

UDC: 378:004(470)

37.018.43(470)

616.98:578.834

https://doi.org/10.18485/uf_edu_covid19.2024.2.ch1

Irina V. Trotsuk¹

RUDN University – Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences,

Sociology Department

RANEPA – Centre for Agrarian Studies

Moscow (Russia)

CHAPTER 25

POSSIBILITIES AND LIMITATIONS OF DISTANCE LEARNING UNDER THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC AND DIGITALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN RUSSIA

Abstract: Based on some relevant sociological studies, the article aims at identifying the key challenges of the ongoing digitalization of the higher education system in Russia, which expanded in scope and scale under the COVID-19 pandemic. As a rule, sociological studies of the higher education system under the pandemic focus on social attitudes of the student youth, while the university teachers' attitudes remain outside the scope of research. To bridge this gap in the sociological understanding of the higher education digitalization, especially in the extreme conditions of the urgent and forced transition to distance learning, the article presents some results of the most relevant, interesting, large-scale, monitoring surveys of the Russian university teachers. Based on these sociological studies, the author argues that the teachers' attitudes towards distance learning normalized over time, however hybrid/mixed learning is considered more acceptable. The pandemic not so much created new problems in the higher education system as revealed and emphasized the already existing ones. University teachers admit the technocratic benefits of digital revolution, especially under the pandemic, but question the humanistic benefits of digitalization in the form of remote work and distance learning. Moreover, in identifying the key challenges of online education, teachers and students agree (technical capabilities, lack of personal communication and/or its insufficient digital substitutes, decreasing quality of knowledge and

¹ irina.trotsuk@yandex.ru; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2279-3588>

monitoring, declining motivation and involvement, increasing workload for lesser results). University teachers would definitely prefer the traditional offline teaching or at least the blended/mixed/hybrid format, but there is the still unresolved issue of the 'right' ratio of face-to-face and online classes.

Keywords: *digitalization, higher education, COVID-19 pandemic, Russian university teachers, traditional offline learning, blended/mixed/hybrid learning, face-to-face and online classes.*

In recent decades but especially in the last few years, the Russian higher education has faced both political and social-economic challenges such as weakening international scientific and educational ties, increasing intellectual isolation and growing risks of limited resources. Certainly, teachers of Russian universities (about 300 thousand; Indicators of Education 2021: 306) as a social-professional community possess a unique human capital (Zborovsky, Ambarova 2022b) for the positive impact on higher education and society, provided a thoughtful combination of mobilization (see, e.g.: Jenkins 2003; Rogers, Goldstein & Fox 2018; Staniland 2010) and resource (see, e.g.: Shpak, Tokmasheva 2015) management approaches to assessing and using the university teachers' potential (Zborovsky, Ambarova 2022a). These approaches present the ways in which Russian universities concentrate resources and efforts to achieve strategically important goals in a limited time, focusing on the development of their 'personnel core' – teaching staff and university management (see, e.g.: Agasisti 2010; Lynch, Baines 2004). Moreover, unlike administrative management model, mobilization model follows the principles of flexibility, attention not only to the strong nodes of university system (and community) but also to weak connections to ensure the most rational and careful use of human resources and activate an extremely wide range of teachers' resources for solving strategic tasks and maintaining development dynamics.

The general strategy of the Russian higher education development with the focus on the university human capital was partly and forcedly 'forgotten' under the COVID-19 pandemic which had a serious impact on many aspects of social life, being a global phenomenon that easily crossed geographical and political borders in its objective problems, information agenda and measures to combat the pandemic and its consequences (see, e.g.: Nazarov, Ivanov & Kublitskaya 2022). Under the pandemic and right after it, most studies (including sociological surveys) focused on social attitudes to the pandemic as such, measures taken by the authorities to combat it, vaccination and features of the media discourse (see, e.g.: Trotsuk 2021a; 2021b). Thus, in Russia the fear of coronavirus varied depending on the media agenda, measures taken and dynamics of the pandemic. For instance, in March

2021, about half of Russians (46%) believed that the country had passed the peak of the epidemic (see, e.g.: Artamonov, Lavrentiev 2021), while in its first months, Russians had hopes for a quick victory over the coronavirus and doubted the need to get used to a new way of life (social isolation, distance learning, remote work, etc.) (Sociology of the Pandemic 2021: 46). Although the COVID-19 got 'woven' into the social fabric, destroying some practices, intensifying and creating others, the pandemic not so much created new fears (globally) as intensified the already existing ones, such as fears of losing job (84% in October–November 2020) or civil liberties (61%) (see, e.g.: Edelman Trust Barometer 2021; Yastrebov 2021).

