

The Specific Features of a Government Control over Higher Education, Considering the Interests of Parties to the Social and Labour Relations

¹Konstantin V. Vodenko, ²Ivan A. Bokachev, ¹Natalya A. Levchenko

³Valentina I. Rodionova and ³Lyudmila A. Shvachkina

¹Platov South Russian State Polytechnic University (NPI), Novocherkassk, Russia

²North Caucasus Federal University, Stavropol, Russia

³Don State Technical University, Rostov-on-Don, Russia

Abstract: This study is devoted to studying the role of a government control over higher education, considering the interests of the leading parties to the social and labour relations. The prospects for government control, focused on developing partnership between higher education institutions and employers are considered. It is noted that the promising cooperation between education and business is under small innovative enterprises of universities development. The role of higher education institution as the leading mechanism for the social stratification of the Russian society is shown.

Key words: Government control, higher education, innovation development, employers, the prospects for social partnership development

INTRODUCTION

Developing full partnership between higher education institutions and employers that can become a driver of the domestic economy development and also make the positive influence on the social sphere in general is the most important field of control. Moreover, the main problem that blocks the way to develop this partnership is dealt with the fact that learning services market in Russia is actually isolated from labour market. Education fulfills a number of socio-cultural reproduction functions, including the national security issues, which cannot be definitely reduced to the demands on the market. In this context, it is necessary to consider the importance of educational latent function, directed to a typical compensation of the Russian population's dissatisfaction with its own social status and living standards (Vodenko and Chernykh, 2015). Therefore, the relations between educational and economic institutions often have a contradictory character and are expressed in what, for instance, many domestic and foreign researchers are still using the ideas of a permanent class fight in their concepts, returning to the Marxist paradigm of the social analysis (Habermas, 2010). It is also impossible to lose an opportunity to have effective cooperation between education and business in the aggravation of the global economic competition.

Thus, this current situation offers the great opportunities for the state to take part in developing social partnership between the leading parties to the

social and labour relations, where private capital along with the state one is capable of forming a cluster of employers, who are interested in creating the Russian economic innovation sectors.

The object of the research is a control over higher education, considered through a prism of developing social partnership between higher education institutions and employers as parties to the social and labour relations. The strategic aspects of a government control over education, considering the specific features of education, government and business interaction at the present stage of developing Russia are the subject of the research. The aim of the study is to consider the prospects for a government control over higher education in the context of developing social partnership between the leading parties to the social and labour relations. To achieve the aim of the research, it is necessary to solve the following tasks:

- To consider education as the leading reproduction institution of society's class and occupational structure
- To study the specific features of a government control over social sphere and human resources
- To explicate the interaction between education, government and business in the context of developing Russia
- To reveal the prospects for a government control over education on the basis of social partnership development

The degree of scientific development of the theme includes the analysis of the learned treatises about a sociological survey of the role of the state (government institution) within the development of social partnership between the leading institutional parties to the social and labour relations. The analysis of the prospects for a government control over higher education, being considered in the study, was made by relying on the works of such domestic researchers as M.K. Gorshkov, F.E. Sheregi, P.M. Kozyreva, M.S. Popova, A.V. Ridiger, S.A. Dyuzhikov, K.V. Vodenko and others.

The structural and functional model of analyzing the interaction of social institutions, presented in the classical works of T. Parsons and R. Merton was used as a theoretical foundation. As well, P. Bourdieu's social capital concept, J. Habermas's ideas were used and the conceptual frameworks of state development in the "late modernity" conditions (A. Giddens) were tried out in this study. The institutional approach and the principle of institutional economic development are of no less value to the research (T. Veblen, D. North, A.E. Shastiko and others). Much attention is given to the leading role of social, political and economic institutions in controlling the social and economic systems. The institutional approach cannot be implemented without using the Government Regulation of the Economy Principle (J.M. Keynes, R.E. Hansen, J. Hicks, L.I. Abalkin, S.Y. Glazyev, D.S. Lvov and others).

EDUCATION AS THE LEADING INSTITUTION FOR RECONSTRUCTION OF SOCIETY'S CLASS AND OCCUPATIONAL STRUCTURE

The most important criterion for society stratification is the educational background of individuals, besides the best education in general increases the potential of a young specialist in constructing his own professional career. However, the main receivers of higher education in modern society are middle class representatives who invest in education actively (Vodenko and Chernykh, 2015; Vodenko *et al.*, 2015, 2016a, b). In general, following the neomarxist interpretation of higher education institution, it is quite possible to agree with the opinion that this institution promotes maintaining a class compromise and respectively legitimate the researcher in all the societies of late capitalism (Habermas, 2010). Thus, higher education performs the state functions, directed to strengthening and regulating the economic processes and maintaining the country's ideological safety in the latent and rather mediated form. In this context, it is important to note a certain sort of accretion at the institutional level of the state and education. For

instance, only education institutions train future professional officials, political scientists and sociologists, who are capable of fulfilling direct managerial functions and providing a technological and advisory assistance to the environmental researcherities at a public expertise level.

