Dear colleagues,

This issue is all about academic inbreeding. Academic inbreeding is defined as the practice of universities hiring their own graduates as faculty, i.e., as teaching staff and researchers. The term “inbreeding” comes from biology where it is used to describe the mating of organisms that are closely related genetically. Despite “academic inbreeding” being just a vivid analogy for biological inbreeding, a closer look at both phenomena helps discover numerous similarities between them, including their internally contradictory nature. On the one hand, inbreeding is a widely used breeding technique that helps augment desired traits. On the other hand, mating or breeding of organisms that are closely related genetically can lead to inbreeding depression and, thus, to more recessive traits manifesting themselves and eventually even to degeneration.

Recruitment of own graduates is common in many regions, countries and universities; sometimes (when perceived as something advantageous and desirable) it is a consciously, purposively chosen strategy, in other cases it is done out of necessity (due to lack of alternative solutions). Still, academic inbreeding can have negative consequences, too. They include limited circulation and exchange of knowledge, stagnation, replication of faulty ideas and practices, self-isolation, and low level of engagement in the global exchange of ideas, knowledge and best practices. This means that academic inbreeding is a phenomenon that is, on the one hand, of interest for researchers and practitioners in university governance but on the other hand, stirs discord between the supporters and opponents of this practice.

The articles in this issue, authored by both researchers and practitioners, provide different views on academic inbreeding with all its pros and cons, as well as on the ways and methods of balancing inbreeding that are used at some universities. We also present a short guide on research literature dedicated to academic inbreeding; it is aimed at those who take an interest in this topic and would like to know more about it.
The Center for Institutional Studies is one of HSE’s research centers. CInSt focuses on fundamental and applied interdisciplinary researches in the field of institutional analysis, economics and sociology of science and higher education. Researchers are working in the center strictly adhere to the world's top academic standards.

The Center for Institutional Studies is integrated into international higher education research networks. The center cooperates with foreign experts through joint comparative projects that cover the problems of higher education development and education policy. As part of our long-term cooperation with the Boston College Center for International Higher Education, CInSt has taken up the publication of the Russian version of the “International Higher Education” newsletter.
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Retain or Let Go? Efficient Inbreeding Practices at a Leading Russian University

Marianna Chistyakova

Head: Strategic Development Department, ITMO University, Russia
chistyakova@corp.ifmo.ru

The issue of academic inbreeding is especially relevant in the context of globalizing education and intensified participation of Russian universities in the highly competitive global academic market. Is academic inbreeding nothing but a vice for universities, whose development is only viewed to be possible in the framework of openness and active impregnation with external experience and competences? Or can inbreeding have a positive, stabilizing effect by helping universities maintain necessary balance? Should alumni be ‘let go’ or actively invited to stay? What aspects of inbreeding are efficient and reasonable? Answers to these questions can be found in the inbreeding strategy of Saint Petersburg-based ITMO University, one of Russia’s leading research universities.

ITMO University joined the Russian Academic Excellence Project 5-100 aimed at enhancing the competitiveness of Russian universities in 2013. The implementation of the strategy for enhancing the university’s competitiveness depends on people, on the team that has undergone profound transformations over the past 5 years and comprises of researchers, teaching staff, administrators, students and alumni.

Academic inbreeding is very wide-spread and remains the key recruitment channel for many Russian universities. Up until the mid-2000s, ITMO University actively used inbreeding strategy and had a large share of its own graduates among its researchers, teaching staff and especially among senior leadership. Orientation towards the global market required changes in the university’s recruitment policy. Gradual ‘dilution’ of existing inbred staff and recruitment of external candidates for open vacancies began first within the administration, then researchers and, finally, teaching staff.

Currently over 65% of the university’s senior leadership (rector, vice-rectors, heads of Schools) and nearly 50% of all mid-tier executives (heads of departments and units) are non-inbreeds. The share of ITMO University alumni among its faculty declined from nearly 50% in 2003 to 40% in 2018.

Nevertheless, despite the fact that the university has chosen for a strategy of openness and active recruitment from the global market, it does not replace the ‘deliberate inbreeding’ strategy. ITMO University 2018–2027 Development Strategy clearly states that balance is one of the drivers for institutional development. Inbreeding remains one of the consciously chosen approaches that ensure balance between staff renewal and retention of talented graduates, between innovations and preserving institutional culture and traditions. ITMO University managed to find the balance by combining two approaches:

1. Retention of the most talented and motivated alumni that can do complicated research, train new generations of professionals and become leaders of labs and administrative units;
2. Attraction of ‘silver-corded’ alumni, who have already gained educational or professional experience at other prominent academic institutions or in business.

Both approaches are clearly beneficial for ITMO University. The former helps retain the brightest students, who are already part of the university’s schools of thought, who share institutional values and traditions and who have acquired the competences and technologies that meet the university’s high quality standards. The latter approach helps bring back loyal alumni who have broadened their competences on the global market, received PhDs from foreign universities and gained work experience in multicultural and multilingual teams.

At the same time, neither of the approaches is risk-free. For example, the first approach is associated with the risk of hiring relatively isolated young specialists who are not engaged in global practices and lack educational or work experience at leading international universities or research centers. On the other hand, retaining the best graduates is problematic in itself because the university as an employer has to compete with the best Russian and international companies, and graduates often choose in favor of the latter.

