



International Conference on Research Paradigms Transformation in Social Sciences 2014

Philosophy of Education as a Social Development Factor: World Trends and Prospects for Russia

Ardashkin I.B. *

National Research Tomsk Polytechnic University, Tomsk, Russia

Abstract

The author analyzes the correlation between the development of society and philosophy of education. The goal of this article is to demonstrate that social development is more clearly shaped when the process of education is given an appropriate philosophy, which means the presence of a sense-making and goal-setting strategy (paradigm, “religion”) of the evolution of society. The example of a number of the world's leading countries confirms the value of such correlation. Even when in a crisis, these countries adapt to the modern world's dynamics (globalization, informatization, etc.) with higher speed if they possess an adequate education philosophy. These leading countries' philosophy of education is underlain by the thesis: the quality of education defines the quality of life. This outcome can be achieved by drawing on such values as freedom, creativity, partnership, and trust. World university rankings show that the most successful universities aim at achieving this outcome and rely on these basic values regardless of all the modern transformations. The author comes to the conclusion that Russia, represented by its leaders and its government, should, given its desire to join the ranks of the world's leading countries, should instate substantial indicators of quality of life for its citizens, as well as strive to generate an education philosophy of similar nature and actively introduce it in the process of education in the first place.

© 2015 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>).

Peer-review under responsibility of Tomsk Polytechnic University.

Keywords: philosophy of education, social development strategy, globalization, quality of education, quality of life, freedom, creativity, partnership, trust.

1. Introduction

Hardly anyone will deny that today Russian society is in the state of transition. It has successfully renounced the Soviet (communist) organization, but is still searching for its own new Russian incorporation. The fact that this search is yet to succeed demonstrates the constant restructuring of the society's various spheres (political, military, pensions, public utilities, etc., including education). It is natural that constant changes do not facilitate stability (which the Russian authorities claim to be the result already achieved), which adds to certain difficulties in economic development and the recent problems in foreign policy. All of these are the factors that make one think one more time about the direction of our social development.

* Ardashkin I.B. Tel.: 8-913-877-56-79
E-mail address: ibardashkin@tpu.ru

2. Scope and methods of research

According to the author, education is a core system of any society (the Russian one being no exception) and a conduit for all social intentions. Education cannot exist apart from the society, which makes this system reflect all the society's problems. Moreover, education often preserves these problems as it prepares the society's prospective members for their future lives in the framework of certain conditions, while supposing that they will act in under other conditions that are yet unknown. But this may leave the learners unprepared for the new circumstances, as they have not been trained for these (they have not been known). The stability pronounced today is very much alike the case of problem preservation, where education plays one of the main stabilizing roles.

At the same time, the world is developing dynamically and the processes of globalization are very active: in this situation the absence of timely response (no response to a challenge) makes our society a more and more backward formation. There is no saying that Russian society does not react to these challenges. A lot is being said about the need for a breakthrough and the priority of innovative development, but there is no sight of practical implementation of these appeals. To be more accurate, there are projects and efforts initiated by the president and other executive authority that are well-supported, but they lack what can be called a philosophy, a conceptual aspect. More importantly, these efforts come "from above" and do not provoke the necessary reaction from the population. On the one hand it understands the necessity of change, on the other it absolutely distrusts the government as a whole, which in practice leads to mere mimicking of actual changes.

Addressing the issue of transforming the philosophy of education in Russia as a social development factor presents an attempt to analyze the sources of the current situation, and identify the foremost steps towards solving it with due account for world trends in social development in general and education in particular.

In order to prove the specified thesis the author plans to use the method of explication that will allow to clarify a number of key concepts and processes that take place in the system of education in the context of formation of an information society. The method of comparative analysis will be employed to demonstrate the peculiarities of philosophy of education as a social development factor in Russia and abroad. Furthermore, the author will resort to the potential of etymological analysis to identify additional conceptual meanings of the notions already known to us.