P.M. Kozyreva's research emphasizes that "education makes a great influence on the key indicators of labour market (economic activity, employment and unemployment) in the Russian conditions. In particular, higher and better education is "paid off" by strengthening the professional status and the increased stability of employment, helps to find an interesting and highly-paid job more quickly and be retained. The unemployment rate among the highly-educated citizens is lower than among the poorly educated ones, who are always a risk group and the first to face a job loss threatening in the crunch (Kozyreva, 2015)". Therefore, higher education still remains an important mechanism for the social stratification of the Russian society and can be considered as a resource for improving the living standards of citizens.

According to the structural and functional approach, practiced in F.E. Sheregi's works, the scientific analysis of education institution must not only describe its obvious form but it also explicates its latent content. The researcher notes: "The obvious form is a mechanism for reconstructing the social and professional structure of society and the latent content is a mechanism for reconstructing the distributive relations. In the former case, it is mainly about an economic component, in the latter case, it is about a social one. These components are contradictory. Serving as the integrating and differentiating functions of education, the standard social relations, together with the vocational training system of young people are a link, recognized to cover up this contradiction (Sheregi, 2015)". Therefore, the integrating function of education promotes familiarizing the younger generation with a wide range of the social values, serving as the most important mechanism of socialization. The differentiating function of education institution forms various groups, according to labour division at the starting level of youth labour socialization, bringing a contradiction to the class structure (Habermas, 2010).

However, due to functioning higher education institution and its ideological influence on the population, there being formed the stable society of conformists, who identify themselves with the middle class. It is possible to tell that higher education practically forms the middle class in Russia, constructing its identity, first of all, at the ideological level of perceiving the social reality, as the actual wages of the population are behind the income of

the middle class representatives in the developed countries of the West. Therefore, “higher education diploma serves as a means of a certain kind of a symbolical compensation in the Russian society that is necessary to soften the frustration, caused by the Russians’ unsatisfactory living standards (chronic poverty) and the weak social security of citizens (Vodenko *et al.*, 2015)”. In its turn, the current situation is a certain kind of the limiting factor in further expanding market of a full-paid education as it can contradict the state security, aimed at providing stability by decreasing or soothing a social tension.

A GOVERNMENT CONTROL OVER SOCIAL SPHERE AND HUMAN RESOURCES

The urgent problem for modern Russia is efficiency in social sphere development. This problem must be solved by considering the structural crisis of the Russian economy that is going on under the policy of sanctions against our state, pursued by the developed countries of the West. The social sphere of the Russian society includes, first of all such branches whose direct activity helps to solve the social problems of citizens. It is accepted to refer education, health care social assistance to the disadvantaged groups, local employment, migration policy, housing and communal services, cultural and youth policy to the most important branches of social sphere. A big role in government regulation of social sphere is given to improving locals’ quality of life. In this context, it is not about people satisfying their basic minimum requirements any more (food, safety) and it assumes their ability to use a wide range of biological, social and economic resources such as health, public relations, an access to education, financial opportunities, civil rights, etc. Thus, the state becomes a mouthpiece of the common interests and aspirations of the heterogeneous society, serving as a guarantor for its unity and safety. Possessing the power over all members of society, it is capable of balancing political values and opinions in society. In social sphere state promises to play a protectionist role, preserving its citizens from a direct influence of pop-up market or other crisis phenomena, connected with economic difficulties. Therefore, in many respects a government control assumes an allocative nature of activity, i.e., having the financial, symbolical and cultural resources at its disposal. One of the key functions of social sphere control is as follows: to maintain class compromise, legal order, civil solidarity, stability and cooperation of the country considering an ethnic confessional variety in society.

In this context, in our opinion, it is necessary to make allowance for citizens’ public opinion monitoring, i.e., it is

important to consider the solution of which major problems, the Russians see the main tasks of government control.

