in my further analysis I will focus on the three professional dimensions of the academic profession: an “established” scholar, “global scholar” and “manager”.

Below at the diagrams one might see the means of the regression scores for the entire sample as well as by university type, faculty position, administrative position of faculty, field, gender.

Diagram 2. Three images (regression factor scores, means)
Diagram 3. Three images (regression factor scores, means)

The Images by University Type

- established scholar
- global scholar, involved in international networks
- manager able to get funding

- 'succfl' Rus-ClassU
- 'succfl' Rus-TechU
- 'succfl' Rus-PedU
- 'succfl' West-ClassU
- 'succfl' West-TechU
- 'succfl' West-PedU
- self-ClassU
- self-TechU
- self-PedU

The images are presented for different university types and traits, including established scholars, global scholars involved in international networks, and managers able to get funding.
Diagram 4. Three images by faculty position (regression factor scores, means)

Images by Faculty Position

- 'sucfl' Rus-Asst1
- 'sucfl' Rus-Asst2
- 'sucfl' Rus-AssocProf
- 'sucfl' Rus-FullProf
- 'sucfl' West-Asst1
- 'sucfl' West-Asst2
- 'sucfl' West-AssocProf
- 'sucfl' West-FullProf
- self-Asst1
- self-Asst2
- self-AssocProf
- self-FullProf

Legend:
- established scholar
- global scholar, involved in international networks
- manager able to get funding
Diagram 5. Three images by administrative position (regression factor scores, means)

The Images by Administrative Position

- established scholar
- global scholar, involved in international networks
- manager able to get funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'SucfI'Rus-chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'SucfI'Rus-top univ adm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'SucfI'Rus-other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'SucfI'Rus-no adm post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'SucfI'West- chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'SucfI'West- top univ adm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'SucfI'West- other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'SucfI'West- no adm post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Images by Administrative Position establish scholar, global scholar, involved in international networks, manager able to get funding.
Diagram 6. Three images by field (regression factor scores, means)

The Images by field

- established scholar
- global scholar, involved in international networks
- manager able to get funding

-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1

'Sucfl"Rus-Phys
'Sucfl"Rus-Bio
'Sucfl"Rus-IT
'Sucfl"Rus-Math
'Sucfl"Rus-Hist
'Sucfl"Rus-Soc
'Sucfl"Rus-Philol
'Sucfl"W-Phys
'Sucfl"W-Bio
'Sucfl"W-IT
'Sucfl"W-Math
'Sucfl"W-Hist
'Sucfl"W-Soc
'Sucfl"W-Philol
'Sucfl"W-Ec
Self-Phys
Self-Bio
Self-IT
Self-Math
Self-Hist
Self-Soc
Self-Philol
Self-Ec
Diagram 7. Three images by gender (regression factor scores, means)

The Images by Gender

- established scholar
- global scholar, involved in international networks
- manager able to get funding

'Sucfl"Rus-Male

'Sucfl"Rus-Female

'Sucfl"West-Male

'Sucfl"West-Female

Self-Male

Self-Female
Results and discussion

The data analysis shows that the profiles of successful careers in Russia, in the West and the current faculty careers notably differ. The successful faculty in Russia can be described as quite an established scholar, whose work is not necessarily requires managerial skills, who is very little involved in international academic networks.

On the contrary, a Western faculty is seen as an established scholar (more respected than a Russian one), integrated in international networks, doing more managerial job and somehow also not that hard-working. Estimating their own work, the respondents comprised a portrait in which an average Russian faculty is not in the position of an established scholar, disconnected from international community and not a manager searching for funding.

We can see how the profiles are changing depending on the environment factors (university type, region (Moscow vs. regions, field), faculty position, socio-demographics (age, gender).

Faculty at classical comprehensive universities have the profile of a successful career in Russia closer to an ideal Western one, in contrast to faculty at polytechnics and pedagogical universities. However the international aspect for Western faculty is more notable. Interestingly, regarding the managerialism, the perceptions of an ideal career do not differ a lot – in both cases it is quite modest.

Stronger managerial component one can find at technical universities, where the faculty consider it relatively more important for a career both in Russia and in the West. But the dimension of an established scholar as a part of an ideal career at Russian polytechnics is quite moderate. The same can be referred to pedagogical institutions, whose faculty do not demonstrate distinctive perceptions regarding a successful career in Russia, thus the gap between their defined ideal for a Western culture and Russian opportunities is high.