3. Findings.

First, a few words about the notion of philosophy of education. Works of Russian researchers display a developed tradition of defining what the philosophy of education is. First of all, as a separate philosophical discipline, and also as a special area of knowledge that includes theory of education, pedagogy, and psychology of education. A large number of approaches have been identified that both deny the status of education philosophy as a separate discipline, and assert the opposite (Gershunskii, B.S. (1998)). This paper puts emphasis on understanding of philosophy of education not as a specific discipline, but as a certain trend, which represents general understanding and strategy of the expected learning outcome related both to the future of every individual member of the society, and the society in general. The author's interpretation of philosophy of education is close to T. Kuhn's concept of paradigm (from Greek παράδειγμα – example, model, pattern) and is concerned with identifying the main attitudes, perceptions, and values that we may not yet reflect well, but have already shaped their image. Such understanding of philosophy of education correlates well with the explanation offered in the final report of the international symposium in Prague (1990) "Philosophy of Education for the Twenty-first Century", where it was defined as determination of "the image of the world and the place of the human in it" (Philosophy of Education for the Twenty-first Century, 1992). I.e. philosophy of education is a sense-making and goal-setting landmark.

It is important to state that at this moment our society lacks any clear philosophy of education. It cannot be said that it does not exist at all, it is present and is rather varied (here are some of such philosophemes: make a person successful; train competitive specialists; develop fundamental and applied branches of science in tight connection with the process of education, etc.). But the connection of education philosophy with the development of society and the aspiration to shape the general principles and values of interaction that would be clear to everybody (or to the majority) is clearly absent.

It should be specified that the issue of philosophy of education (its paradigm) is also highly topical in the rest of the world today (Nalivaiko N.V., 2012). Formation of the modern society drastically changes the role of education

and knowledge. Thus, its various characterizations that demonstrate the whole array of its colors are not surprising: information society, knowledge society, network society, post-industrial society, electronic society, consumer society, risk society, etc.. Such variety was not known to traditional and industrial societies, as it wasn't to the systems of education of these types of social constructs. They featured, with a varied degree of intensity, a kind of order, according to which it was approximately clear "which specialization or profession required which amount of knowledge. At the same time it was completely acceptable that having an education (at least secondary or higher) is not a required prerequisite. Life "was not over" without an education, which made it an important, but not an essential component of society's life" (Ardashkin, I.B. 2013). In today's world, knowledge (which also means education) plays a different role, a defining one. "Knowledge becomes a structural unit, a "pattern" of human creative efforts. For a person, to have knowledge is not so much to know how to cognitively image the world, but rather to create new images, new structural dimensions of its demonstration" (Ardashkin, I.B. 2013). But the modern system of education yet fails to handle the world's new trends. This, among the rest, is an indication of imperfection of the existing education philosophy model. As Z. Bauman aptly remarked, "the current crisis in education is, first of all, a crisis of inherited institutions and philosophy" (Bauman Z. 2001).

The essence of the world's education system crisis lies in that it has not yet readjusted itself (there is no clear vision of how to do it yet) with regard to the highly dynamic development that the world society is currently in. People face a large number of problems because they cannot timely adapt to the changes that are happening, since the system of education does not prepare them for it. As A. Toffler writes: "What passes for education today, even in our "best" schools and colleges, is a hopeless anachronism. Parents look to education to fit their children for life in the future. Teachers warn that lack of an education will cripple a child's chances in the world of tomorrow. Government ministries, churches, the mass media – all exhort young people to stay in school, insisting that now, as never before, one's future is almost wholly dependent upon education.

Yet for all this rhetoric about the future, our schools face backward toward a dying system, rather than forward to the emerging new society" (Toffler A., 2002).

This often leads to many traditionally organized education institutions losing the competition to the ones that a priori could not compete with them by definition. In particular, Z. Bauman notes that "under such circumstances, the ad hoc, short-term professional training administered by employers and oriented directly to prospective jobs, or flexible courses and (quickly updated) teach-yourself kits offered through the market by the extra-university media become more attractive (and, indeed, more reasonable a choice) than a fully-fledged university education which is no longer capable of promising, let alone guaranteeing, a lifelong career" (Bauman Z. 2001).

Modern world's dynamism, constant movement, and development become the main feature of the society's life. Nothing is stable in its various areas, everything changes. A person is in the state of being unrooted, unaware of the situation, not able to determine it for oneself once and forever. This is why it happens so that it is practically impossible in one's life to find something certain that would allow a person to find stability for the rest of life. This forces a person (and in future this force will become even more intensive) to constantly retrain, change jobs, change one's place of residence, change interests, etc. Even such seemingly crucial social institution as family will, according to the futurologists, stop playing a significant role in the society. The human itself can be altered with the development of biomedical technologies: one's birth, life, need for communication, values, etc.