Acknowledging all the risks and complications, ITMO University has decided to launch new mechanisms aimed at ensuring sustainable recruitment and employee development. For example, the problem of recent graduates’ ‘disconnectedness’ and lack of external experience is solved through the system of student mobility. ITMO University Academic Council decided that as of 2017 academic mobility would become an integral part of all graduate and post-graduate programs. In 2013, only 2% of all students participated in mobility programs; their share has already reached 10% and is expected to reach 15% by 2020. These are highly motivated master’s and PhD students who later become highly competitive and loyal to the university, so the university is especially interested in hiring them.

The university uses some special tools aimed at the attraction and retention of its best alumni. First of all, there are financial incentives for recent graduates. They are offered to top programmers. [1] Such graduates stay at ITMO University despite the fact that there is high demand for them on the global labor market and despite offers from leading global companies. This is possible due to the Retaining the Best initiative at the Information Technologies and Programming Faculty. IT companies that employ ITMO University graduates provide additional financial support for
those young teachers and researchers who decide to stay and train new generations of professionals. One of the advantages is the development of a unique educational environment in the sphere of computer science due to the retention of young leaders of the IT industry. This is why ITMO University team, including some of the youngest faculty members, became recipient of the Russian Federation Government Award For Education in 2016.

Secondly, ITMO University launched new support tools for young specialists participating in international research labs as part of Project 5-100 (they include tenders for graduates who want to start new labs, participation of recent graduates in the management of existing labs, their active participation in research projects, academic mobility, etc.). Substantial rejuvenation of the management of the university's international labs was to a large degree possible thanks to the retention of its talented young alumni. In 2018, 24% of all international labs are led by people under 40, and nearly 70% of them are inbreeds.

Thirdly, tools aimed at supporting individual and group mobility for faculty were launched in 2014, thus allowing the university's newly employed recent graduates gain experience at leading academic partner organizations.

On the whole, despite the negative sides of inbreeding, ITMO University's strategy of partial self-propagation is reasonable. This is a research university with a focus on training and lab management. Some departments' growth strategies are based on self-reproduction; this is particularly true for fundamental sciences. Such strategies are reasonable and chosen quite consciously but they always include an academic mobility component for inbred staff (participation in conferences, international consortia, internships, etc.).

The university's second inbreeding-based strategy is aimed at hiring 'silver-corded' staff, i.e., alumni who have gained educational or professional experience at leading academic partner organizations.

Inbreeding as Tradition and Compulsion

On the whole, despite the negative sides of inbreeding, ITMO University's strategy of partial self-propagation is reasonable. This is a research university with a focus on training and lab management. Some departments' growth strategies are based on self-reproduction; this is particularly true for fundamental sciences. Such strategies are reasonable and chosen quite consciously but they always include an academic mobility component for inbred staff (participation in conferences, international consortia, internships, etc.).

The university's second inbreeding-based strategy is aimed at hiring 'silver-corded' staff, i.e., alumni who have gained educational or professional experience at leading academic partner organizations. This strategy is currently implemented in a non-systemic way based on personal connections and implies individual employment offers for alumni who can help solve some specific tasks (primarily in terms of research). At the same time, the university is also developing a more systemic approach to alumni relations by expanding its recruitment tools and improving mechanisms used in human resources management. Two instruments that have already proven themselves are especially useful for attracting alumni: tenders for new research labs (first launched in 2013) and ITMO Fellowship & Professorship Program (an international recruitment program launched in 2014). The strategy of recruiting 'silver-corded' faculty will also expand to include special programs for foreign PhD holders. Russian nationals holding doctorate degrees from foreign university already constitute 15% of all ITMO University faculty, and this group will only continue to grow.

Alumni always remain a strategic kind of resource for universities at all stages of their development. Each university decides for itself whether to retain them or to let them go, depending on its mission, vision and goals. For ITMO University the answer is clear. It wants to retain its graduates while ensuring their comprehensive professional development both during their studies and afterwards, when they join the university as young members of staff. It is also ready to let them go but later invite them back, once they have gained educational or work experience in other contexts, other cultures, other academic teams. This is what ITMO University strategy for balance and sustainable development is based on.

Notes

[1] ITMO University is the only university to have won the ACM International Collegiate Programming Contest 7 times; it trains top international programmers, who often win international programming competitions (Google Code Jam, Facebook Hacker Cup, Yandex.Algorithm, etc.).
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TSU History in a Nutshell: Inbreeding as Tradition and Compulsion

Initially, Tomsk University (originally founded in 1878 as the Siberian Imperial University) recruited faculty among the alumni of universities located in the European part of the Russian Empire: in Saint Petersburg, Kazan, Kharkov
that this particular territory is key to the planet’s future. By the fact that many academic evacuees from Kazan, Perm and other cities arrived in Tomsk and settled there. Inbreeding gained further ground during the Soviet period since it was normal for university organization and culture during that time. [2] The post-soviet era and the difficult 1990s led to a major brain drain. Those who stayed in the academia continued to hire their own graduates because this was quick and convenient and served as a means of showing support in difficult life circumstances. A major external factor that played a big role during that period was the lack of adequate funding. [7] Tomsk State University is still affected by external factors that contribute to inbreeding. For example, its geographic location in Siberia, its remoteness from the European part of the country, which is the most well-developed, and the climate are not very attractive for scholars from other regions. Another important factor is the fact that TSU remains one of the most prestigious HEIs in Siberia, and the level of inbreeding is always higher at prestigious universities [6]: TSU’s dominating position within the system actually makes it the main provider of professional staff it is interested in hiring.

