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Shifting Shadows
Private Tutoring and the Formation of Education in Imperial, Soviet and Post-Soviet Russia
This dissertation aims to provide a genealogy of the relations between the public and the private in education. It does so by exploring how public education and private tutoring form and transform each other and why they are seen as legitimate or problematic in different historical and cultural contexts. Drawing on curriculum theory and Foucault’s genealogical approach to history, the study examines how private tutoring has been problematised in Imperial, Soviet and post-Soviet Russia and discusses how these problematisations reflect and shape the dominant visions of education.

The results show that norms and values in relation to which private education has been problematised and addressed in Russia have varied in line with nationalist, communist and neoliberal visions of education. Although most questions, such as tutor competence, individual privilege, inequality, ethics, governance, and ideological conformity, have constantly been in the focus of critical reflection, they were ‘answered’ differently in different historical periods. Others, such as spatial inequality and ethical concern for corrupt tutoring practices, are of more recent origin. In contrast to previous research into shadow education, the study argues that the mimicking character of supplementary tutoring is not its natural feature. Rather, in the Russian case, it is the result of constant problematisation and the corresponding regulation of its conformity with what is regarded as ‘sacred’ national values.

In general, private tutoring in Russia has often been treated as a ‘symptom’ of other educational and societal problems, and addressed indirectly, through reforms in public education. Paradoxically, in fighting against undesirable effects of private tutoring, Russian schools had to adopt some of the traits commonly associated with just that industry, namely individualisation, exam drills, and the promotion of private and positional good. Conversely, changes in the structure, content, pedagogy, or assessment procedures in the mainstream system have provoked considerable changes in tutoring practices, which, however, are not limited to imitation and supplementation. The study concludes that this symbiotic relationship cannot be reduced to imitation, reproduction, or supplementation. Rather, it changes like shifting shadows reflecting and ultimately shaping the dominant perceptions of what education is and ought to be.
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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDSP</td>
<td>Current Digest of the Soviet Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIFO</td>
<td>Gosudarstvennoe Individual’noe Finansovoe Obyazatel’stvo [State Individual Financial Obligation]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSE</td>
<td>Higher School of Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNP</td>
<td>Ministerstvo Narodnogo Prosveshcheniya [Ministry of National Enlightenment]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEP</td>
<td>New Economic Policy of the USSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNC</td>
<td>Russian National Corpus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Novoe Vremya [New Time]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Organisation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSZ</td>
<td>Polnoe Sobranie Zakonov Rossiiskoi Imperii [Complete Collection of Laws of the Russian Empire]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSFSR</td>
<td>Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USE</td>
<td>Unified State Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Union of Soviet Socialist Republics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPR</td>
<td>What’s the Problem Represented to Be?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Public and Private in Education: A Complicated Relationship

For centuries, the organisation of educational processes in Russia and elsewhere was a matter of private concern. However, after the emergence of public schools, private education became a subject of critical reflection and state intervention. Nowadays, the idea of ‘publicness’ has become so natural that universal public schooling is held to be the cure for most societal ills (Baker, 2014; Meyer, 2006; Hogan & Thompson, 2021). At the same time, traditional forms of out-of-school education, such as home-schooling and private tutoring, are often seen as a threat to equality and inclusion and, thus, may be considered illegal or recognized only as supplements.

In this respect, the concept of ‘shadow education’ introduced by recent scholarship is indicative. The shadow metaphor, popularised by Mark Bray, is presumed on the assumption about the supplementary nature of private tutoring:

First, private supplementary tutoring only exists because the mainstream education exists; second, as the size and shape of the mainstream system change, so do the size and shape of supplementary tutoring; third, in almost all societies much more public attention focuses on the mainstream than on its shadow; and fourth, the features of the shadow system are much less distinct than those of the mainstream system. (Bray, 2007, p. 17)

On the one hand, this definition suggests that private tutoring and public education are interlinked in several ways. At the same time, however, by implicitly invoking the opposition of shadow and light, it makes private tutoring appear as something hidden, inferior, and negative. It is therefore no coincidence that many scholars have raised serious concerns about the “worldwide shadow education epidemic” (Entrich & Lauterbach, 2022; Javadi & Kazemirad, 2020; Kim & Jung, 2019c) and its backwash effects on regular schools1. There is also a tendency to discuss the phenomenon as an effect of neoliberalism; that is to say, it is treated as consequence of privatisation, marketisation, commodification, and the loss of the idea of education as a public good.

However, the practice of private tutoring is not so new that it could be attributed to the neoliberal trends dominating global education policy. Indeed,

---

1 For references, see chapter 2.
its history can be traced back to ancient Greek and Roman cultures. At that time, children were entrusted to pedagogues—household slaves who served as both supervisors and custodians of children. In the Laws, Plato describes the importance of pedagogues as follows:

> When the day breaks, the time has arrived for youth to go to their schoolmasters. Now neither sheep nor any other animals can live without a shepherd, nor can children be left without tutors, or slaves without masters. (Plato, ca. 354 B.C.E./2012, p. 278)

The work of the pedagogue was clearly related to formal schooling. Davis (2003) writes, for example, that a pedagogue was usually appointed as soon as children started school. Pedagogues accompanied the child, usually a boy, on the way to and from his teacher, making sure that he paid attention during lessons, helping him with homework, and ensuring his moral and physical well-being (Laes, 2009; Smith, 2006; Young, 1987). Yet, the tutors’ responsibilities far exceeded those of the teachers:

> It is a great day for an Athenian boy when he is given a pedagogue. This slave (perhaps purchased especially for the purpose) is not his teacher, but he ought to be more than ordinarily honest, kindly, and well informed. His prime business is to accompany the young master everywhere out-of-doors, especially to the school and to the gymnasion; to carry his books and writing tablets; to give informal help upon his lessons; to keep him out of every kind of mischief; to teach him social good manners; to answer the thousand questions a healthy boy is sure to ask; and finally, in emergencies, if the schoolmaster or his father is not at hand, to administer a needful whipping. (Davis, 2003, p. 4)

In other words, being a pedagogue was not about being a teacher, but about enabling a smooth transition from the private to the public sphere. Accordingly, their work—pedagogy—was not limited to teaching and formal schooling, nor was it a mere supplement to school or family.

In many Western societies, the custom of placing children in the supervision of someone outside the family and formal school persisted at least until the nineteenth century, as did the roles of teachers and tutors. In his famous treatise *On Education*, Kant (1803/1900, pp. 23-24) writes of “the difference between a private teacher who merely instructs, and a tutor or governor who guides and directs his pupil. The one trains for school only, the other for life”. He continues:

> Education is either private or public. The latter is concerned only with instruction, and this can always remain public. The carrying out of what is taught is left to private education. (Kant, 1803/1900, p. 24)

---

2 Etymologically, the word *pedagogue* is derived from the Greek ἄγω (ágō) – “I lead”, and παῖς (país, genitive παιδός, paidos) – “child”; hence, it means “to lead a child”. 
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Thus, in Kant’s view, public and private education complete each other, and both are necessary for the perfecting of humans and the welfare of the state. He asserts that the intention of public education is to “promote a good private education” (p. 24).

As indicated above, these ideas seem to have lost their familiarity in modern times. Although private tutoring is still a natural part of schoolchildren’s lives in various parts of the world (see chapter 2), as such it has come to be associated not with holistic personal development and preparation for life, but with rote learning and cramming, inequalities and corruption. Not surprisingly, it has become a subject of critical thought, a matter of public concern, a problem that needs to be addressed.

It is important to point out that although the notion of ‘shadow education’ is increasingly criticized in academic discourse (e.g., Kim & Jung, 2022), the question of the ‘light’ is largely bypassed. Instead, it seems to be widely accepted that it is the public (mainstream, regular or formal) system that paradoxically both constitutes the source of light and the objects that casts various shadows. In this understanding, the notion of ‘public’ tends to be equated with democracy, equality, and inclusion, while ‘private’ is generally seen as problematic. However, taking into consideration that public schools, especially in authoritarian societies, can promote illiberal values, these understandings of the notions of ‘public’ and ‘private’ become less obvious. In such environments, private alternatives may in fact be more democratic in the sense that they have a potential to be more open to contestation of values than it is possible in the public sphere (cf. Habermas, 1991).

The idea for this dissertation grew out of my interest in the concepts of public and private and the ways they reflect and shape our ways of thinking, researching, and making sense of education. To further illustrate this point, in the subsequent two sections I elaborate on the concepts of ‘shadow education’ and ‘private supplementary tutoring’ and discuss the assumptions each embodies. I then offer tentative suggestions as to how these concepts can be defined so that they can account for a variety of historical and contemporary forms of tutoring practices.

Shadow Education

Although the practice of private tutoring, as illustrated above, is not new, the term ‘shadow education’ is. It was introduced into educational research in the early 1990s. This does not mean that private tutoring was not a subject of academic interest before that time (see e.g., Cohen et al., 1982; Rosenshine & Furst, 1969). However, it was not conceptualised as shadow education.
The origin of the term is usually attributed to Stevenson and Baker (1992, p. 1640) who used it “to denote the strong connection between allocation rules and nonformal schooling” rather than to imply that these activities are opaque or hidden in the shadows (cf. Bray et al., 2019). Although their study focused on a specific type of tutoring, one that is used in order to prepare for entrance examinations, Stevenson and Baker (1992, p. 1639) stressed that the term could refer to a variety of educational activities (such as cram schools, correspondence courses, and practice examination) that “occur outside formal schooling and [are] designed to enhance the students’ formal school career”.

Over time, however, the term has come to be used in a somewhat narrower sense as a synonym for private supplementary tutoring (see, for example, Bray’s definition quoted above). From this perspective, the mimicking, supplementary character of private tutoring is the most discernible feature of the otherwise hidden phenomenon. Thus, in this usage the metaphor of ‘shadow’ is meant to emphasize that tutoring practices mirror the development of the mainstream system and at the same time are invisible.

This conceptualisation of ‘shadow’ has long been and remains dominant in the field, despite growing criticism. Some scholars argue, for example, that the term is politically constructed because it frames private tutoring “as subordinate or inferior to public education” (Kim & Jung, 2019b, p. 6). It has also been pointed out that the shadow metaphor makes private tutoring appear as though it were something passive. However, unlike the shadow, which cannot affect the source of light, educational practices covered by the concept certainly can and do so (Mori & Baker, 2010). Others question the mimicking nature of tutoring practices, noting that to assume that shadow education simply imitates the public system is “to present a partial or erroneous explanation of this phenomenon” (Kim, 2016, p. 24). To go beyond this limitation, Kobakidze and Suter (2020, p. 316) suggest using the concept in a broader sense to include “formal or informal educational arrangements such as private tutoring, extended education, after-school studies, outside-school-time, informal learning, or additional studies”.

To add new directions to the discussion of the concept, it can be useful to look at the meanings of the word ‘shadow’. Webster’s Dictionary lists fourteen different meanings of the noun (“Shadow,” n.d.). The first of these

---

3 This is not to say that the word “shadow” was not used earlier in relation to similar educational practices. See, for example, Marimuthu et al. (1991). See also chapter 9, in which I refer to Zhukov’s (1990) article on “the light and shadows of shadow pedagogy [emphasis added]” that predated Stevenson and Baker’s publication.

4 It is worth mentioning that in Russian mass media, the terms ‘shadow education’ and ‘shadow school’ are used in relation to both supplementary tutoring, home-schooling and the ‘non-school’ (ne-shkola) movement (see e.g., Granina, 2017). In this case, the shadow metaphor implies that these practices are hidden and semilegal educational practice, rather than imitating the mainstream system. Indeed, unschoolers reject schooling as such and believe that the educational process can and should be arranged differently. Moreover, in Russia both home education and extra-curricular activities can be provided by private tutors.
defines shadow as a “dark figure cast upon a surface by a body intercepting the rays from a source of light”. This could be compared with Bray’s claim that the existence of shadow education is conditioned by the existence of the mainstream system. This implies that public, or mainstream education is not the source of light, but rather “a body intercepting the rays” that creates a shadow. Consequently, one must raise the question of what counts as ‘light’ in education and what or who casts it in a particular direction. It seems also important to consider whether the word ‘shadow’ means “a shelter from the sun” or a “shelter from danger and observation”, as another definition suggests. The noun ‘shadow’ can be defined relatively neutrally as “a reflected image”. It can also be described as “inseparable companion or follower”, implying that it is intertwined with the objects that produce it. However, the word ‘inseparable’ suggests that the mainstream system cannot exist without producing a shadow given that there is a light.

However, when ‘shadow’ is understood as “an attenuated form or a vestigial remnant”, “imitation of something” or “an imperfect and faint representation”, in accordance with other dictionary definitions, the concept of shadow education takes on negative connotations. In fact, as mentioned above, it is this understanding of the shadow that dominates research on private tutoring. Consider, for example, Table 1, which summarises features frequently mentioned in academic literature to characterise public and shadow education.

Table 1. Common traits used to characterise public and shadow education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public education</th>
<th>Shadow education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>open to everyone</td>
<td>restricted to some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>free of charge</td>
<td>accessible for money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state</td>
<td>non-state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mainstream</td>
<td>exclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formal</td>
<td>informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regular</td>
<td>irregular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compulsory</td>
<td>voluntary (but may be forced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uniform</td>
<td>individualised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acknowledged</td>
<td>unrecognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visible</td>
<td>hidden, invisible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outside the home</td>
<td>outside the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(over-) regulated</td>
<td>(under-) or unregulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in large groups, classes</td>
<td>one-on-one or in small groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whole-person development</td>
<td>differentiated learning, cramming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promotes public/common good</td>
<td>promotes private/positional good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prepares for citizenship</td>
<td>market-driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standardised</td>
<td>varying in purpose and nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conservative, stable</td>
<td>flexible, adaptive to change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on my literature review (chapter 2) and Zhang and Bray (2021).
Table 1 illustrates that public education and private tutoring are presented in opposite terms. Furthermore, since many of the features used to describe tutoring tend to be perceived as negative, it has become commonplace to portray it as “a form of oppression” (Yung, 2020) and an “evil” that should be eliminated (Foondun, 2002). As Baker (2020, p. 312) summarised it, shadow education appears to be a “creator of inequality and examination hell, corrupter of public education, welcomed purveyor of access to education in poorer nations, facilitator of neo-liberalism, and an uncontrollable industry”, which is nevertheless “inevitable” and “universal”.