All familiar boundaries (standards) that used to allow a person to take bearings in the world are being erased. Today and in future social boundaries will stop being clear landmarks, as everything is getting mixed up. People depend on each other less and less. A. Toffler and H. Toffler write: "Academic boundaries are eroding, too. Against enormous resistance, more and more work on the campus is becoming transdisciplinary. In pop music, borderlines between grime, garage, rock, Eastern, hip-hop, techno, retro, disco, big band, Tejano and a variety of other genres disappear in "fusion" and "hybridization". Consumers turn into producers by remixing or "sampling" sounds from different bands, different instruments and different vocals into "mash-ups" – the musical equivalent of collages... Even sexual boundaries are no longer fixed, as homosexuality and bisexuality blast out of the closet and the small population of transsexuals grows" (Toffler A., Toffler H., 2012).

Such background makes the system of education look like some island of stability. Children go to school, in school they are, as a rule, in the same classroom (or building), divided into separate classes, and everything is rather strictly regulated. In universities the system of education is undergoing substantial changes (academic mobility,

flexible learning pathways, elective courses, etc.), but most of the education is still connected to one location, one team of teachers, etc.. Its flexibility and dynamism are still falling behind the pace of life.

This way, a person does not receive the training that would allow him to better adapt to the dynamically changing world. The system of education does not prepare for being unrooted. Hence come the metamorphoses that Z. Bauman wrote about, when a system of short-term professional training courses becomes more demanded than a complete university education (Bauman Z., 2001). Such courses can swiftly and efficiently provide a person with the competencies necessary at the moment, while university training inherently cannot adjust so quickly and flexibly.

However, it can be stated that even in serious crises the leading economically developed countries (notably the Western ones) do possess a philosophy of education. And it substantially simplifies their search for optimal solutions in education.

This named philosophy of education is simple and clear: the quality of education defines the quality of life. Important is that it is not just a philosopheme, but an operational system (a sort of religion). This is why by receiving a high-quality education, a person thus ensures the high quality of one's life. Hence is the careful attention to the quality of education in the context of globalization. The Bologna Process itself is a movement for preserving the education quality standards in the conditions of globalization.

The world, after getting a stronger sense of its own interdependence, felt the need for correlating different educational systems between each other and forming a common system of criteria for assessing their qualities. Such integration started to be implemented through the Bologna Process. This led to the need to intensify the processes of mobility, openness, tolerance, and comparison. So it is not coincidental that “the European Commission (K. Gauch) identifies five main directions that it would like to promote: mobility, acquisition of comparable statistical data, its analysis and publication; extending the accessibility of higher education; advancement of transparency tools; global measurement of the Bologna Process” (Major trends in higher education: global and Bologna measurement, 2010).

Another line in the campaign for the quality of education and preserving its high level is the emergence of world university rankings. They specifically act as education quality assessment tools. Especially interesting and essential are the criteria for developing these rankings. These criteria display the connection between the quality of life and the quality of education.

In order to analyze the world university rankings' academic criteria it makes sense to address the three most renowned of them: 1) Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU), active since 2003; 2) QS World University Rankings (QS), active since 2000; 3) Times Higher Education World University Ranking — Thomson Reuters (THE) active since 2010. These rankings evaluate the quality of training in different universities according to the results of their activity and rank these universities depending on the values of their achievements.

The reliable indicator of that these rankings provide a more or less plausible assessment of the quality of university education is the fact that the leading positions are occupied by the same institutions. For example, Harvard University takes the first place in ARWU (the Shanghai rankings) ratings for 2013, while taking the second one in those of QS and the Times for the same period. The first forty-fifty universities in all of the mentioned rankings are generally the same (with some insignificant inconsistencies of their ranks). This vouches for the high quality of the education in the universities that hold their positions in the top fifty, while the difference of their positions in different rankings only indicates the nuances of their criteria.