Looking at the faculty position, it is worth noting that associate and full professors do not consider international connectedness one of key factors of a successful career in Russia. For them to find their way in Russian academic life it is important to be an established scholar, not a global one, nor a manager. Hence, the global academic work is important for younger faculty, and it is them who are more concerned about managerial dimension in their work. There are no significant differences in the perception of a Western career among faculty of various rank.

Faculty holding an administration position tend to perceive a successful career in Russia in terms of being an established scholar, a little managerial, and not internationalized one, while faculty without administrative posts, actually a majority of faculty, consider a career in Russia as moderate mix of respect and reputation in Russia, connections with international community and need for funding search. Nevertheless, the image of a successful faculty in the West does not differ by respondents’ administrative position.

Interestingly, an administrative position is a key to revealing a managerialism dimension: top and mid-level administrators reported a relatively high managerial component in their current work. Thus, they estimate themselves as managers being able to find funding in contrast to faculty not holding administrative position.

The comparisons by field are more complicated, and some differences are hard to be explained by the specificities of the field, but also can be traced to the imperfections of the sample. For instance, an image of a successful career in Russia is quite common for physics, biology and sociology, in which we can find the presence of all 4 dimensions in a positive area. Meanwhile, IT, math, history and economics seem to not include internationalization as a part of a successful academic career in Russia. The linguists refuse to recognize the need for managerialism in faculty career.

The difference by gender shows that women ascribe more importance to the international component of an ideal career in Russia, comparing the men. But what is more interesting is the self-perception by gender. Female faculty find themselves less established as scholars, comparing to male faculty, less able to find funding.
Summarizing, how strong is the "managerial" component and how does it differ? Obviously, the managerial skills, among which are "being a good manager", "able to find external funding", "obtaining grants" are not the most important for an image of a successful career in Russia and in the West, comparing with other aspects. These qualities are seen as more important in the West than in Russia. In this respect, the work of faculty themselves is not considered as involving a lot of managerial activity. The gap is especially impressive when it comes to the comparison of self with successful Russian and West career in terms of grants. Grants are seen to be highly significant for a Western career (see Diagram 1), somewhat important for a Russian career, and only the small number of respondents can demonstrate high grant activity. The higher demand for managerialism in a Russian career could be found at technical universities (as depicts their image of a successful career in Russia), which could be explained by their higher involvement in applied science. The more managerial attitude is a characteristic for junior faculty in contrast to associate and full professors. Interestingly, the low demand for managerialism is among oldest cohort of faculty (56 and older), and the highest for youngest under 35 years old. The image of a professor-manager is rather an attribute in regions than in Moscow. By field the highest indicator is in sociology, the lowest is in philology.

This data is quite consistent with the indicators of the research activity of the faculty. Disregard of the university type, the majority of the respondents have greater interest in teaching than research (45 per cent vs. 38 per cent), allocate most of their time to teaching than research (55 per cent vs. 3 per cent). Generally, the majority (57 per cent) have not submitted any application for a research funding over last three years, and a half have never participated in a funded research project. Faculty at classical universities are more involved in that work (57%) than those at technical (47%) and pedagogical (33%) institutions, with a field rate from 62 per cent in sociology to 25 per cent in philosophy, a position rate from 73 per cent for full professors to 33 per cent for assistant professors (Smolentseva 2011).

The international dimension of faculty work demonstrates serious gaps between current faculty involvement in internationalization (which is low) and their perceptions of how it should be in Russia and in the West.

According to the survey, only 8 percent of academics are maintain contacts with their international colleagues (16 percent in Moscow and 6 percent in the regions) and another 31 percent keep contacts from time to time. Along with regional disparities, there is a status inequality in the degree of internationalization: full professors operate more actively on an international level, with 21 percent doing so on a regular basis. Moreover, faculty at classical universities, in contrast to those in pedagogical and technical universities, are more involved in the international community (12 percent compared to 5 percent and 3 percent, respectively). In any of the various collaborative activities, less than a third of the faculty maintaining contacts reported of joint publications (29 percent), research projects (28 per cent), joint presentations at conferences (20 percent), exchange programs (19 percent), and joint educational programs (7 per cent). In terms of the membership in professional associations abroad, in domestic professional associations, the membership comprises on average 48 percent, and only 6 percent of faculty is formal members of international professional communities. It is biologists and physicists who are most active in maintaining international contacts (Smolentseva 2007).