However, on further consideration, it is evident that traits attributed to private tutoring, such as individualisation, differentiation, market orientation and promotion of private and positional good, are just as visible in public education. Conversely, tutoring can be regulated and open to everyone on a low- or no-cost basis; it can also be provided by state schools, in large groups and classes, and promote whole-person development\(^6\). This means that these forms of education have more in common than Table 1 would suggest.

These considerations allow for the conclusion that the concept of ‘shadow education’ does not simply describe educational practices. Rather, it reflects certain assumptions about the ‘desirable’ versus the ‘problematic’ in education and involves particular ways of thinking about private tutoring and its relation to the mainstream system. I argue, therefore, that the question should not be whether one conceptualisation of the metaphor of ‘shadow’ is more correct and more comprehensive than another, but whether and in what sense an educational practice can be regarded as shadow education.

Private Supplementary Tutoring

The term ‘private supplementary tutoring’, often used as a synonym for shadow education, is no less ambiguous. Indeed, each of its components is loaded with certain assumptions that significantly reduce the complexity of the phenomena to which the term refers.

Bray defines the first component, privateness, as follows:

*Privateness:* support by individuals and companies for profit-making purpose or at least to cover costs, and excluding supplementary help at public expense and the voluntary assistance of family members. (Bray, 2017, p. 473)

Here, ‘privateness’ is described in economic terms as it is explicitly linked to profit-making, which, by implication, excludes a whole range of possible manifestations of private tutoring. According to this definition, free-of-charge academic assistance provided by parents, relatives or peers would not qualify

\(^6\) For further references, see chapter 2.
as shadow education or private tutoring. This limitation, in my view, leaves little room for understanding the proliferation of tutoring practices in recent decades as anything else than an effect of neoliberal ideology, privatisation, and commodification of education. Moreover, this conceptualisation fails to take into account the political, social, cultural, and ethical dimensions of the public and private distinction (Arendt, 1998, 2006; Calhoun, 1998; Dewey, 1981; Fraser, 1992; Habermas, 1991; Newman & Clarke, 2009; Warner, 2014; Weintraub, 1997; Weintraub & Kumar, 1997).

As with the notion of ‘public’, in relation to which it tends to be defined, ‘private’ is not a neutral term. In ancient city-states ‘private’ (οικός) was perceived as something obscure, hidden, withdrawn and shameful that should remain invisible and not be made public or done in public (Arendt, 1998; Habermas, 1991). In everyday discourse, ‘private’ may refer to something belonging to an individual or that is of concern only to an individual, but not of the public interest. Conversely, it can be used to imply something that is entitled to be hidden from the public or that should be protected from possible surveillance and intervention (Weintraub & Kumar, 1997). Rose (1999) points out, for example, that in liberal political philosophy the division into public and private is used to legitimatise state intervention or non-intervention in certain affairs. Calhoun (1997, p. 85) makes a similar point when he says that “relegation to the realm of private can be in varying degrees both a protection from public intervention or observation and a disempowering exclusion from public discourse”. In economic discourse, on the other hand, the private-public distinction is discussed in relation to state administration and the market economy (Geuss, 2001; Weintraub, 1997). In feminist theories, the private sphere is usually linked to the family (and intimacy), rather than to the market and the political (Weintraub, 1997). In sociological thought, ‘private’ can denote a fundamental category of ordering in everyday life as well as “connotate anxieties, choices and diagnoses” (Bailey, 2000, p. 384), while ‘public’ is consistently privileged as an idea, as a concern, as a project (Bailey, 2002, p. 18).

The list of conceptualisations of public and private in different discourses and theories can, of course, be expanded, which would, however, go beyond the scope of this study. What I want to illustrate here is that the dominant definition of ‘private supplementary tutoring’ relies on the somewhat impoverished notion of ‘private’, which has immediate implications for how tutoring practices are conceived, theorised, and explored.

It is also important to emphasize that the distinction between public and private does not necessarily imply dichotomisation; things can be public in one sense and private in another (Warner, 2014). For example, state-mandated supplementary tutoring provided by schools is ‘public’ if it is available to everyone for free (see e.g., the Swedish example in Forsberg et al., 2020). However, since it is often provided in informal and individualised settings, it is also ‘private’. Conversely, paid tutoring is ‘private’ in the economic sense of the term, but when it mimics a formal curriculum, it simultaneously transmits
knowledge, norms, and values that are ‘public’. To put another way, the public and the private can be seen as two ends of the same continuum; just as it is impossible to distinguish the outside from the inside on a Möbius strip, to use another metaphor, it is sometimes difficult to determine when ‘the public’ ends and ‘the private’ begins. Yet, the perspective from which they are defined at a particular historical moment reflects, and indeed shapes, the ways of thinking, governing, researching, and making sense of various educational practices.

The second component of the term, *supplementation*, positions private tutoring as something inferior to mainstream education. According to Bray (2017, p. 473), ‘supplementation’ implies that tutoring covers “subjects already taught in school”. However, as mentioned earlier, research on shadow education is not concerned with private lessons in music, arts, and sports, which usually are parts of the school curriculum. This excludes the possibility of seeing private tutoring as a practice aimed at whole-person development. In the meantime, it is assumed that schooling fulfils such a task (see e.g., Zhang & Bray, 2021). Another question worth considering is whether tutoring supplements school, family, or both?

As mentioned above, recent research has shown that the role of private tutoring is not limited to supplementation. Indeed, various forms of tutoring may also expand, complement, or supplant public schooling (Bhorkar & Bray, 2018; Luan et al., 2020). In these cases, tutoring overshadows mainstream education in terms of time spent in classrooms and the content of instruction.

The last component, *tutoring*, implies a specific mode of teaching, usually one-on-one or in small groups. However, given the variety of tutoring practices that have emerged in recent decades, including mass tutoring, online tutoring, and tutoring theatres (see e.g., Malik, 2017), this part of the term can be confusing. Furthermore, it seems reasonable to ask whether and to what extent private tutoring counts as *education* and what distinguishes *tutoring* from *teaching*.

**Overcoming Conceptual Challenges**

It should be clear by this point that there are no universal and ‘neutral’ ways in which the concepts of *shadow education* and *private supplementary tutoring* can be defined. It is also evident that the conceptualisation of private tutoring as a supplement to or shadow of public education sets certain constraints on how the relationship between the two can be conceived and blackboxes the complexity of interactions taking place there.

Instead of assuming the superiority of public in relation to private, I suggest exploring empirically how they have come into historical being, how the boundaries between them are set, and how their roles have changed over time. For that, both concepts can be used in a fairly broad sense. The notion of
shadow education can potentially refer to various educational activities, including cram schools, preparatory courses, after-school programmes, home-schooling, private tutoring, unschooling, supplementary, and extra-curricular education. Indeed, many of these practices have historically constituted undifferentiated, natural parts of elite education in most Western societies, but as public education expanded, their role became increasingly diverse (see chapters 5 to 7). Although home-schooling, private tutoring and extra-curricular education may be regulated by national governments, they are largely hidden from direct supervision and control. Moreover, while they appear to be growing and enjoying renewed acceptance in various parts of the world (Aurini & Davies, 2005), they still are under-theorised and, in this sense, remain in the shadow of public education. However, I argue that none of these practices can be defined as ‘shadow education’ beforehand, without an empirical investigation into whether they ‘shadow’ or are ‘in the shadow’ of the mainstream system. For this reason, in this dissertation I use the concept of ‘shadow education’ in reviewing previous studies but not as an analytical concept.

By private tutoring I mean teaching in school-related subjects which takes place outside and/or instead of regular school classes. Although most of the empirical examples analysed below concern paid private tutoring, fee-paying and profit-making were not considered distinctive characteristics of the research object. I also avoid the label ‘supplementary’ because it implies a reductive understanding of what private tutoring is or can be. The ‘privateness’ of tutoring practices is defined here in relation to ‘publicness’ of state education institutions. For the sake of simplicity, by public education I refer to education designed and/or controlled by national or local authorities and which is at least to some extent governmental’ (cf. Archer, 2013, p. 54). To demonstrate the fluidity of the boundaries between the private and the public, I also discuss those forms of tutoring that might be called ‘public’ (chapters 7 and 8).

This conceptual openness allows for the inclusion of various forms of private tutoring—such as free-of-charge tutoring, school-based tutoring programs, home-schooling—without assuming their supplementary nature and without attributing too much explanatory value to neoliberal ideology. Seen through this lens, an investigation of private tutoring and its role in relation to public education can put the conventional narratives about the formation of education in a new perspective.

I am aware that the proposed definitions are inevitably tentative and are not based on any universal criterion that could be used to distinguish ‘public’ from ‘private’ across different discourses and contexts. However, I do not think it is possible to completely avoid the preconceptions embedded in these notions without making the research object too abstract and elusive. In defining public

---

7 This definition would, however, not be suitable for countries such as England where public schools are not run by the government.
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education and private tutoring, I sought to avoid a priori negative assumptions, without going to the opposite extreme of romanticising one or the other. My definition puts the emphasis on one distinction that articulates the relation of different forms of education to government. The relevance of this distinction for the study at hand is that it foregrounds the role of government in drawing and redrawing the boundaries between the legitimate and the problematic, the public and the private, and in structuring education along these lines.

Aim and Research Questions

This dissertation sets out to provide a genealogy of the relations between the public and the private in education. It does so by exploring how public education and private tutoring form and transform each other, and why different tutoring practices are seen as legitimate or problematic in specific historical and cultural settings.

Genealogy is viewed here through the lens of problematisation\(^8\) and draws on empirical examples from the Russian context. More specifically, I examine the ways in which private tutoring has been problematised in Russia over the past three centuries and discuss how these problematisations both reflect and shape the dominant visions of education.

In the next two sections I will explain why Russia presents a suitable case for the study and describe the historical periods on which the analysis is focused.

Private Tutoring in Russia: Introducing the Case

In Russia, the tradition of providing education through private tutoring is at least as old as public schools themselves (see e.g., Fedyukin, 2019; Kondratieva, 2008; Mikhailova, 2019b; Solodiankina, 2008). A tutor, or *repetitor*, as it is called in Russian, could be a home teacher who assisted a student with his or her studies, or a teacher under whose guidance students living in boarding schools completed their homework. In fact, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries different forms of private tutoring were so widespread that they soon became the subject of laws and regulations (see chapters 5 to 7).

Despite the changed political environment, private tutoring did not disappear under the Soviet rule when collective values were paramount and almost any sort of private enterprise was strongly discouraged (see chapter 8). Moreover, the 1980s saw the emergence in Soviet Russia of so-called ‘shadow pedagogy’ (Zhukov, 1990); that is, schools run by cooperatives whose main task was to remedy the shortcomings of state schools.

\(^8\) For a theoretical elaboration of the notion of ‘problematisation’, see chapter 3.
After the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991, a whole industry re-emerged providing tutoring of various kinds at all levels of the national education system: from preschools to primary and secondary schools and all the way up to higher education. Today, the majority of Russian citizens perceive private tutoring, or *repetitorstvo*, as an integral element of education (Bolshov, 2018; Forsberg et al., 2019; Krylova, 2011; Mogilev & Pervakova, 2014).

Although there are no accurate nationwide statistics on the prevalence and variety of tutoring practices, the polling data indicates that it is rather widespread and growing. According to the *Russian Public Opinion Research Centre*, the number of respondents insisting on the need for additional tutoring classes for those wishing to enrol in higher education has increased from 65 percent in 2016 to 72 percent in 2018 (VCIOM, 2016, 2018). In the most recent survey, 42 percent of school graduates reported that they had hired private tutors to prepare for the Unified State Examination\(^9\) (VCIOM, 2019). Another survey conducted in 2019 by the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration (RANEPA, 2020) found that 25.9 percent of families employed private tutors and 13.2 percent paid for extra classes at school.

Whilst tutoring has clearly become a mass phenomenon in contemporary Russia, it is rarely subject to political regulation. Experts attribute this to a lack of knowledge, which prevents effective action, even though the attempts aimed at bringing private tutors out of the shadows are said to have been made in recent decades (Makeev, 2019). As such, private tutoring remains in the informal sector as tutors are encouraged but not required to register with the tax authorities and their services are not subject to licensing. Against this background it is understandable why the term ‘shadow education’ is often used by Russian scholars analogously to ‘shadow economy’; that is, it refers to something that exists on a semi-legal basis and outside of public control (see e.g., Balakina, 2012).

On the other hand, the lack of policy on private tutoring may mean that it is not seen as a problem to be solved. Indeed, in Russian research literature *repetitorstvo* (private tutoring) is often described in positive terms as “a constant and necessary [emphasis added] companion” to schooling (Mogilev & Pervakova, 2014, p. 173) and as part of “a holistic (formal, non-formal and informal) educational process” (Shipkova, 2018, p. 40). This does not mean, of course, that possible negative consequences are not problematised (e.g., Balakina, 2012; Kravchenko, 2016). However, an ambivalent and positive attitude towards tutoring seems to dominate\(^10\).

---

\(^9\) Unified State Examination (hereinafter the USE) is a standardised high-stakes test introduced in Russian in 2001 (see chapter 9).

\(^{10}\) See, for example, Balakina’s (2012) article on the economics of private tutoring in which she lists seven positive and only four negative traits of the practice.
Accordingly, there are calls not for laws and regulations, but for creating conditions for the convergence of mass public education and private tutoring (Mogilev & Pervakova, 2014). Sannikov (2021) argues, for example, that private tutoring is not only and not so much an economic phenomenon, but primarily a pedagogical activity. He believes that studying private tutoring can generate new pedagogical knowledge that “can make adjustments to teacher training methods” (Sannikov, 2021, p. 194). Based on similar considerations, others suggest that tutoring methods should be included in the curricula of teacher training institutions (Shipkova, 2018) and that research into tutoring services can provide parents with a scientific basis for choosing the right type of private teacher for their children (Raikhelgauz, 2019).

Clearly, the Russian case differs from others in many ways. Firstly, while international research presents shadow education as a hidden, unregulated, and undesirable phenomenon, in Russian academic discourse repetitorstvo is generally discussed in a more positive light. Secondly, while most governments, according to Zhang and Bray (2021, p. 46), view shadow education “as problematic, rather than something to be encouraged”, the Russian government does not seem to regard it as a problem requiring intervention. However, this has not always been the case. As already noted, private tutoring was indeed a subject of heated policy and public debate in Imperial and Soviet Russia.