The most significant values of these criteria are quite close (related). In a certain sense this asserts the author's idea of the importance of the philosophy of education (as a paradigm or religion) as a leading factor of social development, which sounds for the leading countries as “the quality of education determines the quality of life”. The most substantial values of these rankings' criteria scale are related to the factor of reputation. In the Times rating the total value of reputation is 34,5% (15% is comprised of a university's academic reputation including its research activity and the quality of education; the 19,5% being the scientific reputation in certain areas of research).

In the QS ranking the academic reputation makes up for 50%. The ARWU ranking does not have a clear criterion like this, but has the indirect ones (scientific publications, teaching staff expertise, quality of education) that comprise the total of 60% of rating values.

If similar values are included in the reputation structure of the two other rankings, reputation values will also increase to 70% in the QS ranking and to 67% in the Times ranking. All the other indicators are significant, but are

second in quantitative assessment values (Academic Ranking of World Universities, 2014; Quacquarelli Symonds World University Ranking, 2014; Times Higher Education, 2014).

Reputation (academic, scientific, other) acts as an indicator of the compliance of the world's leading universities' activities to the high quality of training, which, in turn, becomes a guarantee of the high quality of life. The priority of reputation reflects that measuring the quality of education was chosen for a reason. Reputation is a complex notion that supposes the presence of a high-quality product and services, while also including consumer feedback that involves renown, good name, responsibility, and trust in the provider of a product or a service. Reputation is not formed at once, it represents reliability that has been tested for a long period of time. In the author's opinion, it is for this reason that reputation has the most significant values in world rankings. Thus, by obtaining education in the world's leading universities, graduates receive the opportunity to find employment with the leading companies, hold key positions, receive a big salary, etc. (everything that signalizes a high quality of life), becoming a living example that confirms that these particular universities train the most qualified specialists.

Other parameters in the world rankings indirectly imply reputation. In particular, the Shanghai ranking (ARWU) 10% of a university's activity evaluation is formed by the number of the university's graduates who have been awarded the Nobel Prize, and 20% – by the number of its teachers who have earned the Nobel Prize or the Fields Medal (Academic Ranking of World Universities, 2014).

In the QS ranking the parameters that indicate reputation are the relation of the citation index of research papers written by the academic staff to the total number of the academic staff – 20%; the proportion of foreign teachers to the total number of the academic staff – 5%; the proportion of foreign students to the overall number of students – 5% (these are linked to the reputation that allows to pick and invite foreign teachers and students) (Quacquarelli Symonds World University Ranking, 2014).

The Times ranking (it is important to note that it has the most parameters for university assessment – 13, as compared to 6 in the other rankings) also has parameters that indirectly indicate reputation, although their values are smaller due to their total number. This way, the amount of funding of a university's research activities by third parties in relation to the total number of the academic staff – 5,5%, the proportion of the number of foreign academic staff to that of the local ones – 3%; the proportion of the number of foreign students to the number of local ones – 2%, etc.

The criterion of reputation demonstrates that leadership in education has many important aspects. It is impossible to achieve significant results by focusing only on some specific aspects of the activity. Even having substantial financial resources, it is impossible to achieve high values by trying to purchase the necessary products and resources, hire appropriately qualified staff, etc.. Reputation as a criterion means that a good name, reliability, and trust act as the most crucial sources of social capital than a big, but still one-time income. This exactly is the measurement with no direct and tangible carrier that comprises what this paper names the philosophy of education, when social development and the institution of education become living and interacting systems that react keenly to the changes that occur inside them (Times Higher Education, 2014).

In this context it is impossible to take no notice of how the university education reacts to the changes in social reality that were described above (globalization, dynamism, unrootedness, etc.) and viewed as a challenge to education. The reliability and fundamentality of the university education very poorly relate to the swiftness of the changes that take place in the world. But this is at the first glance. If one considers the system of education as a whole, it becomes clear that within its framework the universities are the quickest to react to change. Most specialists that deal with the issues of education state that a modern university is a research university, a place where scientific research and the process of education are integrated the most. Scientific research allows to quickly and reliably gain new knowledge, while the process of education gives the opportunity to instantly get it across to future specialists (a kind of “knowledge fresh off the research conveyor belt”). An additional crucial factor for modern-day universities is the practice of introducing their findings into production. This is what they call innovation today.