Thus, very rarely do faculty maintain contacts with international colleagues, and probably even have a chance to meet any international colleagues; very few published abroad, and very few have a good command of a foreign languages, most important of which is English now. Also, these qualities are more important for the Western academics. It should be noted that faculty of classical universities perceive themselves more internationally involved than their colleagues at technical and pedagogical universities. Interestingly, full professors more rarely participate in international activity than their colleagues of other ranks, and that requires further analysis.
The successful career in Russia is seen as somewhat internationalized at classical universities in contrast to technical and pedagogical, by assistant professors (lecturers, senior lecturers) rather than full professors, by faculty without administrative position than top and middle university administrators. In Moscow an ideal career is perceived as more international comparing to the regions. Internationalization is in demand in philology, sociology, less in physics, biology and the lowest in economics, math, IT, history. It is difficult to explain such differentiation by field, and that needs further investigation. The female faculty believe in a more international career than male faculty, and the younger cohort is more interested in international aspects than their older colleagues.

What is striking is a gap between self-estimation and “successful” careers in Russia and in the West. Some personal modesty of the respondents, lowering their self-evaluation, could also be a factor contributing to the explanation of the gap, however in the light of previous research within the project showing quite low indicators of research activity of faculty members that can be only one of the factors.

Conclusions

Understanding the gaps between ideal perceptions of the faculty work and real notions contributes to the analysis of the changing academic profession in the context of globalization in terms of transforming demands to the research, teaching, “managerial”, administrative skills of faculty. The research enables to conclude that Russian faculty do not ascribe high importance in the Russian reality to managerial skills (such as being a good manager, able to get external funding, get a grant), nor they consider themselves proficient in these matters, while managerial skills are becoming increasingly important for Western academics.

Moreover, the result we get is that a successful academic career in Russia today is not related to the managerial, administrative skills and positions, not corresponding to the grant-seeking process or any search for funding. Usually, speaking of managerialism we imply that this activity is connected to the grant money, project money, basic or applied funded research. In this survey we had only 5 per cent of respondent who we can consider a highly research oriented group (Smolentseva 2011). So in this respect the result we received here can be explained by generally low involvement of faculty in research, and in this framework it is natural that the managerial skills are not in demand.

Furthermore, the low involvement of faculty in research can be explained with not only high teaching loads, low salaries, lack of time to do research, lack of experience in grant-writing process (which is significant), but also the lack of incentives for research and the low level of development of system of research funding in Russia. The number of public and private foundations is small, the grant size are usually not that large, the amount paper work is daunting, and all these are exacerbated by the corruption issues. Also, most recently, the funding of two governmental foundations is planned to be decreased in the next few years.

The internationalization is not integrated in the academic work of the most of Russian faculty members. As we could see, faculty are very little involved in internationalization and even do not consider a high level of internationalization as a part of a successful academic career in Russia. That is something beyond their everyday practice. Internationalization is more a characteristic of the Western academics in the perceptions of the respondents.

So how does globalization affect Russian faculty? The answer is probably either it does not affect, passes by, since we cannot see a direct impact such as an increase of managerialism or involvement into internationalization, or the globalization does strengthen Russian faculty’s disadvantaged position on the global scale, deepens the stratification and differentiation of

---

faculty (with the emergence of a small research oriented and “global” strata of faculty) and leads to the decline at the national level.

It is worth noting that a gap between ideal notions and reality correlates to the dissatisfaction and demotivation of academics, decline of the morale, erosion of professional norms. That eventually might show up as an unwillingness to work well, to teach, to do research, pay attention to students and their needs, burst of corruption that distorts the essence of faculty work. These trends might not be obvious, not lying on the surface, being hidden behind the outrush of external activity, but still persists. Relevant policy at the governmental and institutional levels should address these issues in order to support and stimulate the development of the Russian higher education and research.

We cannot also expect the rise of the Russian academic profession in the near future, nor the rise of the Russian higher education as a system which depends on the academic profession serving its core component. “A sufficient degree” of economic security of faculty which is considered as one of the key components to ensure academic freedom of teaching, research and service (AAUP 1940) has never been achieved in Post-Soviet Russia. Recent policy initiatives on the national level have put more pressure on universities in terms of accountability, research and publications requirements while not contributing to the bringing up conditions which secure faculty positions economically and stimulate faculty professional activity. Thus, the Russian academic profession at higher educational institutions – a historically teaching profession on average – might not cope with the challenges of globalization, internationalization and come to a deeper decline.
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