

DOI 10.31651/2524-2660-2021-1-69-73
ORCID 0000-0002-4277-3453

ARUTYUNIAN Nazik

Doctor in Pedagogy, Professor, Director of Pedagogy and Education Development Center,
Yerevan State University, Armenia
e-mail: nazik_harutiunian@yahoo.co.uk

ORCID 0000-0002-8756-5762

VARDANIAN Iryna

Ph.D in Pedagogy, Associate Professor of the Department of English Philology,
Yerevan State University, Armenia
e-mail: irina_vardanyan_79@yahoo.com

UDK 37.013.74-047.44:[005:378.018](479.25+480)(045)

**A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT
OF ARMENIA AND FINLAND**

The study focuses on higher education systems in two different countries. The comparative analysis of their management solves two fundamental problems: cognitive and the exchange of advanced practices.

The article discusses the three most widely used models of higher education management in the world, followed by a comparative analysis of higher education systems management in Armenia and Finland in the context of the Bologna Process.

Significant Issues: The comprehensive studies of education systems worldwide have recently become extremely important and valuable, as they provide substantial opportunities to exchange advanced practices and contribute to the development of Comparative Pedagogy.

This research aims to conduct a comparative analysis of higher education system management of Armenia and Finland, one of the most developed countries in Europe, by presenting the similarities, differences, achievements, and management system problems.

Literature review on the issue: There are numerous studies of European, Russian and Armenian scientists about the higher education management in different countries of the world, suggesting their comparative analysis. Among them, the most significant can be mentioned: S.D. Reznik, V.M. Filippov, A.G. Bermus, A.P. Nesterov, N.E. Vorobiev, I.S. Bessarabova, Ju.I. Misheneva (Popova), Ossi V. Lindqvist, P. Scott, Alberto Amaral, Glen A. Jones, Berit Karseth, B.L. Vulfson, M. Michaela, P. Shreya, N. Harutyunyan, A. Grigoryan, Yu. Sargsyan, A. Budaghyan, M. Avetisyan and others. The studies of all authors represent new approaches to the issue under discussion.

Research novelty: For the first time, a comparative analysis of higher education systems management in Armenia and Finland is carried out, revealing the similarities, differences, achievements and problems of their education systems. This study will contribute to the exchange of advanced practices and the development of Comparative Pedagogy.

Keywords: *higher education; management system; management model; globalization; education reforms; Bologna process.*

Nowadays, the role of human capital is undeniable, especially in the processes of economic, scientific and technical development. Consequently, it is not difficult to notice that education is becoming the main driving force for modern society's development. Education is the production of operational knowledge, which assures the advances of society in all spheres. This idea is emphasized by many scholars. Specifically, S.D. Reznik and V.M. Filipov state, "Education is considered a state priority in many countries. Many of them have undergone radical changes to create a flexible system of higher education that will meet the global competition's new demands" [1, p. 15]. Furthermore, A. Bermus asserts, "In the modern world, the responsibilities and risks of operations of higher education institutions are even more significant than those of commercial establishments" [2, p. 368].

At present, diversified approaches and models have been designed to manage higher education institutions systematically. Those models have found their practical application in a number of countries at different times.

In this study, we will present *Continental European, Anglo-Saxon and German or Humboldtian models.*

In particular, the Continental European model is based on the principle that higher education is more than enough to be in the hands of independent educational institutions [3, p. 281]. In continental Europe, a university is viewed as a public institution that is considered the main economic, social, and cultural instrument for developing the nation-state. It is under government control. Until the last quarter of a century, universities in many European countries have been entirely funded and governed by the state. France is a classic example of this model.

The logical question arises concerning the basic principle governing the Anglo-Saxon model. According to A. Amaral, higher education is crucial to be entrusted to the nation-state's political whims [3, p. 282]. Amenable to this model, higher education's sustainable development must be ensured following market requirements so that higher education is not affected by possible changes in state politics. The basis for this substantial model is the essential factor that ensures university autonomy, self-government and academic freedoms, which play a significant role in the sustainable development and progress of universities. This model has been approved in the UK, USA, Canada and Austria.

Now we will proceed to reviewing the Humboldtian model of higher education. The key idea of this model is to assure the unity of educational and academic freedoms. Nowadays, this idea is considered to be an essential requirement for education and scientific development, as it warrants the application of scientific achievements in the economy, health care, and the sphere of education. The following model has been adopted in the Bergen Communiqué'. The developer of the foregoing model is Wilhelm von Humboldt (19th century, Germany.) Besides Germany, the Humboldtian model is applied in Austria and Switzerland. The models mentioned above are widely used in different parts of the world with variable outcomes.