In the pre-covid period, the Russian society developed a significant resource for consolidation in difficult situations, based on the centuries-old traditions and values. The pandemic disrupted numerous tactical and strategic plans (Gorshkov, Tyurina 2023), including in the higher education system, thus destroying the habitual way of life of millions of people and forming a new 'social normality' (see, e.g.: Gafiatulina et al. 2020) both for society and for professional groups, primarily medical workers, but for university teachers too, albeit in a much lesser extent. The coronavirus pandemic is not so much a medical or epidemiological problem as a social and even sociological one (Sociology of the Pandemic 2021: 4), which was proved by many studies examining various aspects of the pandemic (see, e.g.: Society and the Pandemic 2020). Since 2020, the Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences has conducted monitoring surveys to evaluate the state of the Russian society in the economic, social-psychological, moral and behavioral perspectives and present a comprehensive and multifactorial picture of the situation in dynamics (Gorshkov, Tyurina 2023). This sociological diagnostics identified two conditional groups in the Russian society. On the one hand, the group of the most positive attitudes – careful attention to health, acceptance of social distance, mandatory wearing of masks and regular vaccinations. However, the corresponding practices were diverse: many people wore masks and reduced the number of contacts, but at the same time did not consider it necessary to make physical exercises or go in for sports, stick to a healthy diet and self-preservation behavior. On the other hand, the group of the most negative attitudes – to distance learning (online education) and social monitoring, COVID-19 dissidence, rejection of self-isolation and vaccination certificates. Distance learning (online education) was the leader in the group of negative social attitudes under the pandemic, which can be explained by the dominant idea that the direct, personal contact in the educational process cannot be completely replaced by any indirect communicative practices, especially for a long period of time.

Russian universities switched to remote work in March 2020, and the 2019/2020 academic year had the forced distance learning format (Aleshkovski et al. 2021). The 2020/2021 academic year in Russia, as in most countries of the world, had a

mixed format, but the worsening epidemiological situation in the fall of 2020 led to a partial repetition of the spring distance scenario for most universities. According to the Russian Ministry of Education and Science, by mid-December 2020, 55% of universities worked in a completely remote format (Interview of the Deputy Minister 2020), and the rest preferred a mixed format, i.e., the emergency transition to the online education in March 2020 differed from the relatively planned transition to distance and mixed learning in the fall of 2020, which allowed to solve and prevent, at least partially, many problems identified under the first and forced transition to distance learning. The experience gained by the Russian higher education system during the first pandemic period of restrictions affected the scale and speed of its digital transformation, stimulated an analysis of training technologies and teaching methods, changed the requirements for teachers' and students' competencies and skills from the perspective of the information and digital society.

In many studies, the COVID-19 pandemic is considered one of the most serious shocks to the education system, even an education crisis (see, e.g.: Shtykhno, Konstantinova & Gagiev 2020; The Covid-19 Pandemic 2020; Gillis, Krull 2021; Toquero 2020). Most 'indicators' of this crisis are typical for national educational systems, but their manifestations and possibilities of solving differ (see, e.g.: Govindarajan, Srivastava 2020; Gonçalves, Sousa & Pereira 2020; Muhammad, Kainat 2020; Unterhalter, Howell 2021; Qandil, Abdel-Halim 2020). In Russia, sociological studies were conducted both on the initiative of the Ministry of Education and Science and by universities and research organizations (see, e.g.: Higher education 2020; Lessons of the stress test 2020), and the following key challenges were identified: technical equipment, information and resource capabilities of educational organizations; digital, regional and social inequality; availability of electronic devices (computers, smartphones, tablets) for online learning; availability of necessary conditions for remote work; lack of digital content and insufficient qualifications for online training; social-psychological features of distance learning for students and teachers.