In sum, Russia provides an interesting case for exploring tutoring practices, both from a historical and contemporary perspective. In the following section I outline the historical periods in which the major changes in the relationship between the public and the private in Russian education are studied.

Outlining the Timeframe: Imperial, Soviet and Post-Soviet Russia

In order to understand the logic behind the changing roles of public education and private tutoring in relation to one another, this dissertation explores some critical moments in the history of Russian education when the meanings of ‘public’ and ‘private’ become subject to revision. Chronologically, the study covers three periods—Imperial (1721–1917), Soviet (1917–1991) and post-Soviet (1991–onwards) Russia—and traces several waves of nationalisation and privatisation, broadly defined as the expansion or reduction of state provisions for education.

The imperial period stretches over two centuries and is commonly described as a time of nationalisation of education. During this period, the first state schools emerged and the responsibility for education gradually shifted
from the private to the public sector\footnote{It should be noted that the first state schools (the so-called cypher schools) were opened in 1714, that is, before Peter proclaimed Russia an empire in 1721.}. However, the consistent preference for private education on the part of the general public, and especially the nobility, hindered the development of schools. It was against this background that the government began to problematise the traditional ways of gaining knowledge through apprenticeship and private tutoring.

The next period, the Soviet era, is characterised by several ideological shifts. In the first post-revolutionary years, the process of nationalising of education reached its apotheosis, and the very notion of ‘private’ became an ideological taboo. However, along with the gradual liberalisation of the political regime and the introduction of compulsory secondary education\footnote{In Russian usage, ‘secondary education’ includes the primary level.} in the post-World War II period, Soviet education saw a development of quasi-market mechanisms such as school choice, competitive school admission, and outcome-based teacher accountability. This marked a turn to what Ball and Youdell (2008) call endogenous privatisation, or privatisation in education.

A more ‘complete’ form of privatisation arrived in post-Soviet Russia. Passionate about market-building, the state loosened its control over education, allowing non-state actors to participate in the provision of educational services. However, the authoritarian tendencies of the last two decades signalled a tighter state control of educational activities (prosvetitel’skaya deyatel’nost’), carried out outside state institutions. This marked a new shift towards re-nationalisation of education (see chapters 10 and 11).

As mentioned, private tutoring existed throughout these periods. Consequently, it would be a mistake to presume any intrinsic links between the rise and decline of private tutoring, on the one hand, and privatisation and nationalisation of education, on the other. Nor is there a linear development from nationalisation to privatisation and back again. Rather, it can be assumed that the history of relations between public and private education is characterised by continuities and breaks, internal contradictions and ideological compromises arising from and reflecting different visions of education and the desired society. Thus, by inquiring into the history of problematisations of private tutoring in relation to the mainstream system this dissertation also offers a lens for reimagining the history of education and educational governance.

It should be noted that this study does not offer exhaustive accounts of each of the three periods. Instead, as mentioned, I examine in more depth some critical moments when private tutoring became the subject of intense public debate, and ultimately, the target of direct or indirect policy action.
Disposition

The dissertation comprises 11 chapters. Following the introduction, in which I outline the research object, the context and present the aim of the study, chapter 2 provides a review of international research on shadow education and situates the present project in relation to it. Based on a systematic approach, I describe three topics in previous studies on shadow education—its nature, determinants, and outcomes—and summarise the main findings. This part of the chapter also offers a meta-analysis of the public and private arrangements of private tutoring observed in different countries. Thereafter, I look more closely at research on policy issues and private tutoring in Russia.

Chapters 3 and 4 develop theoretical as well as methodological and analytical frameworks. Chapter 3 lays out the theoretical precursors that inform the study. It starts with a brief overview of how curriculum theory has been used in previous research on shadow education. After that it develops the argument that curriculum can be understood as a boundary object that relates to and determines, albeit in varying degrees, both public and ‘shadow’ education. I then turn to Foucault, and particularly to his notions of governmentality and problematisation, and discuss how the postmodern approach differs from more conventional ways of theorising the curriculum. One of the main arguments made in this chapter is that curriculum and, more broadly, education policy, reflect and shape our ways of thinking about what “ills” need to be cured in order to produce the desired citizen and the desired society.

Guided by these theoretical assumptions, in chapter 4 I present the methodology and methods deployed to examine problematisations of private tutoring, their presuppositions, and effects. First, I present Carol Bacchi’s post-structural approach to policy analysis and elaborate on the adjustments made in this dissertation to examine the absence of policies on private tutoring in contemporary Russia. Second, I discuss general considerations for data collection and analysis and the limitations of the developed approach.

Chapters 5 to 7 focus on the imperial period in Russian history and examine how problematisations of private tutoring kept changing alongside the gradual expansion of public education. More specifically, chapter 5 explores how private education was conceived and regulated in the long eighteenth century. In this chapter I discuss three dominant questions around which the policy debate about private education evolved: 1) the question of tutors’ competence; 2) the question of curricular compliance; and 3) the question of privilege and merit. I explore why these questions arose in this specific historical context and how they were ‘answered’ in policy and public discourses.

In chapter 6, I focus on the first half of the nineteenth century and analyse how the same set of questions were reinterpreted and modified in accordance with a nationalist vision of education. Particular attention is paid to the ways in which certain forms of private tutoring were aligned with reimagined national values and turned into legitimate alternatives to public education. The
chapter argues that the mimicking character of some forms of private tutoring is the result of numerous problematisations rather than a natural feature.

Chapter 7 deals with the rise of supplementary tutoring in tsarist Russia. The first part of the chapter focuses more narrowly on the etymology of the Russian word *repetitor* and its use in policy documents and informal sources. This part of the chapter examines public supplementary tutoring, that is, tutoring provided by public institutions. In the second part, I explore the conditions which made the rise of private supplementary tutoring possible.

Chapter 8 is devoted to the Soviet period. It begins with a brief overview of Soviet policy from the first post-revolutionary years to the early 1960s and traces some of the changes in the official view on the private in general. The bulk of the chapter analyses empirical sources from the last three decades of Soviet rule, focusing on how the problem of private tutoring was reconceptualised in relation to core communist values such as collectivism, solidarity, and uniformity. The chapter also examines how references to the ‘evils’ of private tutoring were used to justify changes in public education.

The turn towards a market economy in late Soviet and, especially, post-Soviet Russia brought to the forefront new concerns with tutoring practices, which are discussed in chapters 9 and 10. In particular, chapter 9 focuses on the modernisation reforms in the early 2000s. Here, I explore how appeals to the undesirable effects of the hidden tutoring market were invoked to legitimise major reforms in public education. The chapter also discusses how the questions of curricular uniformity and social justice inherent in the Soviet era were re-articulated in the neoliberal language of standardisation, quality, competition, and accountability.

Chapter 10 offers another example, albeit of a different nature, of post-Soviet policy formation. In contrast to the previous empirical chapters, it focuses on one single question, namely the ethical concerns about tutoring supplied by in-service teachers to their own students. Firstly, it discusses how this practice has been conceptualised in previous research on shadow education. Secondly, it historicises the phenomenon by discussing how it has been viewed and dealt with in Russia. Thirdly, it analyses the formation of the 2012 *Law on Education*, in which the government attempted to prohibit teachers from tutoring their own students. For this purpose, I delve into the public commentary on the bill and examine how citizens participating in the law-making process challenged the established ethical problematisation, pointing out its inherent contradictions. The chapter thus highlights issues ignored by the government and rarely discussed in international research on shadow education.

The final chapter synthesises the main results and discusses them in light of most recent political developments in Russia. In particular, I reflect on how and why private tutoring and other related practices have come to be seen and problematised as part of shadow *economy* rather than shadow *education* in Russia. Thereafter, the chapter summarises persisting themes in reasoning about the problems of private tutoring and discusses how the ‘diagnosis’ of
the problem has been revised in the wake of nationalist, communist and neo-liberal visions of education. I also elaborate on the reasons for the seeming lack of policies on private tutoring in contemporary Russia. Particular attention is paid to indirect mechanisms of governing informal education practices through the curriculum. Lastly, I discuss how government attempts to forbid, delegitimise, or decrease the demand for private tutoring have simultaneously (trans)formed, and continue to (trans)form, the nature of public education.
The increased interest in out-of-school educational activities in recent decades has generated an extensive body of research literature. In this chapter, I summarise the findings of international research on shadow education and contextualise the study within the field.

The chapter consists of two larger parts. The first part presents the findings of a systematic review and outlines three of the main topics in previous research. In addition, this part of the chapter offers a meta-analysis of different arrangements of tutoring practices with regard to provision and funding. The second part examines more narrowly topics that are of particular relevance for this dissertation, namely, studies that focus on (a) policy issues and (b) private tutoring in the Russian context. The final section situates the current study within the wider literature and highlights its empirical and theoretical contributions to different strands of educational research.

**Review Methodology**

The data for the systematic part of this review was gathered in spring 2018 by searching the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), Scopus, Web of Science, as well as the library database of Uppsala University, Sweden. Keywords and phrases used in the literature search included *private tutoring*, *private tuition*, *private supplementary tutoring*, *supplementary education*, and *shadow education*. This strategy yielded around 500 publications. The rather large initial pool was narrowed down on the basis of relevance; since the study at hand focuses on tutoring in school subjects, research on tutoring in preschool or higher education as well as peer tutoring was excluded. It was also a requirement that publications be based on original, scholarly research (i.e., reports and book reviews were excluded). There were no restrictions regarding research design with both qualitative (n=83)\(^{13}\), quantitative (n=69) and mixed (n=10) methods included\(^ {14}\). Finally, lists of references were searched for additional studies. This selection procedure resulted in 179 texts published between 1999 and 2018.

---

\(^{13}\) Here and below in this chapter \( n \) refers to the number of studies of specific type or on specific topic.

\(^{14}\) In several cases, it did not follow from the abstracts what method had been used.
In analysing the sources, I first screened the titles, abstracts and keywords of each study and read the full texts of all papers that I found interesting and relevant for the purpose of this dissertation. After that, I coded the texts manually with regard to their topics as well as temporal (which historical period is in focus) and spatial (what country or region is in focus) dimensions. The thematic coding resulted in 31 codes, some of which were grouped into three broader categories (see Table 2).

Table 2. Main topics in previous research on shadow education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature (n=34)</th>
<th>Driving factors (n=58)</th>
<th>Outcomes (n=79)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patterns of participation</td>
<td>Determinants (structural factors)</td>
<td>Social outcomes (equity/equality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typology of provision</td>
<td>Demands (individual factors)</td>
<td>Learning outcomes (effectiveness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>Supply</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is worth noting that as the initial selection of research papers was done on the basis of my screening of titles and abstracts, there may be an inherent bias in the sample, because the abstracts do not always accurately reflect the content of the reported study. Consequently, it cannot be ruled out that some publications, research questions and topics were deemed irrelevant and left outside the scope of the review.

Secondly, the review is based on works written in English, which means that it cannot and does not show a complete picture of the whole field. Nevertheless, the findings of this review are indicative for what aspects of shadow education have been problematised and researched, in what contexts and from what perspectives.

Thirdly, and related to the second point, the review gives only a limited insight into how private tutoring has been addressed in research reported in the Russian language. This is partly due to the restricted access to Russian databases from abroad and also to the fact that most of the studies I was able to find contained poor descriptions of the data and methodology. To compensate for this, the previous chapter provided a brief overview of Russian research on private tutoring.

Finally, as mentioned, the data for the review was collected in 2018 and does not reflect more recent research. However, the findings of later publications are taken into account in other parts of the dissertation.
The Main Topics of Previous Research on Shadow Education

What is the Nature of Shadow Education?

Shadow education, it bears repeating, is a relatively new area of educational research. It comes therefore as no surprise that many studies are concerned with the nature of the phenomena to which the metaphorical concept refers.

A cursory analysis of the literature suggests that the notion of ‘nature’ can refer to different characteristics of the research object, such as forms and types of provision, scale, costs, quality, patterns of participation and conceptualisations of the term itself. For example, Bray (2010, 2013b) writes that the nature of private tutoring is determined by class size—from individual tutoring to mass lecture theatres—and by personal and professional qualifications of tutors, which affect the quality of tutoring. He also outlines the different forms of tutoring that are emerging thanks to advances in technology: in fact, tutoring can be provided not only in the form of traditional lectures, but also by telephone or via video conferencing. Similarly, Silova (2010, p. 332) discusses types of tutoring (private lessons and preparatory courses) in her analysis of the nature of supplementary tutoring in Eastern Europe and Central Asia. Here again, the notion of ‘nature’ refers to typology.

Moreover, research into the nature of private supplementary tutoring often involves an attempt to assess its spread in a particular country or region. In such instances, the ‘nature’ of the phenomenon is described in quantitative terms. For example, in one of the most cited publications in the field, Bray and Kwok (2003) argue that, despite various methodological challenges, it is possible to “secure some estimates of the scale and nature of private supplementary tutoring” (p. 611). Here the notion of ‘nature’ is clearly ascribed measurable characteristics.

In general, studies on the nature of shadow education offer overwhelmingly descriptive (forms and types of provision), often quantitative (prevalence, costs) and largely under-theorised accounts of the phenomenon. In the following section, I synthesise the findings of this line of research and place them in relation to privatisation literature. In so doing, I want to show the complexity of the relations between the public and the private in education as manifested in the plethora of arrangements of tutoring practices in different parts of the world.

Public and Private Arrangements of Tutoring: A Meta-Analysis

The diverse nature of tutoring services in different historical and cultural contexts generated considerable variation in conceptualisations of the phenomenon (see e.g., Brehm, 2017; Kim & Jung, 2019a; Malik, 2017). Davis (2013) makes a distinction between two bodies of research that conceptualise private
tutoring as ‘supplementary education’ or as ‘shadow education’. According to Davis, the concept of shadow education deals with tuition conducted outside schools and in exchange for a fee. This concept is widely used in studies focusing on East Asia, Europe, and the former Eastern Bloc. The term supplementary education, on the other hand, includes non-commercial and voluntary forms of tutoring and is used more often in studies on the United States, the United Kingdom and Canada. To develop this argument, I would argue that in the research literature, the term ‘shadow education’ usually points to tutoring services that are privately provided and financed and, thus, operate largely outside state control. By contrast, the term “supplementary education” entails a more formal relationship between public and private education sectors, as it is often sanctioned by local governments.