Innovativeness becomes an essential condition for the development of the universities, as they must rapidly react to the quick changes in society. This is another indication of the significant role of the philosophy of education as a factor that binds the development of society to that of the education system. Suh Nam-pyo, President of Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, to whose leadership the steady progress of this university in the QS rating is attributed (2008 – 95th place, 2011 – 90th place, 2012 – 63rd place, 2013 – 60th place), once wrote: “Social needs frequently stimulate innovation. Today creation of jobs, economic growth, and solving the immediate problems

related to energy, environment, water, and sustainability (EEWS) demand innovative solutions” (Nam P. Suh, 2010). This is why universities are trying to develop as research universities that build upon the unity of scientific research, educational process, social trust, and partnership.

When forming the demand for innovative development, society must also fully support the universities' efforts in this direction. Without sufficient support they will not be able to fully succeed in this direction, because they will fail to evaluate their findings in research and education. In 2009, on the VII Glion Colloquium (Switzerland), devoted to discussion of the future of the world's research universities, this idea was acknowledged as one of the main conclusion of the final summary “A Call to the Universities”: “The creative thinking behind such innovation will require the contributions and cooperation of every segment of society, including not only those in government, but also those in business, industry, the professions, public life, foundations, civic bodies, learned academies and NGOs. But, most of all, it will require the active participation of the universities, for it is in these institutions that the leaders of each new generation are nurtured; it is there that boundaries to our existing knowledge are explored and crossed; it is there that unfettered thinking can thrive and unconstrained intellectual partnerships can be created. It is there, within each new class, within each new generation, that the future is forged” (University Research for Innovation, 2010).

In fact, this is the idea that represents the philosophy of education that conforms to the world's best examples and acts as a landmark for education. But the most important is what lies in the foundation of such education philosophy that allows to observe the relation between the quality of education and the quality of life.

The following values can be distinguished on the basis of this philosophy of education (University Research for Innovation, 2010).

1. Social contract (universities still follow an unwritten social contract, generating new knowledge, training new leaders, informing the public, forming expert practices, etc. In exchange for that the society supports education, supports it, respects the opinion of university experts, and offers the greatest possible autonomy and academic freedoms).
2. Integration of discoveries and education (universities must demonstrate the implicitly existing link between discoveries and education and also train their students to be capable of independently integrating training and findings in their lives).
3. Leader training (the decisions that are made and will be made by leaders of today's generation and the following ones will have a decisive impact on the future, that is why the system of education must raise critically thinking, professionally competent, moral, and responsible leaders).
4. The power of partnership (the interdisciplinary approach and team-based projects are the priority for the university education in particular, and education in general).
5. Systematic problem solving (any social issue intersects with other issues a lot, thus its solution must be approached systematically).
6. Creative coalitions (all problems require new approaches, and their development requires creative coalitions).
7. The need for innovation (innovation is necessary not only in industry, business, and state affairs; each area of public life must consider the consequences of the implemented innovations).
8. Reduction of privileges (improvement of access to education (including higher education) for the less privileged groups of population).
9. Freedom as a basis for activity (it is impossible to engage in any kind of activity without feeling the freedom and respect to oneself and the outcomes of one's activity).
10. Priority of hope (confidence and optimism in overcoming the threats at hand).

In the author's opinion, the most significant values that define the other priorities altogether are freedom, creativity, partnership, and priority of hope. All the other values are successive in their nature, i.e. are derived from the basic ones. The public contract, integration of discoveries and education, leader training, systematic problem solving, the need for innovation, reduction of privileges – all of these are consequences of the deeper attitudes mentioned above. Freedom, creativity, partnership, and the priority of hope are the main values of the philosophy of education in today's world that are indispensable for overcoming the crisis in social development and education.

If we address the situation in our country, it is clear that we have to take this path. But there is an issue much more serious than the difficulties connected with innovative development. Unfortunately, in our case it is very difficult to identify the availability of such an education philosophy that can be adopted to develop further (as was described above). Such need is voiced as an idea in Russia. But it is absent among the society's value priorities as the regulatory models of behaviour.

This is confirmed by opinion polls. According to the VCIOM (Russian Public Opinion Research Center) poll “Starting in 2014: troubled background in Russia”, the problem of education ranks ninth (worries 21% of Russians) and is in no way related to the issue of quality of life (which ranks third and 46% of Russians are worried about it) (Starting in 2014: troubled background in Russia. Opinion polls).

