

occurring so far, international scholars visiting one of Russian university cities were notified that their travel and accommodation would be paid for if they would promise to evaluate the host university favorably during the next reputation survey. Overall, the most visible reaction to ministerial attempts to internationalize Russian science manifested itself in attempts by academics to export the practice of collusion outside of Russia.

Was the prospect of world-wide export of practices characteristic of Russian scholarship realistic? There is some good news and some bad news. The good news is that Russian academics are too few and not resourceful enough to make a difference globally. Colluding requires providing something in return for compromising academic integrity — and here Russians simply do not have much to offer to more than a handful of academic tourists agreeing to patronize them. As far as publications are concerned, there are a few documented cases of establishing partnerships with editors of important journals that resulted in emergence of various thematic issues which allowed to bypass the more unpredictable regular submission, but this cannot be considered a big impact on the system of periodicals in general. Unless Russian academic market becomes significantly more important globally, it is hardly a major threat to international academic virtue. The bad news is that scholars all over the world experience similar pressure, and while Russia may have a dubious honor of being the first to suffer the consequences, it will probably not remain the only one.

## References

[1] *We are not discussing here other costs of publication pressure, such as alleged loss of originality as a result of desire to make a paper a hundred-to-one stake.*

---

# Under Pressure: Transformation of Academic Work and Discourse in a Globally-Oriented Russian University: Case of National Research University Higher School of Economics

**Ivan Gruzdev**

*Director,  
Center for Institutional Research,  
National Research University  
Higher School of Economics, Russian Federation  
[igrudzdev@hse.ru](mailto:igrudzdev@hse.ru)*

**Roman Abramov**

*Associate professor,  
Faculty of Social Sciences, Sociology Department,  
National Research University  
Higher School of Economics, Russian Federation  
[r Abramov@hse.ru](mailto:r Abramov@hse.ru)*

**Evgeniy Terentev**

*Leading Analyst,  
Center for Institutional Research,  
National Research University  
Higher School of Economics, Russian Federation  
[eterentev@hse.ru](mailto:eterentev@hse.ru)*

*Pressure pushing down on me,  
Pressing down on you, no man asked for [1]*

The Russian government has recently launched a national academic excellence project that aims to enable a handful of leading universities to take positions in top-100 of the global rankings by the year 2020 (The 5-100 Project). Fifteen and, later on, six more universities selected to participate in the program have already received or have a chance to receive extra funding and are expected to perform better in the global education market. Having more resources, these institutions have realized the necessity to strengthen their teaching and research functions with a special stress on the latter. Institutional consequences of this academic excellence initiative are widely discussed but what happens to academics within these institutions? The most straightforward aftermath for the faculty at participating universities is higher pressure to publish and, moreover, to publish internationally. Thus, the motto “publish or perish” that has been working the academics’ nerves for years already is nowadays more than relevant in Russia’s leading universities. Basing on the data of the annual faculty survey conducted at Higher School of Economics and the analysis of public debates reflected in the media and on Facebook, we make an attempt to reveal the changes that are happening to HSE faculty under pressure to publish.

Generally, the academic world has reacted to this pressure with the discourse of alarmism, which is characterized by sentiments predicting the decline or even immediate death of the academic life. The fact that a large proportion of faculty share and represent such views in public discussions is not entirely new but alarmist discourse is getting more and more robust. Publishing issues are an essential part of this discourse. There are at least three typical complaints voiced by faculty. First is that academics are expected to show high productivity in compressed times frames, although “good scholarship requires time” [2] and the term “productivity” itself is inappropriate for traditional university life. In a certain sense, it sounds like a slightly naive call for professional autonomy to stand against the invasion of managerialism in academia. Then follow complaints against the spread of bibliometric indicators as measures of scientific outcomes. The relevance of international citation databases is questioned. The ways bibliometry is employed

to account productivity are challenged. The third kind of grievance represents the voice of “pure” teachers whose professional identity doesn’t include research and is limited to transmitting knowledge. They point out that good teaching should be appreciated no less than research. Government officials, university administrators and even other academics that support transformations try to respond to these complaints. However, alarmism persists and, in our view, is even growing, which means that the communication between the supporters of different views is failing.