In the context of the following theoretical analysis of education management, we would like to present the results of the comparative analysis of management features of higher education systems in Armenia and Finland. The following study will determine each country's approved and favoured model of education management and establish whether these models justified themselves when facing the modern challenges of higher education, or provided competitive, relevant and high-quality education in their own country. The results of the performed comparative analysis of higher education systems man-

agement in Armenia and Finland are revealed to answer these questions.

One of the Armenia's most important national issues is preserving and developing the education system, its scientific management, and its compliance with international standards, assuring in this wise its competitiveness in the international arena. The implementation of such procedures, of course, requires serious education reforms. Currently, Armenia is at the stage of making reforms in the higher education system.

N. Harutyunyan and A. Grigoryan pinpoint that "For the modernization and development of education in each country, it is expedient to get integrated into international educational processes to improve the quality of education, bring it into line with international standards, and increase its competitiveness and attractiveness. It is the goal of the reforms carried out in the field of higher education in Armenia, the ultimate target of which is to form a dynamically developing society, characterized by spiritual, legal, professional and cultural levels, as well as rational application of civilization achievements" [4, p. 5]. With this in view, Armenia actively participates in international educational processes, taking appropriate steps to integrate into the European Higher Education Area.

After signing the Bergen Communiqué in 2005, the Republic of Armenia joined the Bologna Process and took responsibility to reform the higher education system in various directions. Among the reforms mentioned above, we will focus on the issue of university management.

Starting the 2004–2005 academic year, higher educational institutions in Armenia converted to a three-level education system: bachelor's, master's and doctoral. As a result, it transformed the curricula, programs, and textbooks, taking into account the European higher education standards.

In 2005, the management of higher education institutions also changed. Considering Article 6 of RA Law on Higher and Post-Graduate Professional Education, adopted in 2004, Management Councils are formed in all higher education institutions of Armenia in 2005. Their members comprise both lecturers (25%) and students (25%). The representatives of the RA Government (25%) and the Ministry of Education and Science (25%) are also included in the Council.

It deems relevant to mention that the University Council is a cooperative and collegial body. Lecturers, students, the state, and the representatives of the economic and social fields contribute to the university management. The posed issues are discussed in the

Council, and decisions are made jointly by a simple majority of votes.

The University Council elects the Rector through the procedure of a competition, who, as an executive body, reports to the Council once a year. Under the new university management system, they are granted some autonomy and academic freedoms, and yet, the state retains an excellent control over the state institutions to have an impact on their free operations (funding, licensing, accreditation, oversight, and participation in management).

Extending the aforementioned, the new management system diversified the principles, functions and methods of interuniversity management. Specifically, since 2014, Armenian universities' organizational and legal status has changed; thus, universities have become foundations. Moreover, Boards of Trustees are formed, which are considered to be the supreme governing bodies of the universities. Their structure is similar to that of university councils.

After universities turned into foundations, they significantly increased the active participation of students in the university management system. They are included not only in the Board of Trustees (25%) but also in the Scientific Council (25%) of university and the Scientific Councils (25%) of all faculties and centres. Compared to the previous higher education management system before 2005, the difference is evident in university autonomy and academic freedoms. Nevertheless, the question arises: which model of higher education management in Armenia more or less corresponds to the existing management models in the world? The answer is apparent. The new system of higher education management, adopted by Armenia, fits into the Continental European higher education management model, appealing to the Humboldtian model.

Now, we will go on to the next issue concerning the management of Finland's higher education system. Finland is regarded as one of the most developed countries in Europe. In accordance with N. Vorobiev and I. Bessarabova, Finland has achieved economic success due to the Finnish socio-economic model and such national characteristics as diligence, solidity, obedience to law, wise spending of the funds, innovation activities, high estimation of education and vocation training, and a willingness to continuing improvements [5].

Yulia Misheneva claims that the Finnish education system is targeted at providing a high level of enlightenment, knowledge, and capabilities for the entire population. In Finland, the principle of continuing education has been announced, and anyone is provided

with an opportunity to study at any age [6, p. 109].

Typically, in Finland, legislative issues and the appointment of general principles on education policy falls within the country's Parliament competence.