Previous research has shown that shadow education activities can take place outside and inside schools, in parallel to or instead of regular classes, one-on-one or in large groups, for free or for a fee, etc. In order to put the research object in a broader perspective or, conversely, to capture specific forms of private tutoring, other concepts have been used alongside the elaborated term of private tutoring/tuition. These include supplementary or supplemental education (Aurini et al., 2013; Deke et al., 2014; Dierkes, 2013; Mori & Baker, 2010), outside-school learning/education (Baker et al., 2001; Stecher & Maschke, 2013), extended instruction time (Gromada & Shewbridge, 2016), all-day schools (Fisher & Klieme, 2013), bespoke education (Davis, 2013), and pre-entry coaching (Prakhov, 2017). On the one hand, such definitions are broad enough to allow comparison across space and time. On the other, they inevitably impose patterns of thinking that are not suitable for many local contexts. Thus, in addition to the English terms, a number of trans-lite-rated terms such as Japanese juku, Korean hakwon, Cambodian rień kuo, Taiwanese buxigan, Greek frontistiria, German Nachhilfe and Swedish läxhjälp have been used to better reflect the country-specific characteristics of the phenomenon. These concepts offer a deeper insight into the cases in question but make cross-cultural comparisons difficult.

Besides individually purchased tutoring supplied by private entrepreneurs, in many countries there exist ‘public’ forms of tutoring provided in school settings on a non-commercial basis, often as part of an extended after-school program (e.g., South Korea’s Educational Broadcasting system). Even mixed models have been observed in contexts where local governments subsidise remedial tutoring for economically disadvantaged and low-performing students.\footnote{For references, see the section on pro- and anti-tutoring policies in this chapter.}

Voluntary tutoring is described by Tan (2017) and Zambeta (2014). Tan (2017) shows that in the Singaporean context, private tutoring is available to families from all social classes, as it is often subsidised or provided free of charge by ethnic self-help groups and non-profit organisations. A similar case
is reported by Zambeta (2014), who studied the role of “social frontistiria” in Greece. She notes that in times of economic crisis, various actors, including local authorities, non-profit organisations, the Church, and parents’ associations provide free access to private tutoring.

Figure 1 below brings together the findings from the previous research and literature on privatisation and illustrates multiple arrangements of supplementary tutoring with regard to provision and financing. The model is adapted from studies on private-public partnerships in education (Patrinos et al., 2009; Verger & Moschetti, 2016), where private tutoring is traditionally placed in the intersection between private provision and private funding. However, a meta-analysis of previous research on shadow education challenges the understanding of supplementary tutoring as an exclusively private enterprise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supplementary tutoring outside the school walls</td>
<td>• Preparatory courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tutoring provided by school-teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Voluntary tutoring (provided by private bodies or NGOs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>• Subsidies/vouchers for remedial tutoring</td>
<td>• School based tutoring programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1. Provision and financing of (supplementary) tutoring. The model adapted from Patrinos, Barrera-Osorio and Guáqueta (2009).*

It should be noted that the prevalence of a particular type of tutoring can change over time, and that different types are combinable and can coexist in the same country (see e.g., Yamato & Zhang, 2017). It also deserves mentioning that certain types of tutoring, such as preparatory courses, can be set up by both public and private organisations. Similarly, tutoring services provided by public schools can charge fee (as e.g., in Russia) or be free of charge (e.g., Swedish läxhjälp). Certainly, in reality there is an even greater variety of public, private, and combined forms of tutoring.

This diversity of public and private arrangements can be conceived as different degrees of privatisation of education. For example, public funding of private tutoring targeted at certain groups can be seen as a component of public-private partnership or “exogenous privatisation” (Ball & Youdell, 2008), which is based on a contractual relationship between the state, tutoring agencies, and parents (see e.g., Robertson, Mundy, & Verger, 2012; Verger &
Moschetti, 2016). As in other forms of public-private partnerships, in this case the government does not provide remedial tutoring, but continuously funds, regulates and evaluates its providers (Robertson & Verger, 2012).

In contrast, other forms of tutoring do not emerge as part of a deliberate attempt to involve private actors in the provision of public services, but in response to public policy. This is especially true when schools are forced to operate as quasi-markets, emphasizing individual performance and outcome-based accountability. In Ball and Youdell’s (2008) terms, this could be described as “endogenous privatisation”, or privatisation in education.

The blurring of the public-private boundaries makes it sometimes impossible to distinguish one from the other. In many countries, as mentioned above, tutoring has become a legitimate and integral part of mainstream education. The intersections and merging of mainstream and shadow education in Japan are illuminated in Zhang and Bray’s (2017) study of different types of juku which have become entrenched in the public education agenda (see also Mori & Baker, 2010). In a similar vein, Paviot (2015) observes that in Kenya and Mauritius, private tutoring appears “to have evolved in such a way that we can no longer consider it a ‘parallel’ form of practice but instead as a crucial element in most pupils’ daily school life” (pp. 168–169).

Driving Factors

One of the most common strands of research on shadow education concentrates on socio-cultural determinants and individual demands for private tutoring. This line of research employs a range of sociological and educational theories (e.g., Bourdieu, rational choice theory, game theory, grounded theory, critical theory, Bronfenbrenner’s ecological systems theory, and digital Taylorism) as explanatory frameworks.

Among the most pervasive determinants associated with the growth of private tutoring are market-driven policies, which are seen as putting competitive pressure upon national education systems (Baker et al., 2001; Ghosh & Bray, 2018). In addition, research on shadow education has identified a variety of country-specific factors contributing to the expansion of private supplementary tutoring in a particular country or region. For example, the immense popularity of tutoring services in Asian countries such as Japan, the Republic of Korea, and China, traditionally presented as the cradle of private tutoring, is frequently attributed to the Confucian approach to learning, with its emphasis on diligence, visible and strongly framed pedagogy, and “tiger parenting” (Bray & Kwo, 2014; Butler et al., 2017; Sriprakash et al., 2016; Zhang, 2014). Put differently, the high rates of private tutoring in Asian countries have been described as a cultural, and even racial, feature. In contrast, scholars who have studied the demands for private tutoring in low-income countries, including post-Soviet societies, placed a greater weight on economic factors such as teacher salaries, their social status, and unemployment (Atalmis et al., 36
Other factors facilitating the uptake of private tutoring include curriculum-related issues; that is, the depth and breadth, the vertical and horizontal consistency, and the relevance of the formal curriculum (Altinyelken, 2013; Jokić, 2013; Pearce et al., 2018). These factors have proven to play an important role in shaping individuals’ demand for private tutoring. For example, in their study of private tutoring in the Australian context, Sriprakash et al. (2016) show how a mismatch between parents’ perceptions of good pedagogy and the characteristics of the formal curriculum force them to employ tutors. Drawing on Bernstein’s conceptual apparatus, the study makes a distinction between visible and invisible pedagogies. Visible pedagogy is characterised by a strong framing expressed through “strong boundaries between subject areas, single modes of assessment with explicit and rigid criteria for evaluation, and overt hierarchies between teacher-student relationships” (p. 429). Invisible pedagogy, on the other hand, privileges cross-curricular, interdisciplinary activities, tacit rules, weaker control, and an inclusive, democratic relationship. The study shows that middle-class parents with a Chinese background seek additional classes for their children because they are concerned about the gap between the weakly framed pedagogical approach of Australian schooling and the strongly framed examination system. For them, the use of private tutoring with more explicit, “visible” forms of instruction and assessments has become a pedagogical strategy to compensate for the perceived imbalance of the Australian curriculum. Sriprakash et al. (2016) argue that a focus on pedagogy helps to shift attention from viewing private tutoring as a cultural phenomenon, as it is framed in the dominant public discourse in contemporary Australia, to understanding it as an expression of new class struggles over educational codes in what Bernstein calls a “totally pedagogised society”.

Other studies suggest that different aspects of public education, such as testing regimes, exam stakes, and selection strategies, can influence the level of tutoring consumption (Jokić, 2013; Pearce et al., 2018). Loss of confidence in mainstream education, particularly evident in post-Soviet countries (Silova, 2010), is also one of the factors generating demands for private tutoring (Dierkes, 2013).

As participation in private supplementary tutoring is understood as a rational decision made by individuals (Ireson & Rushforth, 2014; Jokić, 2013), many studies focus on micro (individual) factors that come into play in the decision to hire a tutor. Employing a tutor is often seen as a component of parental involvement or as an indicator of “parentocracy” (Doherty & Dooley, 2017; Park et al., 2011; Sriprakash et al., 2016; Tan, 2017). The analytical focus of these studies is not on students’ abilities and efforts, but on parents’ wealth and desires as important factors in shaping children’s educational
paths. It is suggested that beliefs about education, previous and current school experiences, and educational aspirations are important determinants of the prevalence and purpose of shadow education (Davis, 2013; Ireson & Rushforth, 2014; Jokić, 2013; Kwo & Bray, 2014).

Finally, it has been observed that the demand for private tutoring can be generated not only by mainstream systems, but also by tutoring agencies themselves (Zhang & Bray, 2015). This can be done through subtle “nudges” or more explicit and sometimes aggressive advertising strategies (Doherty & Dooley, 2017; Dooley et al., 2018; Hallén & Karlsson, 2018; Koh, 2016) that cause students (and parents) to doubt whether they can master their studies without additional help.

Outcomes

Research on the outcomes of shadow education can be divided into two subcategories (see Table 2). The first one examines the implications for schools, students, parents, and tutoring providers in terms of equality and justice (Bae et al., 2010; Bray, 2013a; Bray et al., 2013; Bray & Kwo, 2013; Entrich, 2018; Hartmann, 2013; Mazawi et al., 2013). The predominant argument here is that private supplementary tutoring reproduces social hierarchies by providing privileged access to education to social groups with strong economic, social, and educational capital (Addi-Raccah & Dana, 2015; Brehm & Silova, 2014; Dang & Rogers, 2008; Huang, 2017). What undermines this argument is the fact that tutoring is used not only by wealthy families (Davies, 2004) and, as discussed, can be supplied on a non-commercial basis. Moreover, it can also serve as a means of ensuring equal educational opportunities (Entrich, 2018; Lubienski & Lee, 2013; Tan, 2017).

The second, and by far more popular, category of research addresses the effectiveness of private tutoring (Deke et al., 2014; Ha & Park, 2017; Hof, 2014; Ireson, 2004; Kim, 2015; Luplow & Schneider, 2014; Popov et al., 2002; Prakhov, 2017; Wittwer, 2008, 2014; Zhan et al., 2013; Zhang & Liu, 2016). One of the most frequently asked questions in these studies is whether tutoring actually helps students improve their academic performance, get higher test scores, and enrol in desired institutions. The rather contradictory results of this branch of research are discussed in reviews by Bray (2009), Dang and Rogers (2008), and Park et. al. (2016), to which I refer readers interested in this topic.

Interestingly, the effectiveness of tutoring is described almost exclusively in quantitative terms, suggesting that the underlying belief of these studies is that tutoring is about achieving measurable benefits. In the meantime, research on the demand for tutoring offers a more nuanced account, pointing to other reasons for seeking additional classes, including greater understanding of the school content, increased interest in a particular school subject, improved study skills, and increased confidence and self-esteem (Davis, 2013; Guill &...
Thus, it seems that the different strands of research do not communicate with one another and, as a consequence, offer a limited understanding of the complexity of the phenomenon in question.

Research on Policies on Shadow Education

Research on policies on shadow education has concentrated around two main themes; the first concerns the approaches through which policies respond to private tutoring (e.g., Bray, 2009; Bray & Kwo, 2014; Lee et al., 2010; Lubinski & Lee, 2013; Saha & Saha, 2009), whereas the second assesses policy outcomes against intended goals (e.g., Choi & Cho, 2016; Kim & Chang, 2010). Below I summarise the findings of the first category due to its greater relevance to this dissertation.

Bray (2007, pp. 74–77) describes six basic policy approaches to private supplementary tutoring depending on the degree of government involvement:

1. *A laissez-faire* approach means that the government ignores private tutoring, leaving it to market forces.
2. *Monitoring but not intervention* implies gathering information about the tutoring market without adopting any regulations. In this case, policymakers are aware of the existence of a hidden educational market and monitoring its development, but, again, allow the market to self-regulate. Bray notes, however, that it is unlikely that governments collect information without intending to take action (p. 75).
3. *Regulation and control* is a form of active government engagement, which may address both educational and non-educational features of tutoring services. For example, there may be regulations concerning the facilities, students’ safety, opening hours, class size, fees, and curricula.
4. *Encouragement* is another approach to regulation, where the government creates a favourable environment for the development of the tutoring market rather than imposing restrictions on it.
5. *Mixed approach* means that some forms of tutoring are banned while others are not. For instance, local ministries of education may strongly discourage schoolteachers from tutoring their own students, while other types of tutoring remain unregulated.
6. *Prohibition* is an extreme measure which implies a complete ban on all commercial forms of tutoring.

Bray (2007) notes that policy approaches are context-sensitive and should be understood accordingly.

Certainly, this variety of approaches reflects fundamental differences in the ideological underpinnings of policy decisions that bring private tutoring into or out of the shadow. This point will be developed in the next section.
Pro- and Anti-Tutoring Policies

In essence, the adoption of policies on private tutoring depends on government views on the appropriateness and implications of private sector participation in public education and the ability of private providers to steer it towards the desired—collective or individual—outcomes. Incentive-based approaches, observed mainly in the USA, the United Kingdom, France and Australia (Bray, 2009), promote market principles in education. They are based on the assumption that schools alone are not sufficient to ensure higher academic achievement for all students. In contrast, “anti-shadow” approaches, widely practised in Asian and African countries, seek to reduce the demand for tutoring by limiting the involvement of private providers in public education and strengthening alternative supplementary programs in schools.

Lubienski and Lee (2013) elaborated on this by comparing policies on supplementary education services in the USA and the Republic of Korea. In the USA, they observe, policy makers subsidise tutoring for economically and/or academically disadvantaged students as part of the No Child Left Behind initiative, thereby encouraging competition between schools and external providers. This policy approach is premised on the perceived benefits of diversifying providers, which, according to market logic, can better meet the needs of students and ultimately lead to the improved educational quality. In South Korea, on the other hand, the tutoring market is said to have “emerged organically” (p. 225) in response to public demand and has reached such a scale that it has come to be seen as problematic. Not surprisingly, policy makers have employed a range of different strategies over the past five decades, from prohibition and detailed regulation to the expansion of school-based alternatives to shadow education (Lee et al., 2010; Lubienski & Lee, 2013). Overall, Lubienski and Lee (2013) argue that policy designs are contingent on views of private supplementary tutoring as a cure or source of inequality.