**TSU Nowadays: Waves of Renewal**

On the whole, TSU graduates still dominate among its staff but there have been some ‘waves of renewal,’ which are becoming more and more visible. The first such wave came with the idea of engaging external scholars in TSU research projects. These can be scholars from other parts of Russia, from neighboring countries or even from beyond the former Soviet Union. Such scholars are usually hired under short-term contracts (usually for 1-3 years), so they rarely relocate and most of the work is done remotely. Such contracts are very common and help mitigate inbreeding despite the university’s remote location. Sometimes it is even beneficial: Siberia’s unique nature is especially attractive for geologists, climate researchers and anthropologists. For example, professor Terry Callaghan (2007 Nobel Peace Prize winner, recipient of TSU Honorary Doctorate Degree, distinguished research professor of the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, coordinator of the INTERACT Network of Arctic Terrestrial Research Stations) does climate research in Siberia since he believes that this particular territory is key to the planet’s future well-being and that studying Siberia will help better understand global processes happening all over the world. The fact that TSU joined Project 5-100 in 2014 boosted diversification and interest in recruiting highly-skilled foreign researchers (including postdocs). These usually are young scholars who want to build their career in the fields represented at TSU. After the university joined the national excellence program, it developed a centralized approach to postdoc recruitment, which immediately had a positive impact on the university’s academic performance (this is often the case when reducing inbreeding [2]). We can say that participation in Project 5-100 played a major role in TSU institutional transformation and helped it become more open; it led to a mass influx of highly professional international researchers after TSU staff started attending regular meetings for Project 5-100 participants and sharing experience with each other. The creation of TSU International Academic Council became another trigger within this process as it is aimed at making the university more open as part of its institutional strategy.

Another channel of renewal is the recent replacement and rejuvenation of university leadership (some deans, head of departments). New leaders tend to reconsider the status quo and suggest new strategies for development, which often require recruitment of new, external people with new competences. The fourth means of renewal is rather stable: it involves native-speaker foreign language teachers. In this respect, TSU leaders are the department of linguistics, the department of foreign languages and the recently founded Confucius Institute.

Finally, renewal also comes with the creation of new units, new departments and chairs. For example, when the department of psychology was founded in 1996 by professor V. Kabrin, it caused an influx of faculty from Moscow, Saint Petersburg and other Russian cities. In 2016, several departments were merged to create the new Institute of Economics and Management, and the Institute of Applied Mathematics and Computer Science was created in 2017 in a similar way; both of them are actively hiring new people.

Another example is specialized departments created under the auspices of various enterprises and aimed at training staff for those enterprises. Such departments often employ practitioners from the corporate sector. Autonomous master’s programs, implemented by Strategic Academic Units, constitute another novelty largely made possible due to TSU participation in Project 5-100; they help attract staff from partner institutions. However, such ‘waves of renewal’ caused by the introduction of new structural units or study programs do not happen very often.

**Attitudes Towards Inbreeding at TSU**

Despite a generally positive attitude towards regular staff changes among various groups of TSU employees, many of them are rather enthusiastic about inbreeding, too. There are several reasons for that, several unique peculiarities of the university’s internal environment and culture.
**Tomsk: The Logic of Mobility vs the Logic of Settled Life**

Academic inbreeding in Tomsk and academic inbreeding in, let’s say, Moscow are two different phenomena in different contexts. Tomsk has always been a dead end in terms of transport and was never affected by major migration flows. Choosing Tomsk as a place to work in usually happens within the logic of settled life, it is a final choice. Newcomers often perceive Tomsk as a unique islet with a strong intellectual potential, which is attractive for academically oriented people, so it is even often called the Athens of Siberia. Tomsk’s main competitors for human resources actually are Moscow, Saint Petersburg and foreign countries rather than neighboring regions. On the whole, Tomsk Region enjoys a high net migration rate because many people choose to settle there. [1]

**Perennial Classics**

Tomsk State University asserts itself as a bastion of classic academic culture. The traditional Professor–Disciple academic relations are valued very highly, so nurturing one’s students with the idea of their further promoting one’s school of thought is encouraged in the academia and is actually called preserving a ‘pure line’ and not inbreeding. [2] So, naturally, keeping one’s employees as perceived as a way of preserving institutional memory and traditions. Traditions include a rather romanticized and, at the same time, austere attitude to the academic profession: according to one of TSU professors, ‘TSU is for dreamers.’

**Reasonable Conservatism and Innovation Limitations**

New people often bring new ideas, new projects and new perspectives on how the university should develop further. This is, of course, good but TSU honors its traditions even when implementing transformations [4]: there are some limits to the extent of systemic upgradeability, which TSU acknowledges and preserved. New ideas that might derail the foundation of university culture are carefully considered but perceived with self-consciousness: preserving one’s authentic identity is especially important in the ever changing world. Therefore, the question of balancing the idea of ‘pure line’ and the necessity for better academic mobility, which ensures breakthrough development, is particularly relevant for TSU nowadays. [3]
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**Inbreeding at a Young University**
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Most empirical studies on the effects of academic inbreeding focus on individual faculty’s productivity. They compare inbreds and non-inbreds in terms of who publishes more (who is cited better, who publishes in top journals more often, etc.). But the results are controversial: some studies show that there is negative correlation between academic productivity and working as an inbred, some prove that there is positive correlation, others find no relation whatsoever. So, it might seem as if there are no robust interconnections between inbreeding and productivity. But this is not true because in order to answer this question, one needs first to consider a more comprehensive point: is there a relation between high levels of inbreeding in a given academic system and the productivity of this very system on the whole? If so, it could explain the fact that there is no universal response about the role of inbreeding at individual level. Indeed, if inbreeding is a commonly accepted and encouraged norm in an academic system, one can expect to find positive correlation at individual level, too: the most talented alumni prefer to stay at their alma mater, they are prioritized in comparison with outsiders when distributing support and resources, they are better
incorporated in the system and, quite predictably, more productive. In such a system performance evaluations would show positive correlation between inbreeding and productivity at individual level but this does not mean that inbreeding is unequivocally good.