To our mind it is important to be sensible of the fact that human resources with the corresponding institutional support from the government are capable of being self-development, i.e., they have properties to accumulate the human (social) capital. Therefore, reducing the investments of the state into a number of the leading branches of social sphere will probably make a negative influence on the concentration of the Russian citizens’ capital. For instance, a decrease in quality (available) domestic medicine, connected with insufficient funding and the high level of corruption in all spheres of public life is possible to consider as one of the key factors for national security threat. In this situation, first of all, it is also necessary to consider the state of the Russian disadvantaged groups, which perceive budget return especially sharply (Vodenko *et al.*, 2016a, b).

The existing contradiction between the liberal theory and the ideocracy domination in the structures of the domestic power, established by practitioners, continues to influence the features of the public administration in Russia. Thus, such society regulates economic benefits allocation by means of the powerful administrative resources, controlled by officials and security agencies, which turn the public property into the ministerial one, using the redistributive mechanisms (Chernykh and Iskenderova, 2015). In particular, an access to the power serves as the main source of achieving welfare and protects private business and property. However, as from the naughtiest of the 20th century, the ruling leadership had successfully mastered an imperial (state) discourse as the main ideological tool for influencing the masses. The seat of power’s focus on the importance of the so-called traditional (conservative) values in the aims of education for citizens in the spirit of patriotism, if the real anti-corruption program against the total embezzlement of the federal budget is not adopted, can be turned into a ritualized rhetoric, intended to hide the structural contradictions in economy and the low level of the Russian administrative apparatus. The global experience shows that the classical liberalism (the state did not interfere in market performance) in reference to the management of the economic functions in the 20th century was significantly pressed by the models for a government control over Keynesian capitalism which managed to become the prescriptions for the government’s interference in economy, admitted by the international community. Now most of economists both liberals and Keynesians agree with that the modern capitalist economy is mixed, i.e., it includes various forms of private business and governmental intervention in the

management of the economy (Naimushin and Paidá, 2009). Besides, the disagreements between liberals and Keynesians are mainly connected with market regulations. However, the anti-recessionary practice in the developed capitalist countries showed that interfering in economy; the state pursued an interventional policy in the interests of large business. It happens due to the fact that despite their transnational status, corporations have special and strong institutional ties with the “mother country” and the government of these countries considers them as tools for their own economic expansion and political rule (Shastitko, 2002).

Despite the severe impact of economic neoliberalism theories, it is important not to transfer the leading capitalist postulate about profit maximization and costs minimization for all spheres of the social relations. It also concerns human resources which need a care about supporting their biological, economic and cultural potential in due course. Otherwise, a sharp fall in people’s quality of life will lead to their social deprivation that will cause a reduction in labour productivity. Therefore, it is the state that performs a social protection function. In this context, it can be considered as the leading symbolical institution that controls and coordinates the social system in general. It is important to understand that the subject of relationship between government and society is not exhausted by the mechanisms of national economy control; it is much wider, as it covers both the social sphere and the problems which are directly connected with developing the civil society in Russia. Thus, it is about the fact that forming civil identity, mainly according to the western standards, in practice leads not only to strengthening public solidarity but it may have the “negative” tendencies including a refusal of “selfless” service and “uncomplaining” submission to the government from the population. For instance, during the czarist rule the Russian residents generally considered themselves to be the lieges of the czar, i.e., his property to some extent. It was reflected in division of society into estates and was supported at the level of the feudal serfdom system. Up to the Bolshevik revolution, despite the slow reforming of the country, the full-fledged bourgeois (civil) society had not been formed in Russia. It could not be especially formed at the totalitarian and researcheritarian Soviet regime which despite the serious sci-tech and social achievements, suppressed nonconformity, private initiative and freedom of economic endeavours.

However, modernizing the society and its basic institutions on the basis of the civil society concept assumes government rationalization (M. Weber) that must be followed by transforming the lieges into full-fledged

citizens. Therefore, the government must fall under desecration to some extent that in its turn causes a discontent of “conformists” who stand up for preserving an ideocracy nature of the Russian government and its sacral status. To our mind, the forecast made by Gorshkov and Tikhonova (2013), seems to be interesting. They suppose rightly that the “development of this tendency will be able to cause a refusal resignedly to suffer from a decline in smb’s position in another economic crisis, a refusal of the standard in a need to serve in the army not at the individual level but in scales of society in future”. In this dual situation, it is possible to suppose quite that the Russian government, undoubtedly, will use the patriotic technologies, switching its citizens’ attention to the geopolitical challenges, threatening the real unity even not so much as the prestige of the country. In this context, for the purpose of maintaining the researcherity of the legitimate power and preserving stability, the task of the efficiency in social sphere and human resource management is of great importance to the Russian government.