Every four years, the Government of Finland adopts a plan for the development of education and research, which, in the short term, sets out the main directions of education and research policy. The highest state body in the sphere of education is the Ministry of Education. The Ministry of Education is responsible for implementing the education policy determined by both the Parliament and the Government within centralized management.

The education system in Finland comprises Universities (Academic Higher Education) and Professional Higher Education Institutions – Technical Institutes (Professional Higher Education). The latter provides practical skills and knowledge to work in various spheres of economy. The duration of study is 3.5–4 years, including internship.

Unlike Armenia, where both state and private universities operate, in Finland, almost all universities are public, and there are very few private Technical Institutes. The state management of Universities in Finland is carried out in the traditional directive style; therefore, Finnish educational institutions' autonomy is weak.

In Finland, university admissions are based on students' entrance examinations. However, unlike Armenia, university entrance exams in Finland are organized by universities, and they select their future students, which indicates a high level of trust in universities.

In August 2005, Finland converted to a three-level higher education system: bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degrees. In particular, in Finnish universities' it takes approximately three years to accomplish a full-time study of bachelor's program, and as the master's program, it lasts from 5 to 6 years. The bachelor's degree in Technical Institutes lasts 3.5 to 4 years, including an internship. After graduating from a Technical institute in Finland, postgraduate education requires three years of work experience in a particular field. The postgraduate educational program is worth 40 to 60 credit and lasts 1–1.5 years. Universities in Finland apply the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS), where 1.5 credits are equal to 40 hours.

It is worth noting that Finnish Universities provide a close relationship between teaching and research work. Large universities are

complexes of educational institutions and research centres.

Ossi Lindqvist, Rector of the University of Kuopio in Finland, points out that the right vision of the future plays a more vital role in reform than it seems at first glance. In general, strategies are necessary and they are supposed to be productive, but at the same time, they require predicting the future to become a reality. In Finland, it is evident that the public has faith in higher education and the results of scientific research innovations, which is confirmed by the considerable funding of higher education by the country's Parliament, as well as non-governmental organizations and the private sector [7, p. 81].

In Finland, the Ministry of Education manages and controls all state financed education. The University Council is the highest management body in Finnish universities. It aims to develop the university's productivity, confirm both economic and work plans, and determine the main directions of finance distribution.

The University Council members include professors, teaching and research staff, administrative staff and students. The president of the University Council is the Rector.

Universities are free to solve the issues of interuniversity management following Education laws. They are independent in choosing the directions of scientific research, deciding on admission exam rules, compiling curricula, and awarding academic degrees. It is important that self-management of universities and freedom of higher education, arts and sciences, is guaranteed by Finland's Constitution.

Summing up, it is necessary to pose the same question: which model of higher education management in Finland more or less corresponds to the Finnish higher education system? The answer is as follows: Finland's higher education management system corresponds to the "Continental European" and Humboldtian higher education management models.

Commenting on higher education management systems in Armenia and Finland, it seems apposite to present the similarities and differences of the systems mentioned above through comparative analysis.

Similarities

– Being concerned about the development of higher education, both countries acceded to the Bologna Declaration, integrating into the European Higher Education Area.

– Both countries have chosen reforms to develop higher education, in the process of which they have preserved the idea of national values and principles.

– Both in Armenia and Finland, the state management and control of universities is exact and strict. As a result, it weakens the institutional autonomy of universities.

– Both countries have a three-level higher education system.

– ECTS credit system for teaching organization is applied in both countries.

Differences

– Both bachelor's and master's study duration in Armenia and Finland is different.

– The highest management bodies of the Universities of the two countries are dissimilar. In Finland, there is a University Council, headed by the Rector. In Armenia there is a Board of Trustees, whose President is elected by the Board.

– In comparison with Armenia, where university admission exams are centralized and organized by the Ministry of Education and Science, in Finland, universities hold admission exams, so they choose their future students.

– In contrast to Finland, where the government fully finances state universities, Armenian state universities are financed by the Armenian government only by 15%.

– In contrast to Armenia, where there are both state and private universities, in Finland, most universities are state; there are very few private technical institutes.

Conclusion. Our research results have led us to conclude that the studies on the management of education systems in different countries reveal the advanced practices of different countries and contribute to the development of Comparative Pedagogy.

References

1. Reznik, S.D., Filippov, V.M. (2011) Management of a higher educational institution. 3rd edition, revised and enlarged. Moscow: INFRA-M, 2013. 416 p. [in Rus.]