Obviously, policy approaches can take different forms depending on the assumptions embedded in them. Encouraging policies, for example, can range from recognition in policy documents to the active promotion through subsidies, taxation breaks and the dissemination of information to stakeholders (Bray, 2007). What they have in common, according to Bray, is that they only address the needs of a limited group of students for whom tutoring is provided for remedial purposes.

Furthermore, it has been pointed out that policies pushing parents into the hands of private providers are based on the assumption that parents and guardians are or should be motivated to boost children’s academic achievement and are able to select the right supplementary education provider (Doherty & Dooley, 2017; Vergari, 2007). However, in the US, the popularity of supplementary education provided by the state has proven to be rather insignificant due to low parental support (Lubienski & Lee, 2013; Vergari, 2007). A similar situation has been reported in Australia, where the government’s Tutorial
A Voucher Initiative to fund remedial tutoring was met with little enthusiasm on the part of the parents (Doherty & Dooley, 2017). To normalise tutoring and provoke greater interest, Australian schools used a nudge policy strategy by letting tutoring business centres advertise their services in schools’ newsletters.

“Anti-shadow” policies may also vary widely. Lee et al (2010) distinguish between a causal treatment approach and a symptomatic treatment approach. The ‘causal treatment’ approach means that policy aims primarily at reforming public education, while the elimination of shadow education is only an indirect effect to be expected. In the Republic of Korea, for example, the introduction of the High School Equalisation Policy was designed to abolish high-stakes entrance examinations; at the same time, however, it was intended to restrain private tutoring by addressing perceived causes. The ‘symptomatic treatment approach’, as the name implies, means that government intervention is directed at treating the ‘symptoms’ rather than the causes of the problem. In the described Korean case, the symptomatic treatment approach would have been to legislate a ban on all forms of paid exam preparation services, rather than to reform public education.

The Fear of Laissez-Faire

Among the different policy approaches to private tutoring, laissez-faire has received the least attention in the research literature. If such an approach is identified, it rarely becomes the subject of theoretical reflection.

Silova’s (2010) analysis of policy responses to shadow education in the post-socialist countries of Eastern Europe and Central Asia in the 1990s is illustrative in this respect. The study argues that private tutoring expanded dramatically in the context of extensive market-driven reforms as it was able to adapt more quickly to the new socio-political reality than “the rigid mainstream education system” (p. 328). Silova points out that since the fall of the Soviet Union, public expenditures on education have declined, affecting both the legitimacy of the teaching profession and the quality of the mainstream system. Combined with an increased demand for higher education, these developments created fertile ground for “the unprecedented growth” of supplementary tutoring. Nonetheless, according to Silova, private tutoring is largely ignored by policy makers in the region; in six out of twelve countries studied, there is no legislative frameworks, other than discouraging teachers from tutoring their own students. Moreover, the study suggests that all countries face difficulties in implementing existing legislative mechanisms. Among these difficulties, Silova highlights

(1) burdensome, bureaucratic procedures for the legalization of private tutoring; (2) a lack of legal enforcement; (3) an absence of implementation mechanisms; and (4) insufficient taxation incentives. (Silova, 2010, p. 337)
While describing the difficulties of policy enactment in some Eastern and Central European countries, the study does not explain in any further detail why, in similar economic and political contexts, some governments respond to the “pervasive” and often “distorting” phenomenon of private tutoring, while others leave it unattended.

In general, the absence of policies on private tutoring is often considered problematic. Perhaps this is why almost every study concludes with policy recommendations, even in settings where private supplementary tutoring is not very common. As the saying goes, “prevention of undesirable dimensions is better than cure” (Bray & Lykins, 2012, p. 72).

However, as Rizvi and Lingard (2009, p. 4) point out “non-decision-making is as much an expression of policy as are the actual decisions made”. As noted in the introductory chapter, a lack of regulation can be seen as a deliberate strategy to shift responsibility for educational and other dilemmas to the private realm or to exclude some publics from the public sphere (Calhoun, 1997; Fraser, 1992, 1997). Thus, it is as important to understand why policy makers do not regulate certain educational practices as it is to understand why they do so. The idea that state intervention does not necessarily entail equalisation and democratisation of education should also be allowed for.

What is Regulated and by Whom?

With much attention given to policy strategies (i.e., how policy makers respond to private tutoring) and policy effects (i.e., whether those strategies are successful), surprisingly little thought has been given to the content of those policies (i.e., what type and aspects of private tutoring are addressed) and the rationale underpinning policy decisions (i.e., why it should or should not be addressed).

As an example, Lao’s (2014) analysis of Thai state policy on private tutoring distinguishes between educational and commercial regulations. The former deal with pedagogy, curriculum, and teacher qualifications, while the latter relate to financial arrangements and transparency, management, and advertising. Lao’s interviews with the owners of private tutoring institutions suggest that commercial requirements are fairly straightforward and can be easily enforced and monitored, while those concerning the quality are much more complex. Drawing on the theory of policy as text and policy as discourse, Lao seeks to explore which actors influence the process of policy formulation and enactment, paying particular attention to institutions that control implementation. Among other things, Lao points out that policy makers in Thailand are often faced with the dilemma of whether private tutoring should be treated as a commercial or educational practice. However, as current Thai policy is dominated by market ideology, it comes as no surprise, the article sums up, that commercial issues prevail over educational ones.
Clearly, an analysis of the institutions and actors involved in policy making can be revealing. By positioning the phenomenon as educational or commercial, policies not only seek to solve different problems, but also reflect different systems of values. I return to this point in chapter 3.

Research on Private Tutoring in Russia

As a worldwide enterprise, private tutoring provides rich material for comparative educational research. Indeed, twenty-three publications in my literature corpus present cross-cultural comparisons. When it comes to single-country studies, however, precedence is given to Asian countries known for their extensive use of private tutoring. The number of papers devoted to a particular country or region is presented in Table 3. It is important to keep in mind that this review only considers studies published in English and listed in one institutional and three global databases. Consequently, the results summarised in Table 3 do not show a whole picture. In fact, the prevalence of studies focusing on Asian countries (more precisely, on East Asia) may be even more pronounced\textsuperscript{16}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of publications</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China, incl. HK</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROK</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Czechia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other countries (20)</td>
<td>1 (\times20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Broadly speaking, when it comes to the scale of private tutoring, the global arena falls into two categories. The first one is represented mainly by Asian countries such as the Republic of Korea, China (including Hong Kong), and Japan, and is characterised by high intensity and a long tradition of private tutoring. The second category consists of low-intensity countries such as the United States, Canada, Western Europe, and Australia, which have

\textsuperscript{16} As Bray and Lykins (2012) note, Asian researchers “lead the world” when it comes to research shadow education.
historically had lower usage rates of supplementary education services and where tutoring markets have just begun to emerge (see e.g., Aurini et al, 2013).

So far, Russia, geographically and culturally located between these two entities, has not received any extensive attention in international and comparative education research on shadow education. I have been able to find five studies that address some aspects of private tutoring in the Russian context. In general, they consider issues similar to those prevailing in the field, namely, the nature, driving factors and effectiveness of the services provided. Below I briefly summarise the findings of these studies.

Kozar (2013, 2015) examined the supply side of the tutoring industry in Russia. In particular, she analysed the content of tutoring advertisements, as well as the demographic data and self-presentation of 32 top-ranked tutors in Moscow. Kozar (2013) found that tutoring services are most popular in the subjects included in the national school curriculum and targeted at schoolchildren. In terms of subjects, English was the most sought-after, followed by mathematics and Russian. The analysis of the self-presentations showed that most tutors are highly educated: 18 out of 32 had a postgraduate degree and the rest had at least one bachelor’s degree. Interestingly, according to Kozar, many present themselves as tutors without reporting their affiliation with formal institutions. When it comes to their self-presentation style, the study distinguishes between two categories of tutors; (1) those who specialise in exam preparation, and (2) those who target a wider range of students. In both cases, tutors referred to the test scores and other achievements of previous students to confirm their ability to help students reach their desired goals (Kozar, 2013).

In another article, Kozar (2015) explores the content of 17 websites offering online tutoring in English. The study shows that central stage is given to tutors’ personal profiles, containing photographs, audio recordings, biographies, competences, and qualifications. However, she observes, there is very little, if any, information about the content of their lessons. Kozar links it to the lack of any ‘fixed’ curriculum since the content of tutoring sessions is highly customised. In other words, the websites “sell” not lessons, but teachers.

Yet another article by Kozar and Sweller (2014) examines the demand side of the tutoring market. It asks whether there is a relationship between the demographic characteristics of online English language learners, their public education experiences, and their expectations of tutoring sessions. Despite the fact that the study is mainly about adult learners of English rather than schoolchildren, I found some of the findings noteworthy. For instance, it shows that

---

17 I have come to a similar conclusion in my analysis of tutor’s profiles collected in 2019 from one of the largest online tutoring platforms in Russia (Mikhaylova, 2019c, 2020). That study showed that, compared to private tutors of the nineteenth century who put forward their own results in advertising their services, today’s tutors cite the results of their tutees, forming, thereby, an understanding of themselves as excellent teachers rather than excellent students.
in contrast to the expectations of students receiving compulsory education, online learners emphasize the teachers’ ability to deliver results. Moreover, students preparing for exams expect their tutor to be strict and demanding.

Using data from annual surveys carried out by the Ministry of Education, Prakhov (2017) compares the prevalence of pre-entry coaching before and after the introduction of the USE. The study suggests that the popularity of preparatory courses provided by universities declined after the introduction of the USE, but the overall enrolment and the level of investment in pre-entry coaching did not change significantly. According to Prakhov, the USE led to an increase in the popularity of classes with tutors not affiliated with a desired university. When it comes to the return on investment in pre-entry tutoring, the findings are not unequivocal and seem to correlate with the type of university. While for non-selective universities participation in tutoring classes or individual tutoring had no significant effect, for applicants to selective universities with higher entrance scores it can be beneficial (p. 184).

Similarly, Loyalka and Zakharov (2016) examine the effectiveness of pre-entry tutoring based on data from a large-scale survey. The study shows that about half of those polled reported participating in private tutoring, with the Russian language and mathematics being the most popular subjects. Moreover, the majority of students who participated in private tutoring were from urban areas and belonged to families with high socio-economic and cultural capital. Regarding the impact of tutoring on students’ academic performance, the study shows mixed results, suggesting that tutoring (or more precisely, preparatory courses) is more useful for high achievers, as it gives them an additional advantage over other students.

Overall, the findings of research on private tutoring in Russia indicate that the country has largely adopted a consumer- and result-oriented approach to education, which received a new impetus after the introduction of the USE. Furthermore, private tutoring in Russia is provided by tutors with advanced educational degrees and is mainly used by high-achieving students from well-off families. These results are consistent with the findings of Silova et al. (2006) that, despite the official rhetoric of equality, in former socialist countries wealthy families have privileged access to more and better educational opportunities, including private tutoring.

Situating the Study

Over the last few decades, private tutoring has received increasing attention in educational research. In this chapter, I have described and systematised the literature published up to 2018 and identified three main thematic clusters, namely (1) the nature of shadow education, (2) its causes, and (3) its outcomes. The analysis indicates a lack of communication between these strands of
research, which significantly reduces the complexity of the phenomenon under inquiry.

In terms of the geographical foci, Russia remains a blind spot on the global map of shadow education. By bringing Russia into the spotlight, the present study makes an empirical contribution to the growing research field. Moreover, although this study focuses on one single country, its findings have direct relevance to parts of the former Russian Empire, the former Soviet bloc, and other post-socialist societies.

Apart from its empirical contribution, this dissertation seeks to bring new theoretical perspectives. Previous research on shadow education has shown that the formal curriculum plays an important role in shaping the demand for private tutoring. However, this body of research is separated from research on policy issues, which, in turn, is mainly concerned with the question of how, if at all, national governments regulate tutoring practices. To put it differently, while studies on curricular issues do not position themselves as policy studies, policy research tends to focus on regulations without linking them to curriculum, pedagogy, and evaluation. The present study lies at the intersection of the two; that is, the curriculum is seen here as a particular kind of education policy which shapes the demand for alternative forms of education and simultaneously has implications for whether and in what sense they will be seen as legitimate or problematic (chapter 4).

Moreover, as this literature review indicates, research on policy on shadow education remains largely descriptive and tends to focus on what might be called “the history of solutions” (Foucault, 2000, p. 256). There is also an interest in studying policy implementation and in evaluating the outcomes in relation to the intended objectives. What is common for these lines of research is that they presume that private tutoring is, or at least should be, a policy problem. This, in turn, is based on the assumption that social and educational problems can be solved in, with, or through policy (cf. Webb, 2014).

The study at hand offers a different perspective. Instead of problematising private tutoring or policies on private tutoring, it places more emphasis on policy formation and examines, drawing on Foucault, how it has been problematised in policy and public debates. This approach draws attention to the ways in which the problem that policies claim to solve has come about and to how a particular understanding of the problem has been normalised in specific contexts. It also allows for an elaboration of the reasons for the seeming absence of policy on private tutoring in contemporary Russia and other similar contexts.

Further, most international research on shadow education deals with current developments and lacks a historical perspective. As a result, private tutoring is often described as if it were a novelty. However, as noted earlier, this practice has existed since ancient times. While its nature has certainly changed over time, as such, it is not new. What is new, though, I argue, are our ways of thinking about and problematising it, often as an effect of neoliberalism. To
understand these transformations, this dissertation looks back to a time when public education was just beginning to take shape. In doing so, it explores private tutoring as a contextualised educational practice whose meaning and significance may be completely different in one socio-political setting than in another.

It is worth pointing out that my aim is not to reconstruct the ‘origins’ of private tutoring; my primary interest lies with problematisations of this practice and the role they have played, and continue to play, in the formation of education in Russia. By adopting a genealogical approach, I want to shed new light on our educational present and denaturalise some well-established ‘truths’ about the nature of both private tutoring and public education.

To summarise, this study will benefit those interested in private and informal education, international and comparative education, the history of Russian education, curriculum research, and education policy analysis.
3. Developing a Theoretical Framework

In the introductory chapter I quoted Bray’s (2007) definition of shadow education, in which he states that it exists because the mainstream education exists, and that it changes in size and shape in response to the mainstream system. He later refined this description by adding: “As the curriculum [emphasis added] in the mainstream changes, so it does in the shadow” (Bray et al., 2013, p. 2).