Russia is a country with traditionally high levels of inbreeding. It was so at pre-revolutionary imperial university at the end of the 19th—early 20th century, it was so during the Soviet times and it remains true for contemporary HEIs as well. To learn more about the reasons of inbreeding and its persistence at Russian universities, see Sivak and Yukevich (2015). [1]

To what extent is the choice of university recruitment policy (inbreeding-oriented or not) defined by external institutional limitations (for example, by the policy employed at most other universities) or by the university’s internal organizational characteristics? Of course, institutional environment is important. If inbreeding is wide-spread, a university that chooses the opposite approach may experience difficulties on the academic labor market: its academically-minded alumni that are ‘pushed out’ may have problems with finding employment at other HEIs. On the other hand, external recruitment turns out to be problematic, too: leaving one’s alma mater is perceived as a sign of disloyalty, failure or inability to integrate into the established system. Another important factor is the role and level of competition on the academic market within a certain discipline and the university’s competitive ability in this particular sphere. For example, if a university decides not to hire its own graduates in economics, would it then be able to attract graduates from other universities who are trained well enough?

The case of Higher School of Economics (HSE) is illustrative in this respect. Despite being relatively young (founded in 1992), HSE has already become a comprehensive research university. Its faculties were not established simultaneously. The faculty of economics was the first one, then came the faculties of sociology, management, and public administration — in other words, social sciences. Later came the faculties of mathematics and humanities (philosophy, history, philology, linguistics, etc.), engineering, and computer science. The faculty of physics is just over two years old.

In the early years, the academic core of the single faculty that existed at the time consisted of graduates of other universities; HSE simply did not have its own alumni yet, so there was no question what recruitment policy to choose. Those people were creating a university and a curriculum that had no equals in the country (at the beginning, it was professors from LSE, Erasmus University Rotterdam and Paris I Sorbonne who taught the most important courses). Many of the very first master’s degree recipients who were PhD graduates and thus ‘sending’ them to the external academic community spots young students inclined to teaching, engages them during their post-graduate studies and nowadays many academics from other universities — also from outside Moscow — compete for vacant posts. HSE has no preference for internal or for external candidates: the university gives preference to the most academically strong candidates, regardless of their background.

What do we mean by ‘academically strong’? Is it about teaching quality? Or internationally viable research? A major factor that defined the swing towards an open recruitment policy was the rethinking of university mission: HSE decided to move away from having a teaching mission only and to become a research university. A university that is interested in attracting top researchers inevitably shifts to the external labor market and open recruitment. At the same time, the selection of top teaching staff is to a large extent associated with internal procedures when the academic community spots young students inclined to teaching, engages them during their post-graduate studies and later offers them employment.

When it comes to post-graduate programs, inbreeding is a separate issue at this level. Indeed, recruitment of one’s PhD graduates by other HEIs is a key reputation indicator: the better the reputation of those HEIs, the higher the reputation and, therefore, quality of students choosing one’s post-graduate programs. In this sense, the most ‘efficient’ strategy for HSE would mean stopping with hiring its own PhD graduates and thus ‘sending’ them to the external academic market. Still, HSE continues to hire its own graduates because the national labor market in the sphere of economics is not well-developed. But the situation on the labor market varies across disciplines, so in some disciplines it is very realistic to assume that PhD degree holders from HSE build academic careers at other HEIs or research centers.

Is academic inbreeding an institutional phenomenon that goes beyond the limits, interests and philosophy of any given university? Yes, absolutely. Can a university embedded in an academic system with high levels of inbreeding still pursue an open recruitment policy and even influence the system to some extent? The case of Higher School of Economics shows that there can be a positive answer to this question.
Aspects of Inbreeding at Samara National Research University
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At Samara University the issue of academic inbreeding is primarily perceived as the question of preserving its academic culture. Founded in 1942 as Kuybyshev Aviation Institute and having survived a number of name changes and mergers, this higher education institution associates with the strong Soviet (and later Russian) tradition of engineering and technical education. Samara University has carefully preserved its practices, which have naturally become family traditions in the broadest sense of the word. This is what its identity was all about; this is what attracted students from all over the country. The situation was the same at Samara State University—the city’s ‘classical’ university, primarily focused on humanities and natural sciences. The two universities merged in 2015 to become Samara University.

Certainly, the fact that Samara University joined Project 5-100, the national academic excellence initiative, served as a catalyst for organizational changes, which were necessary to make the university competitive both nationally and globally. This, of course, had an impact on its personnel policy.