THE SPECIFIC FEATURES OF EDUCATION, GOVERNMENT AND BUSINESS INTERACTION IN THE CONTEXT OF DEVELOPING RUSSIA

The features of education control are largely defined by the state’s social obligations to the citizens of the country, besides, the economic subsystem which is responsible for business development, is substantially nationalized and subordinated to the imperious and bureaucratic machine as education is. There dominated the “power-property” that represents the real operating substitution of a hybrid type, where “the leading role belongs to both officials operating resources of the state capital and businessmen, close to the researcherities, owning the private capital in Russia (Chernykh and Iskenderova, 2015)”. Therefore, the consciousness patterns of the most part of the Russian youth, getting an education in the domestic higher education institutions, focus them, first of all, on public service which they perceive as the leading resource for increasing their own social status (Sheregi *et al.*, 2015).

Just an insignificant part of specialists among young Russians seeks to connect their professional choice, for instance, with multinational corporations, whose performance is not controlled, first of all, by the Russian state or even private capital. In its way, the system of the Russian education is not cosmopolitan and there dominated the local attitudes of work in the consciousness of its graduates. Thus, the given (nationalized and business) system trains specialists

mainly for the domestic labour market, aspiring to work in the public sector. If to speak about the possibility of the so-called innovation breakthrough, its main driver for Russia is a defense industry, controlled by the state.

The modern researcher F.E. Sheregi notes: “the fact that 52.9% of 143.3 million population of the Russian Federation is economically active and only 17.8% of them is engaged in the real sector shows the dominating role of the state about allocation issues. In other words, if to round the last indicator to 20%, the state budget is a direct or indirect source of use not less than for 80% of the population of the Russian Federation. In fact it is the kind of the state natural allocation that existed in the USSR; it is just now replaced by a money equivalent, creating an equivalent commodity-money exchange (Sheregi, 2015)”. The above described tendencies have been strengthened in recent years, which were promoted by the global economic crisis and sanctions against Russia, followed by the country’s isolation from the international and educational cooperation.

Furthermore, the patriotic ideology of the last years, being considered by us as a segment of the intended government propaganda (consequently, ideological management) is inclined to bring the attitudes for the positive perception of the described tendencies in the consciousness of the Russians. As it is known that in any external pressure upon the country, the solidarity of citizens is built around the obvious centers of the researcheries. It means that science politicization in stepping up the requirements for ideology becomes a quite actual reality of the educational sector that influences its interaction with the leading integrated business structures.

Thus, the specific model of education, government and business interaction developed in the special historical conditions of a transition from the planned economy of the communistic system to the capitalist society that functioning in the conditions of the late modernity and the aggravated geopolitical contradictions is traditionally exposed to a sharp criticism in domestic sociology. In this context, F.E. Sheregi focuses his attention on that: “in the vocational training system training young people to reproduce this primary social structure is equivalent to form their dependant psychology, their disbelief in their strengths and opportunities, their inabilities to survive in labour competition and, therefore, their tendencies to use (it is more often induced) the corruption methods of survival. It also shows that there are serious difficulties in young people’s vocational guidance. It is not for nothing that government employee profession is “profitable”. In most young Russians’ sight, it has gained the same importance

as the leading “profitable” professions such as economist, financier and lawyer for many years today (Sheregi, 2015)”. Therefore, the problem of modernizing the Russian society is still under the “liberal” project implementation which assumes such a trajectory in which the government could give free rein to both universities and private business, naturally controlling innovation knowledge and high-tech industry, connected with the national security

THE PROSPECTS FOR A GOVERNMENT CONTROL OVER EDUCATION ON THE BASIS OF SOCIAL PARTNERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

Further development of the domestic economy is supported by the innovation technology assumes creating a favorable environment for social partnership between higher education system and employers, many of which serve as representatives of the private capital. As Dyuzhikov (2010) notes, the modern state “must serve not only as one of the participants of learning services market who is interested in the high-quality of specialists, trained by education institutions but it also must serve as the key subject of shaping and achieving the aims and tasks of educational policy”. The state continues to remain the largest investor in the Russian education, whereas the representatives of the private business including foreign companies, are focused on creating the integrated systems between education institutions and special divisions of corporations to a lesser extent.