Recently, many scholars have come to theorise shadow education by deploying the concepts of curriculum studies (Bray et al., 2018; Forsberg et al, 2019; Jokić, 2013; Kim, 2016; Kim & Jung, 2019a, 2019b; Sriprakash et al., 2016). Moreover, to highlight the difference between the school curriculum and that of shadow education, Kim and Jung introduced the term shadow curriculum, by which they mean “supplementary curriculum out of schooling provided by educational business industries that is intended to improve academic success among individual students in formal education” (Kim & Jung, 2019b, p. 149). Although the term itself seems interesting and relevant for this dissertation, I find its definition overly restrictive.

According to Kim and Jung, a ‘shadow curriculum’ has six distinctive features: 1) it is based on student academic needs; 2) it is oriented towards student academic success; 3) it focuses on school grades and exam preparation; 4) it accelerates various learning opportunities based on family investment; 5) it aims at personalised learning, and 6) it exacerbates the competitive aspects of education. When discussing the limitations of the concept Kim and Jung note:

Shadow curriculum excludes any form of schooling, both public and private, as well as home-schooling funded and/or regulated by governments as they receive public funds. Shadow curriculum also excludes individual or group self-directed study at home, as this does not involve an instructor. It also excludes various available learning sources such as online videos uploaded by Kan Academy or individual creators as they do not specifically target registered students—however, these can be components of shadow curriculum when they are intentionally assigned to specific students by shadow education instructors. (Kim & Jung, 2019b, p. 156)

This description suggests three additional criteria for a shadow curriculum, related to (1) regulation and funding, (2) involvement of an instructor, and (3) a target group. While I partly agree with the relevance of the last point (depending on how the concept of shadow education is defined), the remaining
criteria considerably limit the application of the concept. The first one excludes contexts in which both public and private education requires private investment or, conversely, where private forms of education are fully or partially funded by the government (see chapter 2). Furthermore, the absence of a teacher does not necessarily mean the lack of a curriculum.

Although Kim and Jung (2019b) intend the notion of ‘shadow curriculum’ to call into question the mimicking identity of tutoring practices, the proposed definition pre-determines the goals and contents of shadow education without exploring them empirically. Moreover, theorising shadow education as a new curriculum (p. 15) masks the relations between the shadow and the formal curriculum. As such, it remains unclear in what sense the ‘shadow curriculum’ shadows public education.

In order to explore the relationship between public education and private tutoring in all its complexity, this chapter argues that a curriculum can instead be understood as a boundary object that relates to and defines both formal and informal education. The chapter then considers insights of postmodern theory and in particular Foucault’s notions of governmentality and problematisation and discusses how they can be used to explore the ways of thinking about desirable and problematic education. Finally, the chapter demonstrates how these concepts can be integrated into curriculum theory to capture the process of policy formation and to advance our understanding of how historically and culturally situated visions of education shape the relationship between the public and the private in education in a particular way.

Exploring the Relationship between Public Education and Private Tutoring with Curriculum Theory

Curriculum theory has traditionally been concerned with formal or regular education. Rooted in the works of John Dewey, Franklin Bobbit, Jane Addams, and other early twentieth-century American scholars, it initially sought to construct and improve school curricula on a scientific basis (Kliebard, 2004; Pinar, 2011). Since then, and especially after World War II, this strongly “ameliorative” orientation (Kliebard, 1992) has given way to more descriptive, philosophical analyses of curricula. This, in turn, led to a theoretical and methodological expansion of the field to encompass hermeneutic, phenomenological, postmodernist poststructuralist, post-humanist and other inquiries (Deng, 2018; Pinar et al., 2014), which enabled an understanding of curriculum as both text and context, as text and discourse (cf. Ball, 1993, 2015), as an effect and instrument of power, etc. (see e.g., Pinar et al., 2014).

While this theoretical extension allows the theory to be applied to a variety of educational practices, non-formal ones largely remain outside the scope of curriculum studies. In the next section, I elaborate on the notion of ‘boundary
object’ and how it can help to highlight the role of the curriculum in shaping both formal and non-formal education.

Curriculum as a Boundary Object

We have suggested elsewhere (Forsberg et al., 2020) that curriculum can be seen as a boundary object. The concept has its origins in the sociology of science and refers to “objects which are both plastic enough to adapt to local needs and the constraints of the several parties employing them, yet robust enough to maintain a common identity across sites” (Star & Griesemer, 1989, p. 393).

Star (2010) describes three main components of the concept, each necessary for an object to be considered intermediary or boundary. The first component, interpretive flexibility, implies that boundary objects might have different meanings in different practices or for different groups, but they can also overlap and resemble each other depending on how they are interpreted. The second component, materiality, derives from action. As Star (2010, p. 603) puts it, “an object is something people … act toward and with”. The third distinguishing feature of boundary objects is their processual character; that is, boundary objects reside between social worlds where they are weakly structured, but they can be made more specific and adopted to local use (p. 605).

Does the concept of curriculum contain these components? Apparently, it does, if it is understood not only as a specific text which prescribes the goals and content of education but also as a whole set of norms, beliefs, and values, which it codifies (Lundgren, 1983, 1989). Hence, curriculum can be concrete and abstract, material and procedural, general and specific, common or tailored\(^{18}\), and it is certainly subject to interpretation.

The notion of a boundary object, in turn, allows a view of the curriculum as something that relates to and defines both public and private education, if in different ways and to varying degrees. It can serve as a bridge that connects and simultaneously separates the public and private or formal and non-formal educational spaces. This double movement—separating and uniting—is what allows curriculum to be conceptualised as a boundary object.

Let me illustrate this point briefly. Previous research into shadow education has shown that perceived deficiencies in the formal curriculum can generate a demand for private tutoring (chapter 2). Obviously, if the school curriculum is seen as irrelevant, outdated, overloaded, superficial, inconsistent, or missing subjects or subject areas deemed important, students may seek private tutoring (or other out-of-school activities, including customised tutoring programs for gifted students, home-schooling, extra-curricular activities, etc.), which, instead of providing “more of the same”, go beyond the formal curriculum to

\(^{18}\) Cf. Davis’ (2013) notion of ‘bespoke education’.
enrich, extend, or even substitute it. Remedial tutoring, by contrast, is often supplemental and correctional in character but may involve alternative pedagogy. Finally, tutoring provided by in-service teachers who intentionally omit parts of the curriculum in mainstream classrooms in order to attract students to paid private lessons (see e.g., Bray et al., 2019; Ille & Peacey, 2019) completes the school curriculum. In other words, different tutoring practices have different curricula, which are nonetheless shaped in relation to the formal curriculum (Mikhaylova, 2019a).

The advantage of approaching curriculum as a boundary object is that it allows for an empirical analysis of the multiple curricula of various out-of-school education practices instead of defining their goals and contents in advance. In this study, it has also proved useful for revealing the dynamic interplay between public and private forms of education and for exploring how the school curriculum both shapes private tutoring and is shaped by problematisations thereof.

**Curriculum and Problematisation**

As mentioned above, curriculum theory adopts a broad understanding of the curriculum as a historical, political, and ideological phenomenon that reflects and shapes a particular social and cultural context. However, the term ‘curriculum’ can also be used in a narrower sense to refer to a specific policy document or set of documents—the so-called formal (Goodlad et al., 1979) or official curriculum—that regulates educational processes by prescribing their content, pedagogy, and expected outcomes. It does so by bringing together different visions of the desired society, the desired citizen and the common good that should be achieved through education (Biesta, 2016; Englund, 2005; Popkewitz, 2009; Tröhler et al., 2011) and by making them appear as singular, stable, and legitimate. Hence, an examination of the formation of the curriculum, in both understandings of the concept, is also an examination of how these visions are shaped by existing power relations and “regimes of

---

19 As my colleagues and I discussed elsewhere, the current position of English as one of the most popular tutoring subjects in Russia is not least due to the fact that, being optional, English is not taught (or not taught sufficiently) in all schools, whereas it is considered necessary both in the labour market and in other areas of life (Forsberg et al., 2019; Kozar, 2013, 2015).

Furthermore, the findings of previous research on shadow education indicate that gifted and highly motivated students constitute another category of those who are likely to engage in private tutoring when schools are unable to meet their needs (Aurini & Davies, 2013; Kim, 2016; Kim & Jung, 2019a). Lacking sufficient challenges, these students can lose interest and withdraw from regular classes in favour of home education or advanced tutoring programs. In South Korea, for instance, there are special hakwons where academically gifted students receive customised tutoring programs that allow them to learn more and do it faster and more deeply than in mainstream schools (Kim & Jung, 2019a).
truth” (Foucault, 1991a; see also Apple, 2004; Englund, 2005; Popkewitz, 1997). Kliebard (1992) explains this as follows:

Curriculum in any period can be an invaluable relic of the forms of knowledge, social values, and beliefs that have achieved a special status in a given time and place. A curriculum is, after all, a selection of certain elements of a society’s culture. (Kliebard, 1992, p. 157)

Similarly, Bernstein describes curriculum as one of the “message systems”, through which educational knowledge is realised:

Formal educational knowledge can be considered to be realized through three message systems: curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation. Curriculum defines what counts as valid knowledge, pedagogy defines what counts as valid transmission of knowledge and evaluation defines what counts as valid realization of knowledge. (Bernstein, 2003a, p. 77)

In another essay, Bernstein (2003, p. 72) argues that curriculum is “a system of choices” generated by conflicting conceptions of social order. Consequently, it is “intimately bound up with patterns of authority and control” and is “fundamentally moral”.

It is these conflicting conceptions and varying visions of “imagined futures” (Beckert, 2016), legitimate knowledge and appropriate ways of organising educational processes that are of particular interest to this study. As I shall argue below, these visions necessarily contain an implicit understanding of the ‘problems’ that need to be solved to achieve the desired outcomes.

Governing and the Work of Thought
The vision of the desired society articulated through the curriculum reflects a society’s thoughts about the current context and what it believes should be improved, prevented, or eliminated in order to make this vision a reality. In other words, it implies that something is deemed problematic and therefore in need of change.

From Foucault’s perspective, the process of ‘defining’ the difficulties to be solved is inextricably linked to the practice of government. He argued that the forms and rationales of power—the art of government—are premised on dominant ways of thinking about how something or someone should be governed. The complex relationship between the work of government and the work of thought is reflected in his notion of governmentality.

The term governmentality, according to Foucault (1991b), can mean different things. In one sense it denotes a new way of thinking about and exercising power that “has as its target population, as its principal form of knowledge political economy, and as its essential technical means apparatuses of security” (Foucault, 1991b, p. 102). He links the birth of this specific form
of government to the emergence of various institutions, apparatuses, and knowledges in eighteenth-century Europe.

In another sense, governmentality can be described as an extent to which the state becomes involved in something:

Whether in the case of madness, of the constitution that category, that quasi-neutral object, mental illness, or of the organization of a clinical medicine, or of the integration of disciplinary mechanisms and technologies within the penal system, what was involved in each case was always the identification the gradual, piecemeal, but continuous takeover by the state of a number of practices, ways of doing things, and, if you like, governmentalities. The problem of bringing under state control, of ‘statification’ (étatisation) is at the heart of the question I have tried to address”. (Foucault, 2008, p. 77)

This conceptualisation of the term implies an examination of the role of governmentality in drawing the boundaries between different domains. Governmentality in this sense “allow[s] the continual definition of what should or should not fall within the state’s domain, what is public and what private, what is and what is not within the state’s competence, and so on” (Foucault, 2007, p. 109).

Naturally, the way these boundaries are set structures the possible field of individual action (Foucault, 2002b, p. 341). This does not mean, however, that Foucault denies any possibility of individual agency. On the contrary, he argues that power is premised on the capacity of the subject to act. He defines disciplinary power as

a total structure of actions brought to bear upon possible actions; it incites, it induces, it seduces, it makes easier or more difficult; in the extreme it constrains or forbids absolutely; it is nevertheless always a way of acting upon an acting subject or acting subjects by virtue of their acting or being capable of action. (Foucault, 2002b, p. 341)

Foucault contends that freedom is an important condition for power. Individual or collective subjects, he says, are ‘free’ in the sense that they are “faced with a field of possibilities in which several kinds of conduct, several ways of reacting and modes of behaviour are available” (Foucault, 2002b, p. 342). That is, the subject is understood both as an effect of power and as capable of critique and action.

The presumed freedom of the subjects of governance, which is nevertheless always constrained, is perhaps one of the reasons why governmentality-inspired studies of education often focus on Western liberal democracies (see e.g., Ball, 2010; Fejes & Dahlstedt, 2013; Peters et al., 2009; Popkewitz & Brennan, 1998). Indeed, in a narrow sense, as mentioned above, the concept of governmentality refers to a distinct form of political power that emerged in the West in the eighteenth century. This raises the question of whether it is
applicable to the study of non-liberal contexts such as Imperial, Soviet, and post-Soviet Russia, where sovereignty is the dominant form of rule and power seeks to operate on obedient rather than free subjects²⁰.

On the face of it, this form of power is in conflict with governmentality. However, as Foucault (1991b) explains, in reality sovereignty-discipline-govern-ment are inseparable parts of one and the same triangle (p. 102). Developing this argument, Dean (2010) points to an underlying similarity between liberal and authoritarian governmentalities: both are assembled from elements of sovereignty and biopolitical rule and are based on the practices of constant division and exclusion of certain groups of people. Consequently, we can see elements of authoritarian governmentality in liberal forms of rule and, conversely, liberal political rationalities in authoritarian regimes.

Although I find this question important to consider, it is beyond the scope of this study to investigate how the governance of education is exercised in liberal or illiberal political regimes. I use the term governmentality to refer not to a specific form of government, but to ways of thinking and reasoning about how to direct human conduct. This conceptualisation derives from the meanings of each of the constituent elements of Foucault’s neologism—the ‘government’ (by which he meant “the conduct of conduct”) and ‘mentality’ (i.e., modes of thought). In this understanding a governmentality analysis would be concerned with “thought as it is embedded within programmes for the direction and reform of conduct” (Dean, 2010, p. 27).