The traditional way of working with human resources essentially meant having smooth document workflow mechanisms: employment—personal records maintenance—termination of employment. But these functions alone could not be enough for one of the country’s leading universities. Therefore, personnel policy at Samara University became much broader in order to include such spheres as employee development, support for high-potential employees, employee performance evaluation and, of course, recruitment of new talents. So, when analyzing our current and prospective employees, our human resources department was confronted with the issue of academic inbreeding.

Discussions with colleagues at Samara University showed that there was no head of department who was not interested in hiring their own graduates (in case they were sufficiently knowledgeable and competent). Of course, each person has their own understanding of what ‘sufficient’ actually is but this does not change the general picture. The most common explanation is, ‘The university did not invest in these people for them to go elsewhere.’ In support of this view, many interlocutors used the ‘rental apartment’ metaphor: ‘How can we talk about any kind of traditions, about any kind of stability if we train “tenants”?’

It is also important to talk about a special group of graduates—about foreigners. The situation is changing, of course; it has changed substantially but not dramatically. On the whole, Samara University employees agree that there is a need for internationalization. They agree that having an internationally-oriented policy is largely beneficial for the university: it helps improve student learning, broaden the mental outlook and range of interests of the academic staff, brings teaching and research closer to the outside world. Still, the number of international graduates interested in employment at Samara University is relatively low. There is language barrier and contrasts in mentality; many employers believe that sometimes international graduates are less well-trained. Interestingly enough, Samara University human resources department is trying to recruit international talents from outside, too, disregarding the university’s own international graduates. This is understandable since employment at one of Russia’s leading research university sets high standards for researchers and for teaching staff, so recent graduates actually need to have several years of experience as assistants and/or in the real sector of economy.

Speaking of ‘academic inbreeding,’ it is also interesting that Samara University employees often hire their own relatives who happen to have graduated from this university, too. Most of the people I have discussed this practice with view it negatively. They acknowledge the fact that ‘family dynasties’ often help improve the university’s corporate culture and nevertheless, they prefer diversification and social mobility over clanism.

In this context it is particularly interesting to study the ‘success stories’ of the ‘minority’ employees—namely, of the university’s international graduates who have stayed. Presently only 5% of all full-time international faculty (over 80) are inbreeds. Many international faculty members have already become assimilated, started families and even become entrepreneurs. They face some employment barriers, all of which were already mentioned above. They also enjoy certain benefits, such as expedited employment mechanisms, broad diasporas and numerous international centers in Samara. Samara University graduates from Cameroon, Congo, Kazakhstan and Nigeria who are employed at the university agree that academic inbreeding is very important. Such kind of internationalization is in a way unique for Samara University and was only possible due to the university’s participation in Project 5-100. Still, the development of internationalization did not start
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simply because it was obligatory for Project 5-100 participants. Global processes of intercultural transfusion have a positive impact on the number of international faculty. So does the university’s welcoming environment, internationalization strategy and the existence of departments that work with alumni and with internationals.

On the whole, the attitude of Samara University staff, students and administration towards academic inbreeding hasn’t changed much since the HEI was founded. It has always been perceived positively, and the university is actually proud of the people who decide to stay there after graduation to build their academic careers.

---
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**Introduction**

Discussions of academic inbreeding risk boiling down to one of the two extremes: to seeing it solely as a ‘degeneration’ factor or, on the contrary, as the only way of preserving institutional traditions when everyone is talking about the ‘death of universities.’ The most common way to avoid such extremes and broad generalizations is the analysis of specific conditions in which this or that phenomenon develops and consolidates within the social context of a certain group.

Recruitment by universities of their own alumni as faculty is, of course, a global phenomenon. But it is regional particularities that define the nature and consequences of inbreeding for individual universities. The fact that the term ‘inbreeding’ is used to describe internal recruitment by universities actually invited a broader use of biological metaphors for describing the results of inbreeding for universities—namely, ‘inbreeding depression’ (degradation of bibliometric performance and growing opportunism among faculty against the backdrop of a decreasing ‘scope of research’), which causes some conceptual problems if one disregards the original negative connotation.

**Describing Career Strategies**

The 2015 book *Academic Inbreeding and Mobility in Higher Education* offers comparative analysis of ‘inbred’ university development strategies in 8 countries. [1] This research, which features a description of diverse national higher education systems (from Ukraine to Japan), helps advance one’s understanding of inbreeding. This book offers a zoom-in view of the Russian landscape of recruitment policies in higher education and the Russian tradition of internal recruitment, while the authors assume a rather managerial position because they mention undeveloped labor market and underfunding as the main causes of inbreeding.

A deeper and a more detailed approach to studying Russian academics’ career paths (evidenced from Saint Petersburg sociologists) is offered in *How They Become Professors: Academic Careers, Markets and Power in Five Countries*, in the chapter on Russian public universities. [2] Its authors cite some interviews, surveys and observations that help the reader (even the one that has no in-depth knowledge of the Russian education system) piece together the extremely complex network-based mechanics of decision-making by employers (members of university administration) and prospective employees (candidates for faculty positions). The authors show how the seemingly integral phenomenon of inbreeding (as perceived from the outside) is, in fact, subdivided into a number of sub-practices (for example, when faculty combine teaching positions at different HEIs at the same time), which involve various universities (depending on the amount and stability of social connections of the key facilitator) and other organizations.