These values are not generated “from above” (by the government). And providing that the population does not have them “running in their blood”, following the path of innovative development without proper understanding of the need for it will be equal to mimicking it, when we display the indicators outwardly similar to the world's cutting-edge results, but lack the “filling”, the essence. Like when only the shell of a product is created, but it lacks the appropriate content. There is no understanding why does everyone in general and an individual person in particular need it.

Consider the value of freedom (academic freedoms for education), for example. Throughout Russia's history rich in events, including those in education, there was hardly a time when academic freedoms were somehow formalized in the law for a rather long period of time. After all, introduction of academic freedoms does not mean that they become actual values. Academic freedoms became widespread neither in the Russian Empire, nor in the Soviet Union. The university codes of 1804 and 1863 allowed for university autonomy, rector elections, but were never completely free of the influence of the Ministry of National Education. Furthermore, these codes were soon replaced by other codes (1835 and 1884). In the USSR the philosophy of education was built around its class ideology, in the context of which academic freedoms were a profanation.

Today in the Russian Federation academic freedoms are codified in the Constitution and warranted by the law “on Higher and Postgraduate Professional Education” of 1996, the law “on Education in the Russian Federation” of 2012. However, arguments about the presence of academic freedoms in our system of university education never cease. On the one hand, some researchers frequently narrow academic freedoms down to an educational institution's autonomy (distinguishing between the academic and the financial and operating freedoms), and on the other hand the others write that there is a need to control over academic institutions, as most of them are funded by the state. According to A. Zapesotsky, a Russian researcher, “introduction of university autonomy, as it is understood by certain leaders, in Russian context may lead to anything at all: sectionalism, voluntarism, significant deterioration of education quality (due to lack of supervision), or simply selling diplomas and even academic degrees. Obviously, in our case such norm is unacceptable until the introduction of a system of checks and balances” (Zapesotsky A., 2005).

One can't but agree with A. Zapesotsky in that in our case not everything is smooth in terms of corruption in education, as well as its quality. All the negative developments he mentioned truly exist. But will control and strong government involvement in this issue facilitate the development of our education? After all, it is obvious that increase of control does not contribute to the resolution of the overall situation, but only aggravates it. This also harms the academic freedoms that have been rather modestly present, at least in the classical universities. And without academic freedoms there is no chance for innovative development.

Control, incessant reporting, orders from above and from the outside – all of these are the factors in education that impede the development of independence, initiative, creative approach, and partner relations. Academic freedom suggests the presence of these aggregated qualities as a factor that determines the professional activity in education. C.L. Glenn, professor at Boston University, writes: “Academic freedom is ... the right of university faculty to follow their research wherever it leads them, and to teach their students based upon their own best understanding of the truth” (Glenn C.L., 2000).

It should probably be acknowledged that academic freedom may carry risks, because not overindulging in it takes a professional in a true sense of the word. Besides everything else it takes readiness of society, which consists not only in the ability to give freedom, but also to accept the results it brings. According to V.O. Nicholsky, “in the meantime the right for the freedom of speech by no means always promotes the disclosure of actual truth. For this reason the academic community preserves the right to suppress palpable lie or deliberate fabrication, fight plagiarism

and pseudoscience” (Nicholsky V., 2013). But the mechanism of influence should operate on the principle of self-regulation, when the academic community itself decides what is truth and what is not, what is fabricated and what is not.

Generation of the basic values of education (freedom, creativity, partnership) is impossible without trust as a key factor of social relations. No kind of control will help to achieve professional stringency and responsibility if there is no atmosphere of trust between the principal participants of the collaboration. But trust, as well as reputation, takes a long time to build. It requires laying down common, clear, effective rules of interaction. It is possible to build an atmosphere of trust within the limits of an organization, group of people, or a region, but when it comes to the development of a country, a nation, trust must become a nationwide idea.