If the art of government involves the idea of the direction and goal towards which the conduct should be governed, then it also involves the idea of what difficulties and failures should be eliminated, or at least corrected, to achieve that goal. In other words, governance can be understood as a problematising activity (Rose & Miller, 1992). Accordingly, the history of government, as Rose and Miller point out, can be written as a history of problematisations, “in which politicians, intellectuals, philosophers, medics, military men, feminists and philanthropists have measured the real against the ideal and found it want- ing” (p. 181).

On the Notion of Problematisation

Unlike concepts of power and governmentality, problematisation was not explicitly elaborated in Foucault’s historical and theoretical investigations. However, he admits that problematisation has informed most of his genealog-ical inquires, from the problem of sovereignty in the Middle Ages to the prob-lems of population in early modern European societies:

²⁰ This is not to say that Russian citizens do not have agency, nor that their agentival capacity is limited to either conformity or resistance (see e.g., Yurchak, 2013).
The notion common to all the work that I have done since Histoire de la folie is that of problematization, though it must be said that I never isolated this notion sufficiently. But one always finds what is essential after the event; the most general things are those that appear last. In Histoire de la folie the question was how and why, at a given moment, madness was problematized through a certain institutional practice and a certain apparatus of knowledge. Similarly, in Surveiller et punir, I was trying to analyze the changes in the problematization of the relations between crime and punishment through penal practices and penitentiary institutions in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. (Foucault, 1988, p. 257)

In the introductory chapters to The Use of Pleasure he notes that his approach to the history of sexuality differs from conventional historical accounts in that his focus is not on behaviours, ideas, societies and their ideologies, but on “the problematizations through which being offers itself to be, necessarily, thought—and the practices on the basis of which these problematizations are formed” (Foucault, 1986, p. 11).

Similarly, in a series of lectures entitled Discourse and Truth: The Problematization of Parrhesia, delivered at Berkeley in 1983 and later published in English under the title Fearless Speech, Foucault (2001) outlines the genealogy of the practice of truth-telling, or parrhesia. In concluding remarks, he calls his inquiry a “problematisation of truth”, by which he means an analysis of “how and why certain things (behaviour, phenomena, processes) became a problem”, whereas “other similar forms were completely neglected at a given historical moment” (p. 171). Thus, the absence of policies and regulations can mean that particular practices and behaviours do not appear “susceptible to diagnosis, prescription and cure” (Rose & Miller, 1992, p. 183). On the other hand, non-interference—laisser faire, passer et aller—may also be an element of “the game of liberalism”, which lets things run their own course but in accordance with “the laws, principles, and mechanisms of reality itself” (Foucault, 2007, p. 48).

Foucault’s reflections on the “problematics of government” were developed by Rose and Miller (1992) in their seminal article Political Power Beyond the State, in which they suggest that political power can be analysed at three levels:

1) Political rationalities21, which, Rose and Miller argue, have moral, epistemological and linguistic dimensions. The moral dimension manifests itself in the justification of particular ways of exercising power. The epistemological dimension means that political rationalities are always based on certain forms of knowledge. Finally, the linguistic dimension implies that political

---

21 It is worth clarifying that according to the governmentality studies’ literature, the notion of rationality does not imply that policy making is a rational and consensual process. Rather, it draws attention to thinking, or mentalities, underpinned by more or less systematic forms of knowledge, which inform and condition the practice of governing (Dean, 2010; Rose & Miller, 1992).
rationalities are based on and provide the vocabulary that renders reality thinkable.

2) Political programmes, that is, various reports, white papers, proposals, and other policy documents “that seek to configure specific locales and relations in ways thought desirable” (Rose & Miller, 1992, p. 181). Rose and Miller emphasize that while political programmes are informed by political rationalities, the relation between the two is that of translation; that is, political programmes express a particular concern in another modality to make things appear governable (pp. 181-182).

3) Political technologies, by which Rose and Miller refer to all those strategies, techniques, and procedures through which political rationalities and programmes are articulated and made operable. In education, such technologies can be, for example, ranking, assessment, examination, standardisation, certification, and differentiation. It is important to note that political technologies do not implement political programmes; rather, they translate them into context-specific practices.

To understand how the governance of education takes place, we need, thus, to examine political rationalities, that is, ways of thinking and questioning things and subjects that are to be regulated and governed. These rationalities are implied or expressed explicitly in various ‘programmes’ such as education laws, policies, curricula, and reform proposals that endeavour to shape and reshape our educational and social reality through various technologies.

The History of Problematisations as the History of Thought

Central to a Foucauldian perspective is an understanding of problematisation as both a product and object of thought that is manifested in moral reflection, scientific knowledge, political analysis and so on (Foucault, 1988, p. 257). To become an object of thought, Foucault explains, “it is necessary for a certain number of factors to have made it [an action, or a behaviour] uncertain, to have made it lose its familiarity, or to have provoked a certain number of difficulties around it” (Foucault, 1994a, p. 117). In other words, a problem may exist for a long time but, as Rabinow (2003, p. 20) points out, without “institutionally legitimated claims to truth”, there is no problematisation. This is not to say that madness or crime, for example, are mere constructions that only exist in discourses and institutional practices. On the contrary, Foucault (1988) maintains that problematisation comprises a “set of discursive or nondiscursive [emphasis added] practices that introduced something into the play of true and false” (p. 257) and that provide answers to something real:

---

22 In this regard, according to Rabinow, Foucault’s notion of problematisation is similar to Dewey’s idea of thinking as problem solving. For both, Rabinow (2003) claims, “thinking begins when thinks break down; when the common-sense world ceases to function, reflection begins” (p. 48).
Given a certain problematization, you can only understand why this kind of answer appears as a reply to some concrete and specific aspect of the world. There is the relation of thought and reality in the process of problematization. And that is the reason why I think that it is possible to give an analysis of a specific problematization as the history of an answer—the original, specific, and singular answer of thought—to a certain situation. (Foucault, 2001, p. 172)

Thus, it is precisely because of their existence in the real world that various phenomena become objects of reflection and regulation (Foucault, 2001, pp. 171–172). Yet, problems are not simply ‘discovered’; rather, they are products of “our knowledge, ideas, theories, techniques, social relations and economical processes” (Foucault, 1996, p. 418), which are formed in specific historical conditions. Consequently, problematisation is not a strategic process but a creative one inasmuch as it involves new ways of thinking about previously familiar things and initiates new ways of taking care of them (Foucault, 2001). To put it in Rose and Miller’s (1992) terms, in addition to a new rationality, problematisation requires new programmes and techniques to be developed in order to govern these things. It requires a creation of a story about the ‘true’ cause of the problem, a ‘diagnosis’ that entails a certain solution.

Foucault compares his inquiry into the history of problematisations with a history of thought, which, he says, is different from the “history of ideas”. The latter is concerned with an “analysis of systems of representation” (Foucault, 1994a, p. 117) and “involves the analysis of a notion from its birth, through its development, and in the setting of other ideas which constitute its setting” (Foucault, 2001, p. 7). In comparison, the “history of thought” seeks to explore how human beings problematise “what they are, what they do and the world in which they live” (Foucault, 1986, p. 10). It focuses on the way an unproblematic field of experience, or a set of practices, which were accepted without question, which were familiar and ‘silent’, out of discussion, becomes a problem, raises discussion and debate, incites new reactions, and induces a crisis in the previously silent behaviour, habits, practices, and institutions. (Foucault, 2001, p. 74)

Problems are thus open to a multitude of solutions and can be treated differently depending on what their roots are considered to be, who is deemed responsible, and what tools and solution techniques are available. Foucault argues that there is always an array of diverse and even contradictory ways of

---

23 Compare with Stone’s (1989) notions of “causal ideas” or “causal stories”. Stone argues that difficulties become policy problems only when they are seen as caused by human action and are amendable to intervention. Policy actors, she holds, “compose stories that describe harms and difficulties, attribute them to actions of other individuals or organizations, and thereby claim the right to invoke government power to stop the harm” (p. 282). According to Stone, “causal ideas” and “causal stories” transform difficulties into policy problems; they define the objects of public concern and make them seem “as though they are simply describing facts” (p. 282).
responding to “one single set of difficulties” (Foucault, 1994a, p. 118). Accordingly, the task of history of thought would be

to rediscover at the root of these diverse solutions the general form of problematization that has made them possible—even in their very opposition; or what has made possible the transformation of the difficulties and obstacles of a practice into a general problem for which one proposes diverse practical solutions. (Foucault, 1994a, p. 118)

In other words, the history of thought implies a critical analysis of “how different solutions to a problem have been constructed” and “how these different solutions result from a specific form of problematization” (Foucault, 1994a, p. 118).

Summary of Theoretical Assumptions

In this dissertation the term ‘curriculum’ is used both in an abstract, broad sense and in a concrete, narrow sense. In the former case, it refers to the whole set of norms, values, knowledges, beliefs, hopes and dreams that constitute the rationalities (cf. Rose & Miller, 1992) or mentalities (cf. Foucault, 1991b) of power and that structure educational governance. In the narrower sense, the term refers to policy documents, or political programmes (Rose & Miller, 1992), which embody and temporarily fix the prevailing rationality, or mentality. In this sense, the curriculum can also be seen as a political technology used to translate all those hopes and dreams into practice in ways thought legitimate. In either case, curriculum operates as a boundary object which relates to, defines, connects, and disconnects various educational practices producing thereby a division between the desired and the problematic, the public and the private, teaching and tutoring, and so on. This approach helps to introduce excluded and ‘hidden’ practices into the dominant narrative of the formation and governance of education by showing how they are shaped by and shape the curriculum, both in the narrow and abstract sense of the term.

As argued above, participation in private, non-formal or out-of-school educational activities can be seen as a response to the dominant social and political order articulated in the formal curriculum. On the one hand, curriculum-based tutoring, which is often supplementary and remedial in nature, reinforces the legitimacy of institutionally prescribed rules, norms, and values. In this case, what is worth knowing is already predetermined, and the legitimacy of this selection is not questioned. On the contrary, people act in accordance with the meanings, norms and values articulated in policies, as disciplined subjects, driven by the hope of rewards (grades, credentials, a desired university place, etc.) or fear of punishment. On the other hand, as noted above, tutoring practices can go beyond (extended or extra-curricular education,
enriching tutoring) or even against the formal curricular requirements (unschooling), offering alternative curricula. Participation in these forms of education can be seen as “counter-conduct” (Foucault, 2007, p. 202). It is important to stress, though, that enriching, supplementing, or completing forms of tutoring do not mean a literal repetition or a clear contradiction of authoritarian discourse but may introduce subtle shifts into it.

In order to empirically investigate how boundaries between different educational practices are drawn and redrawn and why they are set in a certain way in different contexts, this dissertation foregrounds the role of problematisations as a key element in shaping the curriculum. This means that instead of diagnosing “the ills of the curriculum” (cf. Schwab, 2013), I read the curriculum as something that seeks to diagnose and ‘treat’ societal ‘ills’ (cf. Rose & Miller, 1992) and thereby to bridge the gap between the real and the ideal, or “between hope and happening” (Lundgren, 1983). It sets the desired trajectory of change, while indicating what problems need to be solved and what means of salvation are available for this purpose.

Put differently, curriculum provides, often implicitly, answers to specific questions. Consequently, in order to understand its grounds, limits and presuppositions, we need to reconstruct the questions that it ‘answers’. Why are these questions posed in a certain way? Under what conditions did they become thinkable? And what do these answers communicate about the vision of the desirable and undesirable society? I suggest that, repositioned in this way, a study of curriculum can bring to the forefront the work of educational thought that reflects and configures our educational present, to which private tutoring is a part.

For that, the notions of governmentality and problematisation can be helpful in that they invite a discussion about the ways of thinking about what society and citizens should be produced through education (cf. Ball, 2010; Peters et al, 2009). Thus, the theoretical ambition of this study is to explore how government normalises particular views on the appropriate and the problematic by regulating or not regulating certain educational practices.

The advantage of adopting this approach to studying the relationship between the public and the private in education is that it helps to avoid binary thinking and to grasp, rather than reduce, its complexity and dynamics. In particular, it requires attention to different tutoring practices and allows for examination of the dominant political rationality which makes certain tutoring practices appear as entirely legitimate in one historical, political, and epistemological setting and deeply problematic in another.

---

24 An example can be helpful here. Consider the statement “All children should learn to read”. This statement is based on certain assumptions about why reading is important to children and to society, and how this can be achieved. At the same time, it also involves assumptions about the potential obstacles and what would happen if children did not know how to read. In other words, the statement contains both a vision of what is desirable and a problematisation.
In sum, this approach may provoke a reassessment of commonly held assumptions about schooling and other educational practices, instead of reproducing and legitimising established ‘truths’ about their history, nature, determinants, and outcomes.
4. Methodological and Analytical Considerations

There is an extensive scholarly debate about how to approach problematisations and what the goal of such an analysis should be. While some readings suggest that problematisation is the object of Foucault’s works (e.g., Barnett, 2015; Kelly, 2018; Rabinow, 2003), others see it as a method of critical inquiry (e.g., Howarth, 2013) or a methodology for generating research questions (e.g., Alvesson & Sandberg, 2013). Still other scholars argue that the two approaches are not mutually exclusive; rather, they can be understood as two styles or two steps of Foucault’s genealogical critique (e.g., Bacchi, 2009; Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016; Deacon, 2000; Koopman, 2013; Lemke, 2011). To avoid misunderstandings, it should be clarified at the outset that in this dissertation the notion of problematisation refers primarily to the object of analysis.

In what follows, I discuss the methodology and research design developed here to examine problematisations of private tutoring and their impact on the formation of education. Given that the number and nature of the empirical sources varies greatly from one period to another, the data collection process followed somewhat different paths, which are described in greater detail in the corresponding chapter. In what follows, I discuss general methodological principles and reflect on issues common to all examined cases and historical periods.

The chapter is structured as follows. I first present Carol Bacchi’s approach to Foucault-inspired policy analysis and position this dissertation in relation to it. I then introduce the methodological considerations that guided the data collection and analysis process and comment on the limitations that the chosen research design entails.

Adjusting the WPR Approach

The idea that policy making is not a problem-solving, but a problem-forming, activity is certainly not new in critical policy studies. There is a variety of approaches focusing on how policy problems are defined, framed, interpreted, and legitimised. Some draw on Foucault’s theories and treat policy as

---

discourse (Ball, 1990, 2015), urging policy analysts to pay attention to the close relationship between power and knowledge and to the role of discourses in constraining the formation and enactment of education policy. While these approaches share an interest in discourses and problematisations, they are based on different epistemologies and, hence, diverse methodologies (Bacchi, 2000; Goodwin, 2011).