**Ephemerality of Inbreeding in Russia**

When a recent post-graduate student completes their dissertation and is awarded PhD degree (thus having fulfilled formal requirements for academic job), this future researcher or professor joins the existing system that they have already got acquainted with over the course of their studies. The earlier they actively engage in this system and embrace the needs of the academic community (preferably during their undergraduate years already), the higher are the chances that they will avoid becoming a vagrant (precarization of the academic profession in Russia is more about low salaries rather than job scarcity though the latter problem is becoming more and more relevant, too). Such an approach can, to a large extent, be considered part of the Soviet legacy because in the Soviet times, there was a system of obligatory job placement, so academically-minded alumni would be sent to PhD programs upon completion of which they would eventually get an assistant professor or assistant researcher position (in faraway regions it was sometimes even required to stay at the university for an extended period of time after PhD defense). In other words, while foreign post-graduates perceive the completion of PhD degree as an eligibility criterion for entering the open international academic market, for Russian post-graduates’ dissertation defense is more of a rite of passage.

At this point there is again a risk of polarization: such a system can be equally called a noble corporation or a suspicious, corruptogenic structure. Ten years have passed since the publication of the most cited Russian-language article on academic inbreeding [3] but there is still no consensus on the role and consequences of this phenom-
enon in the Russian academia. In our opinion, the major challenge that prevents this issue from being discussed rationally is the fundamental dissimilarity between the environment where the term ‘inbreeding’ was invented and the context where it seems to be inapplicable. For example, the authors of "Global Universities Take Pride in Hiring Home-Grown Talent" do not hide their astonishment in the annotation already: “Academic inbreeding is not considered unusual or problematic in many countries.” [4] Indeed, for Western researchers this might be surprising but in the Russian context, one cannot really condemn something that is not perceived to be problematic. Ephemerality of inbreeding in Russia could be explained in the following way: academic inbreeding has for a long time been the status quo, so we should not blame all the problems with increasing Russian universities’ international competitive ability on academic inbreeding only. (Top universities participating in Project 5-100 claim they are leaving the idea of hiring ‘home-grown’ faculty behind but their success is largely based on other, more important factors, such as governmental support, additional funding, increased autonomy, etc.)

Another potential challenge in this situation (just like in other cases of importing foreign administrative practices) would be the risk of making inbreeding an issue of national education policy (let’s just remember the ‘performance-based contracts’ initiative of 2013–2015, which was met with hostility at most HEIs and ended up being imitated instead of real implementation). Even when used with reservation, the term ‘academic inbreeding’ remains a phenomenon that is applicable within the model of academic cameralism, which implies that universities function as corporations, with all that it entails.

The Case of Saint Petersburg Electrotechnical University

Originally founded as the country’s first electrotechnical college, in the last five years Saint Petersburg Electrotechnical University (popularly known as LETI) has adjusted its views on international promotion, organizational design and curriculum planning riding on the wave of broader higher education reforms in Russia. However, recruitment practices have largely remained the same: LETI alumni constitute an overwhelming majority of all its current faculty; moreover, all members of senior leadership completed their PhDs at LETI, too.

At LETI, each argument against inbreeding is rebutted: no single degree awarded at LETI has ever been revoked; there are zero ‘rubbish’ publications; LETI has never been mentioned in Dissernet (a volunteer community network working to clean Russian science of plagiarism), etc. However, there is another major discrepancy with the ‘in-breeding hypothesis.’ While there is no consensus among experts about whether inbreeding causes a decrease in publication and patent activities (some HEIs are not research-oriented at all), inbred universities are usually described as highly hierarchical and inhibiting innovations.

In this sense, LETI stands out due to the fact that leaders at all management levels are elected (from chairs of departments to rector), due to annual rotation of development program executives and a total rejection of any attempts to impose any limitations on the existing democratic procedures. Presumably, LETI is one of the few Russian universities where trade-unions still are meaningful actors of collective decision-making.

Participatory decision-making remains possible by virtue of several factors: a) LETI is development-minded (the number of teaching staff, researchers and students has changed much over the past few years); b) LETI stays small (it has avoided both mergers with larger Saint Petersburg-based universities and franchising—the two signs of massification in academia); c) in terms of internal social policy, LETI perceives its corporate culture as a ‘professorial’ culture. But here is the key thing: despite all changes in the sphere of higher education LETI faculty did not agree to delegate all managerial decisions to ‘pure administrators.’ That is why there have been no top-bottom attempts to introduce the principles of shared governance: share governance is already installed as an intrinsic feature of university life. It would not be an overstatement to say that LETI would suffer a lot from an attempt to combat inbreeding because this is a kind of habitus that takes long to develop.

Conclusion

A university is not an organization, it is not a wissenchaftlicher Fabrik (German for ‘knowledge factory’), it is not a think-thank aimed at solving real-life social problems but rather a theoretical object, an eidos in Aristotelian sense. And the nature of this eidos is a rather effable τέχνη (craft, art’), defined by Pierre Bourdieu as a kind of social magic: it is not through a mere fact of studying but through the experience of co-existence within the academic environment that a university confers a special social status and charisma upon an individual (which are not available at commercial training centers or business-schools, for example). In our opinion, hiring home-grown talents as faculty is a natural norm of recruitment policy for a university that functions in line with the principles of academic life and not in the logic of market competition.
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Academic inbreeding is the practice of universities hiring their own graduates. Inbreeding is very widespread in Russia. According to the ‘Monitoring of Educational Markets and Organizations’ (MEMO) survey (a representative sample of Russian universities faculty) conducted in 2016 among faculty who have Candidate of Sciences degree (the Russian equivalent of a PhD degree) and have three or more years of experience in academia, 45 percent studied at the university where they started their career and were working at the time of the survey. Hereby about a half of university faculty are academic inbreeds.