One of the studies was conducted with the support of the all-Russian public organization Russian Professorial Assembly, which has branches in all regions and unites teachers from numerous universities, in 2020–2021 (via Google Forms platform using a standardized questionnaire form accessed through a link in the letter sent by the university administration through the database of email addresses of its students; N = about 32,000 as there were several waves). This survey showed that the transition to distance learning was the 'smoothest' at universities which had already (before the pandemic) put into use a system of information and electronic support for learning, i.e., had real experience of including all participants in the educational process in a remote/online format. Such universities had already tested technologies for electronic interaction in the educational process, and teachers had certain elec-

tronic content for classes. However, despite the popular idea that distance learning was rapidly spreading and could compete with the traditional format, most students had no experience of remote work/distance learning (69%; Aleshkovski et al. 2021).

The new distance format was a serious stress for all participants of the educational process. Initially, students' fears were associated mainly with the organization of learning, access to the necessary new resources (stable Internet connection, headset, etc.), online certifications and defenses, and employers' perception of the quality of such training. Later, under the planned transition to distance learning, students' fears were determined mainly by external factors, such as health status (personal and of loved ones) or epidemiological level in the region of residence. About half of students assessed distance learning positively (49% in 2021 vs 30% in 2020), which can be explained not only by the more developed technologies and educational content but also by the objectively calmer social situation and public perception of distance learning, i.e., people more adequately and less emotionally evaluated online education, especially when in extreme conditions. Moreover, the comparative analysis of the results of the spring and fall surveys in 2020 showed that over time the organization of studies became more structured, teachers got used to distance forms of interaction with students, developed their skills and got new technical resources. 90% of students mentioned that teachers at their universities gave lectures online in real time on the available online platforms, i.e., the ministry's recommendations on organizing training in a remote format were successfully implemented.

Certainly, not only students' but also teachers' perception of distance learning is of a great sociological interest and social importance. One of the surveys was conducted on the sample of university teachers-members of the Russian Professorial Assembly (via Google Forms platform using a standardized questionnaire accessed through a link in the letter sent to universities; N = about 3,500 university teachers representing all federal districts and all types of universities) (Narbut et al. 2020; Report-2020). Almost two-thirds of universities (70%) managed to switch to remote mode within one week, 24% – within two weeks, and the rest (about 6%) – within three weeks, using different distance learning systems.

Teachers' estimates of the overall organization of distance learning allowed to divide the teaching community as follows: a half (51%) believed that such training was as full as the traditional format but lost in quality; a third (31%) – that training was full without compromising quality; 18% – that their work was rather formal, since there was no true distance learning at their university. Before the forced transition to distance learning, less than a half (45%) had experience of remote work, but most of them used this format as additional (73%), and only a third worked as teachers of online courses (32%). With a high degree of probability, it can be stated that almost every tenth university teacher had real experience of truly distance

teaching, while the remaining 90% were ‘thrown’ into the online educational process and developed necessary skills when solving emerging problems. The most popular tool for remote work was email (86%), 67% used the university online platform, a half (47%) – online conference platforms (mainly ZOOM, Skype and MS Teams), 45% – messengers, 41% – social networks. Thus, a significant part of university teachers organized their remote work with students in familiar forms, i.e., most tools they used were not designed for the higher education system but were accessible and did not require new or additional skills or knowledge.

The variety of resources used at the start of the pandemic shows that the distance learning system of Russian universities was at the initial stage and had neither resources nor trained personnel. This explains why most respondents preferred to work offline – posted educational materials for students in text formats on Internet resources (79%), checked student works sent by email (70%), while only a half gave lectures (54%) and organized seminars (56%) in real-time online format. Not all teachers were satisfied with distance teaching: 49% did not like remote work at all; a third noted the decreasing efficiency of work with students (39%), a quarter (26%) – slightly decreasing efficiency, 18% did not notice any changes, and 8% believed that their work was more efficient. At the same time, almost all teachers (93%) stated that they began to work more (26%) and even much more (67), i.e., in the system of distance learning teachers work more/harder for lesser ‘output’. Teachers’ answers about the problems of distance learning were expected and mainly methodological: students’ decreased motivation and involvement (50%), lack of well-developed technologies for organizing group work (45%) and of adequate forms of control (44%). Therefore, most respondents would prefer a mixed/hybrid system, combining online and offline formats.