2. Bermus, A.G. (2008) Modernization of education: philosophy, politics, culture. Moscow, 2008. 384 p. [in Rus.]
3. Amaral, A., Jones, G.A., Karseth, B. (2002) Governing Higher Education: National Perspectives on Institutional Governance. Springer Netherlands. XXXI, 299 p. DOI 10.1007/978-94-015-9946-7
4. Harutyunyan, N., Grigoryan, A. (2013) Problems of Education Development and Qualification. *Pedagogical Thought*, Yerevan, 1–2 [in Arm.]
5. Vorobiev N.E., Bessarabova I.S. (2006) Features of the education system in Finland. *Pedagogy: scientific and theoretical journal*, 2: 112–117 [in Rus.]
6. Misheneva (Popova), Ju.I. (2014) Current state and trends in the development of education in Finland. *Izvestia VSPU. Pedagogika*, 1 (86): 106–110 [in Rus.]
7. Lindqvist, O.V. (2004) Some Personal lessons about University Management. *University Management: practice and analysis*, 2(31): 78–81 [in Rus.]
8. Sargsyan, Y., Budaghyan, A. (2008) The Bologna Process in Armenia: A Guide. National Center for Strategic Studies of Higher Education. Yerevan: Antares. 74 p. [in Arm.]

Список бібліографічних посилань

1. Резник С.Д., Филиппов В.М. Управление высшим учебным заведением. 3-е изд., перераб. и доп. М.: ИНФРА-М, 2013. 416 с.
2. Бермус А.Г. Модернизация образования: философия, политика, культура. М., 2008. 384 с.
3. Amaral A., Jones G.A., Karseth B. Governing Higher Education: National Perspectives on Institutional Governance. Springer Netherlands, 2002. XXXI, 299 p. DOI 10.1007/978-94-015-9946-7
4. Арутюнян Н., Григорян А. Проблемы развития образования и квалификации. *Педагогическая мысль*, Ереван, 2013. №1–2 [in Arm.]
5. Воробьев Н.Е., Бессарабова И.С. Особенности системы образования в Финляндии. *Педагогика: научно-теоретический журнал*, 2006. № 2. С. 112–117.
6. Мишенева (Попова) Ю.И. Современное состояние и тенденции развития образования в Финляндии. *Известия ВГПУ. Педагогика*, 2014. №1(86). С. 106–110.
7. Линдквист О.В. Некоторый личный опыт в области управления университетом. *Университетское управление: практика и анализ*, 2004. № 2(31). С. 78–81.
8. Саргсян Ю., Будагян А. Болонский процесс в Армении: руководство. Национальный центр стратегических исследований Высшего образования. Ереван: Антарес, 2008. 74 с. [in Arm.]

АРУТЮНЯН Назік

докторка педагогічних наук, професорка, директорка Центру педагогіки та розвитку освіти, Среванський державний університет, Республіка Вірменія

ВАРДАНЯН Ірина

кандидатка педагогічних наук, доцентка кафедри англійської філології, Среванський державний університет, Республіка Вірменія

ПОРІВНЯЛЬНИЙ АНАЛІЗ УПРАВЛІННЯ СИСТЕМАМИ ВИЩОЇ ОСВІТИ ВІРМЕНІЇ І ФІНЛЯНДІЇ

Анотація. Сьогодні у світі надзвичайно актуальними є дослідження, які містять порівняльний аналіз управління системами освіти різних країн. Такі дослідження мають високу значущість, а також розв'язують два важливих завдання: пізнавальне й обмін досвідом. Дослідження, представлені у статті, однозначно сприяють розвитку порівняльної педагогіки.

У статті проведений порівняльний аналіз систем управління вищою освітою Вірменії та Фінляндії. Представлені подібності та відмінності, досягнення, а також проблеми цих систем.

Зокрема, у статті аналізуються реформи, здійснені як у системі управління вищою освітою Вірменії, так і в Фінляндії в контексті Болонського процесу.

У статті також проаналізована триступенева система вищої освіти, кредитна система ECTS, фінансування вищої та вступні іспити двох країн.

Згідно з результатами дослідження, стає очевидним, що як у Вірменії, так і в Фінляндії діє централізоване державне управління системами вищою освітою.

Ключові слова: вища освіта; триступенева система освіти; глобалізація; система управління; освітні реформи; Болонський процес.

Одержано редакцією 01.02.2021
Прийнято до публікації 16.02.2021