Inbreeding is usually associated with low mobility and is commonly regarded as a negative practice that leads to knowledge stagnation, prevents circulation of scientific ideas and low research productivity. However, existing literature on the consequences of academic inbreeding shows ambiguous results: some papers show that inbreeding positively influences research productivity measured by the quantity and quality of publications, while others demonstrate the opposite effect. This variety of results makes it impossible to transfer the findings from one academic system to another, and in Russia this problem has been under-explored.

Our study [1] focuses on the relationship between inbreeding and publication activity in the context of the Russian academic system. This study is the first multivariate study of academic inbreeding and publication activity in Russia based on a national sample. The empirical analysis was based on the data from the MEMO survey conducted in 2016. Due to our focus on inbreeding and publication productivity we included in our final sample only 708 respondents (out of the total sample of 1559). We excluded faculty from private universities, faculty from fields where publishing is not the substantial part of the academic job, and faculty who just might not have had time to become non-inbreeds (who did not have Candidate of Sciences degree or had less than three years of experience in academia).

In our sample we identified three groups of faculty: (1) inbreeds (who studied at the university where they were working at the time of the survey), (2) silver-corded (who studied at the university where they were working at the time of the survey but started their academic career elsewhere), (3) non-inbreeds (who did not study at the university where they were working at the time of the survey). Next, we compared these three groups by three types of articles published during the year prior to the survey: (1) the number of articles in Russian journals; (2) the number of articles in journals published by their universities and foreign journals published by their universities and foreign journals. The most likely explanation may be the lack of the academic inbreeding effect on the faculty’s publishing productivity in terms of the number of publications. It is often the case in academic systems, such as that of Russia, in which academic inbreeding practices are deeply embedded and considered natural.

There are several characteristics of the Russian academic system that may explain the lack of effect of academic inbreeding on faculty’s publishing and perhaps productivity. First of all, historically, high inbreeding and low mobility rates are deeply embedded in the institutional environment and are considered as the norm. The situation was inherited from the Soviet period when it was considered very prestigious for graduates to be hired by their own universities instead of being redirected to other organizations. Second, the Russian academic system is characterized by a rather closed academic labor market and relatively low academic salaries which prevent young academics from moving to other regions where there are more universities, and thus more possibilities for hiring, as their earnings are too low for renting accommodation in other regions. The third reason is unimportance of publishing productivity as...
a ‘signal’ of the faculty’s success. A large proportion of universities in Russia are teaching-oriented and hire faculty mostly for teaching and not for research. Therefore, many faculty do not publish articles at all, regardless of whether they are inbreeds or non-inbreeds.

The results of our analysis show that the consequences of inbreeding in Russia are not so detrimental, at least in terms of its impact on the publication productivity of academics, as is usually thought when taking into account the widespread nature of the practice. As far as we do not see empirical evidence of its harm in Russia, we may suppose that, in the current circumstances, there is no way to implement a total ban on inbreeding, nor any sense in doing so. However, it is important to note that this conclusion is relevant to the quantitative measure of publication activity. Today little is known about the effect of inbreeding on the qualitative characteristics of publication productivity and their impact. Although there is no difference between inbreeds and non-inbreeds in the number of publications, there may be differences in the quality of publications. These differences may be due to the fact that inbreeds and non-inbreeds may share different professional norms and standards which were acquired during the process of their academic and professional socialization. More detailed research on the research productivity of faculty in Russia is needed, especially with the use of indicators of the quality and impact of publications.
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**Introduction**

It is often the case that something designed for a specific purpose proves to have a lot more benefits and beneficiaries than initially intended. This article presents such a case: the Global Teaching Fellowship Program set up by a university for the benefit of its graduate students, which has become a tool for hiring new international faculty, preventing academic inbreeding at a number of its partner universities.

Central European University (CEU) is a young graduate school based in Budapest (Hungary) with a reputation for attracting stellar students and faculty from all over the world. With double accreditation in the US and Hungary, it awards Master’s and PhD degrees in the Humanities, Social Sciences, Law, Management, and Public Policy. It has the best English library of its fields in Central Europe and its new building has been nominated for one of the most prestigious architecture prizes in the world. It is a place cherished by those it nourishes, where free thinking and free speech flourish and become refined. However, the university has its shortcomings: CEU can offer only limited teaching opportunities to PhD students, which are mostly teaching assistantships in the CEU master’s programs and mentorship/teaching for the various CEU non-degree programs. In 2015 the CEU Global Teaching Fellowship Program (GTFP) was primarily created to help CEU doctoral candidates gain teaching experience. Already after three years additional advantages of the program became clear for both fellows and host institutions.

**The CEU Global Teaching Fellowship Program (GTFP)**

GTFP gives advanced doctoral candidates and recent graduates the option to teach at partner universities for one semester or one academic year. In 2015, when it was launched, the program placed 8 fellows in teaching positions at universities in Europe and Central Asia. Since then, over 80 PhDs have taught at universities in Bangladesh, Brazil, Germany, Hungary, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Lithuania, Myanmar, Poland, Romania, Russia and East Jerusalem. The CEU fellows teach courses required by the host department or proposed by themselves. The most likely partners for GTFP are universities which teach in English but are based in non-English speaking countries, and universities teaching in the national language seeking to increase the number of courses taught in English or to open whole English-taught programs.