According to the future requirements of labour market and reindustrialization trends, it is necessary to enhance the quality of specialists by involving employers in vocational education. Social partnership in the context of higher education institution and business interaction will be stable and amicable, provided that each of partners’ interest is protected by the state. Besides, government and society must be interested in attracting private capital to the educational system that it will help to reduce corruption risks, connected with no-purpose expenditures of budgetary funds. Moreover, employers’ cooperation with higher education institutions and power structures will help to increase the social responsibility of business that is necessary for creating the full civil society in Russia. A high-quality increase in the innovation performance of young specialists, who are capable of investing in the cultural capital and development of labour productivity, will be just possible in case of strengthening their economic initiative.

In this context, an expansive development of universities’ small innovative enterprises which can invest their own cultural capital in innovations as well as

to attract private investors' financial resources effectively, is of great interest. Researchers note the high capacity of such enterprises: "according to a group of universities' small enterprises by type of activity, their efforts are focused on developments and applied research. The 40% of the small innovation enterprises carry out production (including assembly, repair and maintenance), nearly a third of the small enterprises develop computer programs and IT technologies and 30% of them do trials (Sheregi *et al.*, 2015)". The similar enterprises are drivers of social partnership between higher education and employers, as there is an increase in the professional practice of future specialists under their activity.

Thus, it is already possible to define which of young specialists is capable of taking part in the innovation performance for making new hi-tech products at a stage of training. Moreover, in higher education institutions there is a professional socialization of young specialists and also a certain sort of sending down those students, who did not study well or do not connect their career with the sphere of production.

CONCLUSION

Developing social partnership between higher education institutions and employers assumes a key role of government participation and control over constructing a scope of engagement between parties to the social and labour relations. However, it is necessary to consider that the specific features of education, government and business interaction in Russia are determined by the leading role of the state. Besides, young graduates consider public service as the main resource for increasing their own social status. The Negative features of the researcherity nationalizing education and business are that the current situation forms young people's dependant attitudes and hampers the development of their economic consciousness which is necessary for working in the competitive global economy. Moreover, higher education institution remains an important mechanism for the social stratification of the Russian society, providing a social lifting of young specialists and their protection in labour market. As the successful examples of higher education control there has been a number of universities' effective innovation enterprises, which are capable of providing further prospects for the development of labour productivity and deepening cooperation between education and business in training young specialists.

REFERENCES

- Chernykh, S. and Y. Iskenderova, 2015. The social aspects of institutional transformation of the power-property in post-Soviet Russia. *Theory Pract. Public Dev.*, 4: 120-120.
- Dyuzhnikov, S., 2010. *The Modern Russian State in Shaping Learning Services Market*. Publisher of the Southern Federal University, Rostov-on-Don, Russia, Pages: 224.
- Gorshkov, M. and N. Tikhonova, 2013. *The socio-cultural factors of russian society consolidation*. The Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia.
- Habermas, J., 2010. *The Problem of Legitimizing Late Capitalism*. Praxis Publisher, Moscow, Russia, Pages: 264.
- Kozyreva, P., 2015. *Education and employability: Opportunities and reality*. Dimensions of the Russian Education, Centre for Sociological Research, Moscow, Russia.
- Naimushin, V. and V. Paida, 2009. *The Russian economy on the way from liberalism to social regulation*. MBA Thesis, The Institute for Research and Design of Electric Locomotive Building, The Southern Federal University, Rostov-on-Don, Russia.
- Shastitko, A., 2002. *New Institutional Economic Theory*. TEIS Publisher, Moscow, Russia, Pages: 591.
- Sheregi, F., 2015. *Education as a social institution*. Dimensions of the Russian education, Centre for Sociological Research, Moscow, Russia.
- Sheregi, F., M. Popov and A. Ridiger, 2015. *Small innovative enterprises of universities*. Dimensions of the Russian Education, Centre for Sociological Research, Moscow, Russia.
- Vodenko, K. and S. Chernykh, 2015. *Diversifying the role of higher education institution in the reproduction and concentration of social capital*. Scholar of the North of Russia, Russia.
- Vodenko, K., E. Cherkesova, L. Shvachkina, S. Fateeva and I. Erosheva, 2016a. *The specifics of the socio-cultural determination of the current economic activity*. *Int. J. Econ. Financial Issues*, 6: 206-210.
- Vodenko, K.V., O.M. Shevchenko, T.I. Barsukova, E.I. Hubuluri and N.V. Mishina, 2016b. *Modern institutes and regulatory forms of social and labor relations in Russian society*. *Int. Rev. Manage. Marketing*, 6: 185-190.
- Vodenko, K.V., S.A. Tikhonovskova and O.S. Ivanchenko, 2015. *Trends and prospects of transformation of the social structure of the Russian scientific community*. *Mediterr. J. Soc. Sci.*, 6: 313-319.