Since the start of the pandemic, the Field Research Center of the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration (RANEPA) has conducted five waves of surveys of university teachers, focusing on the transition to distance learning and the ongoing digital transformation of universities (Rogozin 2021; Vyrskaya, Rogozin 2021; Rogozin, Filina 2021). The surveys showed that the respondents’ attitude towards distance learning normalized over time, and today hybrid/mixed learning is perceived as a norm. In general, the pandemic not so much created new problems as revealed and emphasized the already existing in the higher education system (such as the failure of university administrations to carry out the President’s instructions on increasing teachers’ salaries). In fact, complexity and incompleteness of the post-Soviet reforms in higher education determined a wide range of risks and opportunities which became more complex under the ongoing digital transformation that has changed the status of the university teacher (see, e.g.: Zahavi, Friedman 2019; van Laar et al. 2017; Assessment and teaching, 2018). Despite obvious advantages of digitalization (incorporation of IT technologies and

innovative techniques into the educational process), university teachers are often skeptical about it, emphasizing the changing roles within training, loss of time for both teachers and students, departure from academic traditions and decreasing students' involvement; thus assessing more positively 'blended learning' – a "combination of synchronous and asynchronous activities located on the continuum between face-to-face and online learning" (Graham, 2019; see also: Boelens et al. 2017; Halverson, Graham 2019).

On the one hand, technocratic benefits of digital revolution are obvious and indisputable from the perspective of public or student good. On the other hand, humanistic benefits of digital revolution are often questioned by the 'academy' which is accused of being pre-engaged and interested in maintaining the status quo. This explains why the study of dramatic changes in the educational process under the COVID-19 pandemic focused on the problems that arose for students. However, the main challenges of distance learning are similar for teachers and students: technical capabilities (especially in regional universities); difficulties in establishing personal contact and getting feedback in the absence of personal communication (as its digital substitutes are not sufficient for quality training); a decrease in the quality of knowledge and difficulties in monitoring the progress (students are less involved; it is difficult for teachers to assess their knowledge not to mention practical skills); a decline in students' motivation and involvement (students skip classes or attend them formally, without active participation or even proper concentration; the lack of cooperation makes it difficult for teachers to use group forms of learning and to motivate students); an increase in workload (teachers rework previously developed courses and adapt them to distance formats, prepare new materials, learn electronic reporting, check a larger number of student works; students adapt to new requirements and new forms of learning, spend more time at the computer and prepare more written works).

Blended/mixed/hybrid forms can solve or mitigate these problems of the 'non-traditional' learning, but the still unclear questions are the ratio of face-to-face and online classes in different specialties, subject fields, curricula and courses, grouping of students with different learning forms, increased workload of teachers, organization of extracurricular activities, and so on. Moreover, most university teachers perceive the mixed form of learning as distance form, which leads to the same answers on questions about hybrid and distance learning, i.e., the meaning of the hybrid learning model remains unclear to many respondents. However, teachers argue that student performance declines in hybrid-format classes and improves in both truly offline and truly online classes, while students' involvement in the educational process increases exclusively in face-to-face classes.

The first survey of university teachers was conducted in April 2020 (using a standardized questionnaire accessed through a link in the letter sent to universities

and published on relevant social networks; N = about 34,000 in each of five waves), showed an extremely low level of support for the urgent digitalization of the educational process and revealed quite pessimistic forecasts for the digital transformation in Russia (Rogozin 2021). These results differed from similar surveys in other countries, which showed high adaptability of university teachers to the pandemic reality. However, most university teachers, even with developed digital skills and positive attitudes to online learning, wanted to return to traditional teaching methods after the pandemic. As four survey waves showed, the peak of university teachers' dissatisfaction with distance learning was passed already in 2020, and the attitude towards online learning became calmer: in 2021, 26% assessed it positively (20% in 2020), 14% (37% in 2020) negatively, 33% (29% in 2020) neutrally. About 44% completely or rather agreed that remote work was convenient, 52% still could not accept such a format of teaching. It should be noted that teachers assessed online learning for students in the same way: 41% argued that online learning was convenient for students, 53% did not agree with this idea.