Alarmism, which obviously opposes the policies focused on enhancing publication activity, doesn’t mean that faculty don’t change. The case of Higher School of Economics (HSE) shows that the pressure to publish has its impact on academic life. Specifically, some faculty start changing their professional tracks and try to conform with “publish or perish” policy requirements. At HSE there are three ways through which this policy operates: 1) publication activity assessment, 2) a system of differentiating wages according to publication results, 3) publications outcome is a criterion taken into consideration while renewing faculty’s contracts.

Faculty survey at HSE contains questions about working time budgets and priorities in professional life. The results show that half of those in teaching positions spend more than 25% of their working time on research. [3] Moreover, the share of instructors who stated that research is their professional foreground grew from 26% in 2014 to 41% in 2015, while the same indicator for teaching decreased from 67% to 51%. The majority (87%) of faculty who would like to change the structure of their working time budgets in the future said that if they did change it, they would spend more time on research. The percentage of teachers who participated in research projects has risen from 68% to 79%. In other words, academics who used to be focused primarily on teaching are turning towards research, thus leaving teaching behind. Such reorientation towards research is more prevalent among male faculty (84% of them participated in research projects) than female (74% of which participated in research projects), among academics with less teaching load (with 86% of those who participated in research projects among teachers with fewer than 50 contact hours in the 2014-2015 academic year), and those with a post-graduate degree (83% of them participated in research projects in comparison with 69% of the teachers without a post-graduate degree).

However, not everyone wants changes in their professional life. Around 20% of the faculty spend more than 80% of their time on teaching and therefore don’t engage in research much and don’t show high publication activity. A curious fact is that this subgroup differs a lot from other faculty in terms of their professional attitudes. For instance, comparing with other groups, divided on the basis of their working time budget structure, faculty who are primarily teachers (>80% of time spent on teaching) are distinguished by the biggest share of those who are dissatisfied with their income and who are planning to change their workplace. At the same time, they stand out as a group due to the lowest percentage of those who plan to publish in international journals and who understand the university’s strategic goals. This group seems to be

a bit lost in the changing environment and, at the same time, a bit rebellious, comparing to their colleagues who more or less accept the rules. This draws another line between them. In the survey, there were questions aimed to explore attitudes towards possible sanctions against faculty who don’t fit the minimum criteria of publication activity. Academics with different working time budget structure show different attitudes to the idea of sanctions. Usually those who spend most time on teaching are more critical, while those deeply engaged in research often support the idea of sanctions. In our opinion, it can be interpreted as a polarization between two professional subgroups: “high-flyers and underdogs,” [4] or conformists and rebels. Pressure to publish contributes to the institutionalization of the role of underdogs at Russian universities not only by establishing certain rules but also by creating new incentives for faculty differentiation.

## References

- [1] *From Under Pressure by Queen & David Bowie.*
- [2] *The respondents were asked to evaluate the share of time they spend on the following activities: teaching, research, administrative work, other professional tasks (4 options).*
- [3] Mountz, A., Bonds, A., Mansfield, B., Loyd, J., Hyndman, J., Walton-Roberts, M., Basu, R., Whitson, R., Hawkins, R., Hamilton, T., & Curran, W. (2015). *For Slow Scholarship: A Feminist Politics of Resistance through Collective Action in the Neoliberal University.* *ACME: An International E-Journal For Critical Geographies*, 14(4), 1235-1259.
- [4] Ylijoki, O. H., & Ursin, J. (2015). *High-Flyers and Underdogs: The Polarisation of Finnish Academic Identities.* *Academic Identities in Higher Education: The Changing European Landscape*, 38, 187.

---

## Return on Publications (RoP) and the Changing Nature of the ‘Science Enterprise’

Igor A. Osipov [1]

*Dr., Advisor to FEFU President on priority projects, Far Eastern Federal University, Russian Federation*  
[osipov@dvfu.ru](mailto:osipov@dvfu.ru)

### Publishing, Access and Data: An Overview

These days everything, including publishing and science, is about data. Here is a highlight. On January 7, 2016, at Orthodox Christmas day, ORCID, a US (Delaware-based) corporation which holds open-access registry of unique identifiers for individual authors and their publishing activities officially announced that seven influential society publishers will start requiring ORCID identifiers from their authors [2]. The pioneer of this next deep digitization step — The Royal Society (UK) — was already at the forefront of