Clear communication in the cooperation of educational institutions and society, as well as building the dependence between quality of education and quality of life are only possible through trust. Incidentally, it was the system of world rankings that demonstrated it. The top tens in all three rankings include universities from the USA and Great Britain (the top hundreds in these rankings are also clearly dominated by universities from these countries) whose activities and outcomes rely exclusively on the mentioned values of the education philosophy. Trust acts as a key indicator of these universities' academic communities and, as a matter of fact, of their societies.

There is another kind of example when the government tries to regulate this process with some success. The examples of Japan, South Korea, Singapore, and other countries show this possibility, but in their case the state attempts to generate the aforementioned values from above. And it is only through developing an atmosphere of trust, creativity, freedom, and partnership (internal, external, and international) that they manage to catch up, but not to achieve the leading universities' results. In his evaluation of the prospects for Asia's economic development, Suh Nam-Pyo, who has already been quoted in this paper, believes that “Asian countries should adopt a policy that would provide the conditions for innovative ideas and persons in their own nations and encourage immigration of creative people from other countries. At the same time they should develop policies that would prevent innovators from leaving their own countries. The country must ensure the conditions of life to their highest quality, including a strong education infrastructure and healthcare” (Nam P. Suh, 2010).

Yet, Russia is implementing our another interpretation of development. It is declared that Russia's higher education institutions (at least five of them) must enter the world's top 100 university rankings. On the one hand, achieving a result that would make your country's universities join the ranks of the world's leading educational institutions is very prestigious, but, on the other hand, reaching the top 100 should indicate the qualitative changes in the development of the society and the system of education. But the way of achieving these qualitative changes doesn't get much attention. In particular, the Decree of the President of the Russian Federation “On measures for implementation of the state policy in the field of education and science”, which, in particular, codifies the task of entering the top 100, expresses it as follows: “c) ensure the achievement of the following values in education:

reaching the 100 percent availability of school education to children up to seven years old by 2016;

at least five Russian universities must enter the top hundred of the world's leading universities according to the world university rankings by 2020, etc.” (Presidential Decree “On measures for implementation of the state policy in the field of education and science”, 2012).

The Decree further continues to list the quantitative numbers that have to be achieved by certain term and indicator. What catches the attention is the absence of any mention of philosophy of education, the point of achieving these values, or the values that might be generated to facilitate the achievement of this result. This document only states the outcomes that need to be obtained. Perhaps, such documents need not to speak about the meaning of the components described, but they should have a goal-setting value and should be expressed as a goal. Or they should be discussed after a relevant regulatory act comes into effect.

This topic is rather trite, so there is no meaning in going deeper. However, it is worth to note that without an adequate attitude of the people, without the realization of the essence of such decisions, without a philosophy of education it is impossible to develop to the full extent (namely without the realization of the personal and the individual aspects of the need to develop). The development itself should display the result and the quality it will lead to, not a predetermined place in the rankings that one has to follow.

Russia (and the system of education) faces a choice: either to take the path already tried abroad, or to seek one's own way of development. In the first case we will have to change and endeavour to understand the meaning of these

changes while realizing that our results will be assessed independently of us (as it is done in today's world rankings). In the second case we will actually have to find something of our own, something one of a kind (a national idea), that might in fact turn out to be an imitation of development because we will be setting the outcome assessment criteria for ourselves (which very much tempts to give ourselves an undeservedly high grade). This is why the author sees the first way as the only possible, as it presupposes the development of the values of trust, freedom, creativity, and partnership. And this path must be started with the system of education, with building the spirit of creativity, trust, partnership, and liberty within it, even if at first this will lead to excesses. This is a risk, but slowing down the development in this direction will lead to even greater risks.

4. Conclusions

It should be thus noted that the social transformations that are taking place in the world actually signalize a crisis in social development in general and in education in particular. The system of education, which acts as a core structure in social organization, is currently in a crisis, as it is not yet capable of preparing people for the conditions of the world's rapid dynamical development. The most adequately reacting component of the education system is the higher education (universities). This is the framework where a possible recovery from the current social crisis is visible. The emergence of research (innovative) universities appears to be the best way of development. This becomes possible because in the world (at least in the Western world) the society has developed an appropriate philosophy of education: quality of education defines quality of life. Changes in society and in the system of education are closely interdependent. For this reason the dynamism of social reality is best overcome by means of the values already shaped within classical universities: freedom, creativity, partnership. A condition for successful application of these values in the society's activities is the atmosphere of trust. Innovative development as a clear vector of social dynamics is only possible on the basis of trust, freedom, creativity, and partnership.