The four survey waves revealed a significant potential for developing a positive attitude of university teachers towards digital transformation and hybrid forms of learning. What still has not changed is that most teachers would prefer the traditional, face-to-face format of learning, and these are mainly teachers from the fields of art and culture, natural and medical sciences, and agriculture, while teachers of economics and management, computer and social sciences, and law were more likely to have a positive attitude towards online teaching. The explanation is quite utilitarian: when assessing the benefits of distance learning, teachers tend to accept them if it is technically easy and not associated with practical classes or creative work, which proves the change in the general perception of online learning – from stereotypically critical rejection to realistic, purposeful, selective use (only 10% insist that the distance format of their courses is unacceptable in principle). Almost 90% are ready to adopt a 'blended learning model' but not the fully online learning, which means that university teachers oppose the total transition of higher education to distance learning but admit its relevance in some cases, one of which turned out to be the COVID-19 pandemic.

In general, Russian university teachers considered the pandemic (and the related forced transition to remote work and distance learning) negatively, insisting on the decreasing quality of education for students (from 43% in 2020 to 66% later and to 74% when asked about the first pandemic years) and the increasing risks for teachers (such as losing job under the economic instability). The common 'framework' for such estimates is 'socially normal' criticism of the education system (just like the healthcare system, and both were hit hardest by the pandemic) and of its ongoing digitalization, which are criticized for 'optimization' of universities by reducing their teaching staff, for 'cutting' the budget for science and education, for

imitation of vigorous activity in quantitative indicators 'at the expense' of quality. Thus, most respondents believe that the situation in higher education has worsened since the start of the pandemic not only due to the introduced restrictions or new technologies (for substituting face-to-face interaction) but also since the pandemic exacerbated the long-unsolved problems in the higher education system.

The success of university teachers' adaptation to distance learning before, under and after the pandemic depended on two main factors: personal attitudes towards distance learning (the more positive attitude, the greater chance of using innovative online teaching methods and the stronger faith in digitalization as associated with individualized educational trajectories for the student and with greater freedom for the teacher); the achieved scale and level of digital transformation (although compared to the first survey waves, the share of teachers confident in the growing administrative and state control over their activities has increased). This is confirmed by the following survey data: most university teachers (73%) do not experience any technical limitations for distance learning, prefer texts to video and other forms of online learning (which is the easiest educational material for 'digitalization'), use various educational materials produced in their university, etc. The variety of teachers attitudes to distance learning in general and to digitalization in higher education under the pandemic in particular is determined by many factors, while the named main problems of the university teacher are related neither to digitalization nor to the pandemic (at least directly) – low wages (the request to increase salaries) and huge workload with large bureaucratic reporting (the request to reduce both).

There are still disputes about the use of distance technologies in higher education. On the one hand, the need in distance technologies in education is beyond doubt since there is a global and universal trend of digitalization manifested in most social institutions and structures, and it was this trend that allowed to overcome pandemic restrictions and ensure a more or less normal educational process under pandemic (and in other extreme conditions). Certainly, online learning is already an objective, widespread and generally accepted educational format, but the problem is the right/necessary/acceptable/optimal ratio of offline and online forms. The urgent and forced transition to distance learning under the COVID-19 pandemic significantly changed the introduction and application of new information technologies in the traditional university system, which still requires a comprehensive interdisciplinary analysis (features of distance learning, readiness of all participants of the educational process for it, availability of all necessary resources for distance and hybrid learning, prospects and scenarios for the development of the higher education system) after the pandemic but under the potential threat of new epidemics (for instance, in recent years in Russia, there have been measles outbreaks among students in both universities and dormitories).