Although the teaching fellowship can be awarded only once, some fellows have been teaching in the same departments for the last 2-3 years. How was this possible? The answer is simple: the host universities hired them. This is one of the fortunate, albeit not exactly foreseen consequence of setting up the CEU Global Teaching Fellowship Program. Fall 2018 started with 22 new fellows and 8 old ones continuing teaching as hired faculty.
Beyond addressing the particular problem it was created for—to compensate for the limited teaching experience available at CEU—it became obvious, in retrospect, that GTFP has also other benefits. One is that it increases the employability of PhDs in the humanities and social sciences. Another is the positive impact it has on the host institutions: it helps them advance their internationalization agenda, and it offers a low risk solution for hiring international faculty.

**How GTFP supports the internationalization efforts of partner universities**

There are many arguments that universities where the practice of hiring their own PhD graduates is widespread—phenomenon known as academic inbreeding—cultivate unhealthy environments. They are characterized by immobility, which has damaging consequences for both the quality of teaching and the research output and hinders the internationalization efforts of those universities. The CEU Global Teaching Fellowship Program proves to offer a way out of these difficulties.

For many universities GTFP is a cost-effective way of testing their long-term needs and resources for establishing courses and programs in English. Through hosting GT fellows, the host institution can assess the way students react to having certain subjects taught in English, the impact on the number of their international students, and, more generally, the way it advances the university's internationalization agenda. Accepting a GT fellow is an excellent tool for self-evaluating and assessing the needs, strengths, and challenges in preparation for opening courses or a full study program in English.

**For universities seeking new faculty, GTFP simplifies and shortens the hiring process**

Hiring new faculty can be a lengthy and costly process. For every junior academic position opened to international applicants, hundreds of applications are received, the evaluation of which takes significant time. Afterwards, the successful applicant is invited for a campus visit, which requires time and financial resources. If the candidate declines the offer, the process starts again; another candidate is chosen from the short list and taken through the same steps.

In contrast with standard recruitment procedures, the GTFP saves time and resources for the host institution, as the application process is supervised by the team running the program at CEU. All candidates are internally pre-screened before the applications are channeled to the partner and the result is a smaller number of high-quality candidates. As this is ultimately a fellowship awarded by CEU, providing full information about the host institution / city / country, living conditions, etc. is the responsibility of the team running the program, therefore no prior campus visits are needed. The host institution still provides support regarding work permit and visa application, but most of the additional hassle is nonexistent.

The quality of teaching is ensured by the CEU Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL), which plays an essential part in CEU's commitment to excellence in teaching. From the start of their doctoral studies, CEU PhD students are offered an integrated program for excellence in teaching in higher education. To those appointed GT Fellows, CTL continues to offer one-on-one mentorship tailored to the particularities of the host institution and the higher education system in which it is embedded.

The contracts signed between fellows and CEU, as well as the agreement between the host institution and CEU, have specific clauses on how to deal with misconduct, breach of trust, or other legal problems that may come up. CEU acts as mediator and thus ensures that both the fellows and the host institutions feel safe and confident in their direct relationship. And so, after the fellowship is over, the host university can hire the fellows in good conscience. The Global Teaching Fellowship is thus an almost free-risk trial for long term faculty hiring.

Last, but most importantly, GTFP is a means for changing local academic cultures and mentalities. Local faculty and administrators who become used to having GT Fellows as colleagues are less prone to see academic inbreeding as a normal feature of their environment and are more willing to change the hiring practices.
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Post-doctoral Fellowships

The Higher School of Economics Center for Institutional Studies (cinst.hse.ru/en/) in Moscow, Russia, invites applications for postdoctoral research positions in the field of higher education studies.

The job involves:

- pursuing own research in parallel with working on CInSt’s research projects in one of the three broad areas:
  - Higher Education Studies: faculty salaries, contracts and career concerns; academic inbreeding and mobility; faculty productivity, teaching and research in Russian universities; university rankings; university governance
  - Economics and Sociology of Education: peer effects transmission in online and offline social networks; peer effect structure in different educational systems; social network analysis methods and techniques; determinants of student achievement
  - Scientometrics and Research Policy: scientometrics, including bibliometrics and altmetrics; research evaluation; performance-based research funding systems and their impact on scholarly communication; peer effects in different academic systems; mobility of researchers
- writing research papers for international peer-reviewed journals;
- participation in organization of the events and other contribution to the Center’s development;
- giving public presentations of candidate’s own research to the researchers in the field and the broader academic community.

Some teaching is encouraged, though not required.

The Center offers access to its databases and analytical software, as well as Russian CAP data, Russian Monitoring of education markets and organizations data, Web of Science, Scopus, InCites, SciVal; databases which contain information about student academic achievements, socioeconomic characteristics, behavior, and data about dynamics online and offline social networks.

Requirements:

- a PhD from an international research university in relevant research fields;
- a strong theoretical and empirical background economics, sociology or education;
- ability to work in a team;
- fluent English.

Relevant experience is an asset although not required.

General conditions for Post-Doctoral Research positions can be found at iri.hse.ru/faq_pd. Contracts are normally made for one year. To apply, submit your CV, research statement via an online application form, and two letters of recommendation – to fellowship@hse.ru before February 15, 2019.
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