It should be acknowledged that today's Russian society and the Russian system of education have yet to shape an appropriate philosophy of education as a conceptual component of their functioning. In Russia, quality of education and quality of life do not possess the degree of interdependence that could allow a person to clearly realize how the choice of a learning pathway will affect one's future life, what quality of life will it provide. This is why the author believes that forming an appropriate philosophy of education will be the first step in the way of overcoming the crisis in Russian society and Russian education in particular. And the development of such education philosophy should start by generating the values (first within the framework of higher education, then in vocational, school, preschool, and additional education) of freedom, creativity, partnership, and creating an atmosphere of trust. This process should be started by the state, because such initiative will hardly find sufficient initial support among the lower levels of management (which is corroborated by Russia's historical experience). But the state effort should be built around the leaders' example and introduced voluntarily, not enforced from above. Otherwise Russia's prospects of achieving a stable future appear rather uncertain.

Acknowledgements

The author expresses his sincere gratitude to Tomsk Polytechnic University for the opportunity to take part in such a valuable scientific research forum.

References

- Gershunskii, B.S. (1998) *Philosophy of Education for the Twenty-first Century (In search of practice-oriented educational concepts)* (432 p.). Moscow: Publishing House of the "Perfection", 1998.
- Philosophy of Education for the Twenty-first Century (Collection of articles)*.(1992) (435 p.). NN Pakhomov, YB Tuptalov (Eds.). Moscow: Logos, 1992.
- Nalivaiko, N.V.(2012). Globalization and change of values of Russian education. In journal *Philosophy of Education* (pp. 27 – 32.), 2012, 6 (45).
- Ardashkin, I.B. (2013) Knowledge management as a form of student initiative and effectiveness of education. In *Journal Bulletin of the Tomsk Polytechnic University* (pp. 156 – 162).2013, 323, 6.
- Bauman, Z. (2001)*The Individualized Society* (272 p.). Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001.
- Toffler, A. (2002). *Future Shock* (557 p.). - Moscow: OOO "Publisher AST", 2002.
- Toffler, A., Toffler, H. (2012) *Revolutionary Wealth*. From [http:// www.e-reading.ws/book.php?book=148369](http://www.e-reading.ws/book.php?book=148369).
- Major trends in higher education: global and Bologna measurement. (2010). Professor V.I. Baydenko (Eds.).(352 p.). M.: Research Center of Problems quality of training, 2010.
- Academic Ranking of World Universities. (2014). From [http:// www.shangairanking.com/ARWU2013.html](http://www.shangairanking.com/ARWU2013.html).

- Quacquarelli Symonds World University Ranking. (2014). From [http:// www. topuniversities.com/university-rankings](http://www.topuniversities.com/university-rankings).
- Times Higher Education. (2014). From [http:// www. timeshighereducation.co.uk](http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk).
- Nam, P. Suh. (2010). On innovation Strategies: an Asian Perspective, University Research for Innovation (pp. 289 – 302). E. Weber, James J. Duderstadt (Eds). London: Economica, Ltd, 2010.
- University Research for Innovation. (2010) (358 p.). Luc E. Weber, James J. Duderstadt (Eds). London: Economica, Ltd, 2010.
- Starting in 2014: troubled background in Russia. Opinion polls. (2014). Press release number 2516. From [http:// wciom.ru/index.php? Id = 459 &uid = 114712](http://wciom.ru/index.php?Id=459&uid=114712).
- Zapesotsky, A. (2005). Rate - the future of Russia. Gambling - Bologna project. In Journal Higher Education in Russia (pp. 3 – 8), 2005, 9.
- Glenn C.L. (2000). University mission and Academic Freedom: Are They Irreconcilable? (pp. 41 – 47) In Journal European Journal for Education Law and Policy, 2000, V. 4.
- Nicholsky, V. (2013). "Academic freedom" as a language of self-University (pp. 73 - 78) In journal Higher Education in Russia, 2013, 2.
- Presidential Decree "On measures for implementation of the state policy in the field of education and science" // Rossiyskaya Gazeta, May 9, 2012, Capital issue, № 5775.