REFERENCES

- Agasisti, T. & Johnes, G. (2010). “Heterogeneity and the evaluation of efficiency: The case of Italian universities”. *Applied Economics* 42 (11).
- Aleshkovski, I.A., Gasparishvili, A.T., Krukhmaleva, O.V., Narbut, N.P. & Savina, N.E. (2021). “Russian students about learning under the covid-19 pandemic: Resources, opportunities and assessment of the distance learning”. *RUDN Journal of Sociology* 21 (2). [In Russian]
- Artamonov, R.E. & Lavrentiev, N.V. (2021). “Public opinion during a year of the pandemic: Assessments of events and trends”. In *“Black Swan” in a White Mask. HSE Analytical Report on the Anniversary of the Covid-19 Pandemic*. Moscow: HSE Publishing House. [In Russian]
- Care, E., Wilson, G. & Wilson, P. (Eds., 2018). *Assessment and teaching of 21st Century Skills: Research and applications*. Singapore: Springer.
- Boelens, R., de Wever, B. & Voet, M. (2017). “Four key challenges to the design of blended learning: A systematic literature review. *Educational Research Review* 22.
- Edelman Trust Barometer. (2021). *Global Report*. Available at: <https://www.edelman.com/trust/2021-trust-barometer>.
- Gafiatulina, N.Kh., Kasyanov, V.V., Samygin, P.S. & Samygin, S.I. (2020). *Russian Society in Self-Isolation. Social Effects and Consequences of the Covid-19 Pandemic*. Moscow. [In Russian]
- Gillis, A. & Krull, L.-M. (2021). “Covid-19 remote learning transition in spring 2020: Class structures, student perceptions, and inequality in college courses”. *Teaching Sociology* 48 (4).
- Gonçalves, S.P., Sousa, M.J. & Pereira, F.S. (2020). “Distance learning perceptions from higher education students – the case of Portugal”. *Education Science* 10.
- Gorshkov, M.K. & Tyurina, I.O. (2023). “Consolidation of the Russian society under contemporary challenges: Social-historical and value contexts”. *RUDN Journal of Sociology* 23 (4). [In Russian]
- Govindarajan, V. & Srivastava, A. (2020). “What the shift to virtual learning could mean for the future of higher education”. *Harvard Business Review* of March 31.
- Graham, C.R. (2019). “Current research in blended learning”. In: M. G., Moore, W. C. Diehl (eds.). *Handbook of Distance Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Halverson, L.R., & Graham, C.R. (2019). “Learner engagement in blended learning environments: A conceptual framework”. *Online Learning* 23 (2).
- Higher Education: Lessons from the Pandemic (Operational and Strategic Measures to Develop the System)* (2020). Analytical Report of the Russian Ministry of Science and Higher Education. Available at: https://minobrnauki.gov.ru/press-center/news/?ELEMENT_ID=25528. [In Russian]

- Indicators of Education* (2021). Moscow [In Russian]
- Interview of the Deputy Minister of Science and Higher Education D. Afanasiev (2020). *Russian Newspaper* of December 11. [In Russian]
- Jenkins, C. (2003). "Resource mobilization theory and the study of social movements". *Annual Review of Sociology* 9 (1).
- Laar van, E., van Deursen, A.J.A.M., Dijk van, J.A.G.M. & de Haan, J. (2017). "The relation between 21st-century skills and digital skills: A systematic literature review". *Computers in Human Behavior* 72.
- Lessons of the Stress Test: Universities under and after the Pandemic* (2020). "Analytical Report of the Russian Ministry of Science and Higher Education". Available at: https://minobrnauki.gov.ru/press-center/news/?ELEMENT_ID=21523. [In Russian]
- Lynch, R. & Baines, P. (2004). "Strategy development in UK higher education: Towards resource-based competitive advantages". *Journal of Higher Education Policy & Management* 26 (2).
- Muhammad, A. & Kainat, A. (2020). "Online learning amid the covid-19 pandemic: Students' perspectives". *Journal of Pedagogical Sociology and Psychology* 2 (1).
- Narbut, N.P., Aleshkovski, I.A., Gasparishvili, A.T. & Krukhnaleva, O.V. (2020). "Forced shift to distance learning as an impetus to technological changes in the Russian higher education". *RUDN Journal of Sociology* 20 (3). [In Russian]
- Nazarov, M.M., Ivanov, V.N. & Kublitskaya, E.A. (2022). "Social representations of covid-19 in the unstable information environment (a mid-2021 study)". *RUDN Journal of Sociology* 22 (2). [In Russian]
- Qandil, A. & Abdel-Halim, H. (2020). "Distance e-learning is closer than everybody thought: A pharmacy education perspective". *Health Professions Education* 6 (3).
- Report-2020 on the Mass Survey of University Teachers on the Development of the Online Environment under the Covid-19. Available at: https://minobrnauki.gov.ru/ru/press-center/card/?id_4=2603. [In Russian]
- Rogers, T., Goldstein, N.J. & Fox, C.R. (2018). "Social mobilization". *Annual Review of Psychology* 69.
- Rogozin, D. & Filina, O. (2021). [Manuscript]. *The Third Wave of the Mass Survey of the Teaching Staff of the Russian Higher Educational Institutions on Distance Learning under the Covid-19 Pandemic*. Moscow: RANEPА, Vol. 2. [In Russian]
- Rogozin, D.M. (2021). *Distance Learning under the Covid-19 Pandemic: Methodology for the Administrative Survey of University Teachers and Students*. Moscow: Publishing house "Delo" of the RANEPА. [In Russian]
- Shpak, L. & Tokmasheva, Yu. (2015). "The mobilization-management mechanism of the municipal authorities' interaction with local communities". *Tomsk State University Journal* 399. [In Russian]

- Shtykhno, D.A., Konstantinova, L.V. & Gagiev, N.N. (2020). “Transition of universities to distance learning under the pandemic: Challenges and possible risks”. *Open Education* 24 (5). [In Russian]
- Society and the Pandemic: Experience and Lessons Learned in the Fight against the Covid-19 Pandemic in Russia* (2020). Moscow. [In Russian]
- Sociology of the Pandemic. The “CoronaFOM” Project* (2021). Moscow: FOM. [In Russian]
- Staniland, P. (2010). “Cities on fire: Social mobilization, state policy, and urban insurgency”. *Comparative Political Studies* 43 (12).
- The Covid-19 Pandemic: Shocks to Education and Policy Responses* (2020). <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/33696/148198.pdf?sequence=4&isAllowed>.
- Toquero, C.M. (2020). “Challenges and opportunities for higher education amid the covid-19 pandemic: The Philippine context”. *Pedagogical Research* 5 (4).
- Trotsuk, I.V. (2021a). “All power to the experts? Contradictions of the information society as both depending on and devaluating expertise”. *Russian Sociological Review* 20 (1).
- Trotsuk, I.V. (2021b). “Excessive faith in certainty and its public proponents in the non-linear uncertain world: Reasons and... more reasons”. *Russian Sociological Review* 20 (4).
- Unterhalter, E. & Howell, C. (2021). “Unaligned connections or enlarging engagements? Tertiary education in developing countries and the implementation of the SDGs”. *Higher Education* 81.
- Vyrskaya, M. & Rogozin, D. (2021). [Manuscript]. *The Fourth Wave of the Mass Survey of the Teaching Staff of the Russian Higher Educational Institutions on Distance Learning under the Covid-19 Pandemic*. Moscow: RANEPa, Vol. 1. [In Russian]
- Yastrebov, O.A. (2021). “Compulsory vaccination: Public benefit or individual’s right limitation”. *RUDN Journal of Sociology* 21 (4). [In Russian]
- Zahavi, H. & Friedman, Y. (2019). “The Bologna Process: An international higher education regime”. *European Journal of Higher Education* 9 (4).
- Zborovsky, G.E. & Ambarova, P.A. (2022a). “Resources of the research-pedagogical community: Administrative and mobilization approaches”. *RUDN Journal of Sociology* 22 (4). [In Russian]
- Zborovsky, G. & Ambarova, P. (2022b). “Research-pedagogical staff as a social community under the changing conditions of academic development”. *Education and Science Journal* 24 (5). [In Russian]