Despite a growing awareness about the role of discourses in the ‘making’ of policy problems, there are still few methodological descriptions of how to proceed when analysing problematisations. One of the most influential methodological accounts is Carol Bacchi’s *What’s the Problem Represented to Be*, widely known as WPR. In line with Foucault, WPR puts forward the assumption that “we are governed through problematisations” (Bacchi, 2009, p. 263). Hence, in order to understand how governing operates, we need to inquire into problematisations on the basis of which policies are shaped. For that, Bacchi suggests, researchers can take a particular policy or set of policies as a starting point and “work backwards” by deconstructing its premises and effects.

The analytic scheme developed by Bacchi (2009, p. xii) consists of six interrelated questions:

1. What’s the ‘problem’ represented to be in a specific policy or policies?
2. What deep-seated presuppositions or assumptions underlie this representation of the ‘problem’?
3. How has this representation of the ‘problem’ come about?
4. What is left unproblematic in this problem representation? Where are the silences? Can the ‘problem’ be conceptualised differently?
5. What effects are produced by this representation of the ‘problem’?
6. How and where has this representation of the ‘problem’ been produced, disseminated, and defended? How has it been and/or can it be disrupted and replaced?

This template has guided my research project from its inception. However, I soon realised that private tutoring does not easily lend itself to any conventional or ready-made methodology. In fact, private tutoring rarely becomes the target of direct regulations in Russia, and, at the same time, it has been the subject of heated public debates since at least the eighteenth century. To put it differently, it is problematised, but it is not always explicitly addressed in policies. In some cases, it is treated as part of broader issues such as full private education and home-schooling. In other cases, it is addressed indirectly, through reforms in public education.

Naturally, an analysis of a lack of policy cannot start with a policy. As the project proceeded, I arrived at the conclusion that in order to understand the rationality underlying indirect regulations or the absence of policies, it is more useful to shift the analytical gaze from policies to the problematisations of
private tutoring in certain historical, political, and epistemological contexts (cf. Foucault, 1988, p. 258). This insight prompted a methodological detour.

Let me clarify some points in which my reading of Foucault and use of concepts differ from WPR. Firstly, in WPR the term problematisation refers to both a product of governmental practices (i.e., the object of analysis) and a form of critical analysis (i.e., the method of analysis). According to Bacchi (2009, p. 12), the essence of the WPR approach is to analyse problematisations, or, more accurately, problem representations, with the underlying intention of problematising them. Thus, a WPR-inspired study should involve an analysis of policies as problematisations and a problematisation of these policies.

In my view, the problematisation of a policy presupposes a normative evaluation as it rests on the idea that there are “better” or perhaps “more effective”, ways of formulating the problem. As noted, I do not share the instrumental view of problematisation as a critical method of revealing the “hidden and suppressed contradictions” (cf. Rabinow & Rose, 2003, p. 13). To problematise policies and to suggest alternative problematisations in this way would be to construct a “new schema” or to validate “one that already exists” (Foucault, 1994b, p. 237), an approach that Foucault clearly opposed. Accordingly, this study does not aim to evaluate policies by problematising them or their absence. What it does attempt to problematise and denaturalise, however, are the present ways of thinking about, regulating and researching private tutoring. Put another way, my ambition is to offer a critique of the present rather than of particular policies.

Secondly, problematisation for Foucault is not “an arrangement of representations” (Foucault, 1994a, p. 119), nor is it “the creation by discourse of an object that doesn’t exist” (Foucault, 1988, p. 257). Hence, the purpose of inquiring into problematisations is not to deny the existence of problems or to treat them simply as discursive constructs. Rather, the task is to identify the critical moments when naturalised behaviours and practices become subject to reflection. Although Bacchi (2009) notes that ‘representation’ in the WPR approach is not opposed to ‘the real’, she admits that in Foucault’s works problematisation has a more material existence (Bacchi, 2018). From WPR’s perspective, there are no difficulties that require government to respond; rather, problems are assumed to be shaped within a policy or policy proposals (Bacchi, 2018).

However, Foucault’s notion of problematisation is not limited to policies if policies are understood narrowly as legal written texts or reform proposals. In The Use of Pleasure (Foucault, 1986) he explores how sexuality was problematised by philosophers and doctors in classical Greek culture in both ‘prescriptive’ and ‘practical’ texts. By ‘prescriptive’ texts he means those whose object “whatever their form (speech, dialogue, treatise, collection of precepts, etc.) is to suggest rules of conduct”, while ‘practical’ texts are “designed to be read, reflected upon, and tested out” (Foucault, 1986, p. 10).
In other words, it might be useful to distinguish between policy problems, which find their material representation in ‘political programmes’—in Rose and Miller’s (1992) sense of the term—and public problems, which might be, but are not always, the object of government regulations and visible action. It is also important to stress that state intervention does not necessarily make matters ‘political’. Conversely, issues can be political without being the target of official policy. Hence, if we want to “make politics visible”, which, as Bacchi (2012) argues, is the aim of the WPR, this distinction should not be overlooked and, accordingly, the analysis of certain problematisation can start from sources other than official policy documents.

It should be noted, however, that the borderline between policy and public problems is not always obvious. Dewey (1981) addresses this question in his essay The Public and Its Problems. He argues that “the public consists of all those who are affected by the indirect consequences of transactions to such an extent that it is deemed necessary to have these consequences systematically cared for” (p. 245). In his view, concerns are recognized as public on the basis of value judgments about what constitutes desirable and undesirable consequences and who is presumed to be affected by them. If good or evil consequences are thought to affect a group “distinctive enough to require recognition”, caring-for, or regulating, they will be labelled public concerns (p. 259). Thus, seen from this perspective, a lack of regulations may mean that some issues are considered private matters of no public or political importance.

In similar fashion, other thinkers highlighted the importance of values for determining which problems can be considered public, with the notion of ‘public’ understood as essentially political (Arendt, 1998; Habermas, 1991). For Habermas (1991), the autonomy of the public sphere in relation to the state, the market, and the private sphere is a crucial condition for an open debate on issues of public interest. From this standpoint, public problems are not equated with policy problems, nor is the political limited to policy making.

To enter the public arena, as some scholars have argued, there needs to be a debate about the values that society cherishes and what threatens these values; in other words, there needs to be a conflict or controversy that requires a resolution (Gusfield, 1981; Mills, 2000). This is particularly relevant to education, because, as Bernstein (2003a, p. 77) notes, the way “a society selects, classifies, distributes, transmits and evaluates the educational knowledge it considers to be public, reflects both the distribution of power and principles of social control”. By defining the course of perfection towards which teachers should guide the pupils (cf. Foucault, 1991a, p. 161), the curriculum simultaneously indicates who counts as part of a public that can benefit from a particular selection and organisation of knowledge.

My last comment concerns the scope and timespan of the analysis. To be able to analyse the problematisations of sexuality and to single out the critical moments when ‘givens’ become ‘questions’, Foucault considered a longer and wider timeframe than that envisioned by WPR. This allowed him to trace
persistent themes and important shifts in the way people think and take care of things (Foucault, 1986, p. 15). Genealogy is, thus, a general approach to a critical study of the present, rather than as a separate question to ask in relation to specific texts. By analogy, this dissertation covers three centuries, corresponding to the history of the formation and transformation of public education in Russia. In this way, I have been able to identify particular moments in the history of Russian education when the relationship between public and private became the object of reconsideration. This has also allowed me to discern which issues are the object of constant policy or public concern and which are more specific to particular historical contexts.

In the next section I discuss how a broader focus on problematisations has informed the process of data collection and analysis.

### Data Collection

Examining the problematisations of private tutoring has, at times, been fraught with methodological challenges. The difficulties begin with the process of data collection. As I have already mentioned, it is not always easy to identify policies that either directly or indirectly regulate private tutoring. This is partly due to terminological inconsistencies and often-blurred boundaries between tutoring and other private and education practices. Indeed, in Russia, private tutoring has been addressed within broader policy on home-schooling and private education (chapters 5 to 7), the shadow economy and individual entrepreneurship (chapter 8), and non-state education and commercial educational services provided by schools or private individuals (chapters 9 and 10).

Some policy documents have been found in official collections, such as the Complete Collection of Laws of the Russian Empire (Polnoe Sobranie Zakonov Rossiskoi Imperii [PSZ], 1830e, 1867) and the Collected Proceedings of the Ministry of National Enlightenment (Ministerstvo Narodnogo Prosveshcheniya [MNP] 1875m, 1875l, 1876d) or Popular Education in the USSR (Abakumov et al., 1974a). Others were identified almost incidentally. For example, in chapter 7, I was able to find texts documenting “internal” tutoring (i.e., tutoring within public institutions) thanks to a digital search for the word *repetitor* across multiple volumes of the MNP. Meanwhile, this word is not listed in the Alphabetical Index (MNP, 1888, 1906) of the corresponding collection. Still other texts were found by putting together, piece by piece, previous research on the history of Russian education, official collections of policy documents, and numerous informal sources.

In this way, I have collected 123 policy documents regulating, or at least mentioning, private tutoring and related practices. Table 4 below offers an overview of these types of empirical sources.
Table 4. *Policy documents regulating or mentioning private tutoring or related educational practices in the relevant period.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18th century</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1737 On the Attendance of Underaged Youths in St. Petersburg to the Herald Master, and in the Provinces to the Governors for an Examination in Sciences; for Setting Terms of Study for Them and Assigning Them to Places, after They Have Reached the Age of 20 (PSZ, 1830d).</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1757 On the Compulsory Certification of Foreign Teachers by the Academy of Sciences and the Moscow University (PSZ, 1830g).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1786 Statute on Schools (PSZ, 1830i).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th century</td>
<td>6, 7</td>
<td>1804 Statutes of the Imperial Universities of Moscow, Kharkov, and Kazan (MNP, 1875o).</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1828 Statute on Gymnasia and District and Parish Schools (MNP, 1875n).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1831 Supplementary Rules to the 1828 Statute on Those Who Maintain Private Education Institutions and Teach Young People (MNP, 1875b).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1833 Statute of the Preliminary Foundation of the Moscow Noble Institute (MNP, 1875e).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1835 General Statute of the Imperial Russian Universities (MNP, 1875i).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1848 Statute of the Lazarev Institute of Oriental Languages (MNP, 1876e).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1874 Rules for Students of Gymnasia and Pro-Gymnasia (Zhurnal MNP, 1874).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See also <em>Alphabetical Index to the Collected proceedings of the Ministry of National Enlightenment</em> (MNP, 1888, 1906), articles on:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- home education (<em>domashnee vospitanie</em>);</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- home tutors and teachers (<em>domashnie nastavniki i uchitelya</em>);</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- private education institutions (<em>chastnye uchebnye zavedeniya</em>);</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- tutors and supervisors (<em>nadzirateli i vospitateli</em>).</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period</strong></td>
<td><strong>Year</strong></td>
<td><strong>Event</strong></td>
<td><strong>Regulation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>123</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of identified policies speaks for itself: with the exception of the nineteenth century, tutoring has been subject to little or no specific regulation. This may give the illusion that it did not exist or was not an issue for education authorities in Soviet and post-Soviet Russia.

This is only an illusion. If the analytical focus shifts from the realm of policy, a slightly different idea is revealed: of the prevalence of private tutoring in the periods when it did not seem to exist and the role it played in the formation of education. It is revealed that a large portion of educational reforms were indeed justified by references to the ‘evils’ of private tutoring and can, thus, be seen as indirect regulations thereof. It is also revealed that despite the lack of direct regulations, private tutoring has been the subject of intense debate and has attracted the attention of distinguished academics and the most prominent figures of in Russian culture, politics, and economics. Finally, it is revealed how critical reflection on private tutoring is inextricably linked to other questions, the answers to which are central to the formation of education as a modern institution. In this respect, understanding curriculum as a boundary object has proved particularly useful: it has helped me to examine how different aspects of school curricula, whether purpose, content, or evaluation, simultaneously shape the relevant aspects of private tutoring.

To illuminate this complexity without downplaying the diversity of ways of thinking and reasoning about educational matters, I had to take several detours when collecting empirical sources. For example, in chapters 6 to 8, I first collected informal sources, including memoirs, biographies, tutoring announcements, political letters, official speeches, and mass media coverage of major educational reforms. Only after careful reading of these sources was I able to identify policies developed in response to private tutoring but not explicitly regulating or even mentioning it.
The informal sources for chapters 5 to 7 were found using a digital search in the Russian National Corpus\(^2\) (https://ruscorpora.ru, hereafter RNC). I searched for words that could denote private teacher/teaching or private tutor/tutoring in the relevant period. These included *domashnee vospitanie* (home education), * chastnoe obuchenie* (private education), *guvernior* (governor, tutor), *repetitor/stvo* (private tutor/ing), *domashnii uchitel’* or *domashnyaya uchitel’nitsa* (home teacher, male or female), *domashnii nastavnik* (home tutor), and *chastnyi uchitel’* (private teacher). For chapters 8 to 10, I have used the database East View and the digital archives of major Soviet and post-Soviet newspapers and periodicals, as well as previous research on Russian education policy.

Among the sources identified in this way, I have selected those that (1) detail the issue at hand, (2) reveal issues not reflected in policies, or (3) criticize a proposed or adopted policy solution. In other words, I have selected sources that illuminate the assumptions underlying problematisations of private tutoring, policy silences and alternative problematisations. This strategy yielded 95 additional policy documents and 461 informal sources (Table 5).

Table 5. Additional policy documents and informal sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Other sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Imperial Russia</em> (1721-1917)</td>
<td>18(^{th}) century</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4 (Incl. orders, decrees, statutes on public and private education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19(^{th}) century</td>
<td>6, 7</td>
<td>24 (Incl. orders, decrees, statutes on public and private education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Soviet Russia</em> (1917-1991)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8 (Incl. all-union laws and transcripts of hearings of the Supreme Council of the USSR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) The RNC (n.d.) is a general language corpus incorporating over 900 million words from authentic Russian texts of various genres (fiction, letters, memoirs and biographies, scientific texts, journals, newspapers) from the early eighteenth century to the present day. Beside this, the RNC contains a corpus of spoken Russian (recordings of public spoken Russian and transcriptions of the Russian movies) from 1930 to 2007. Those were, however, not considered in this dissertation.
The collected sources are, of course, diverse in nature: they range from short tutoring advertisements and commentaries to the draft law to policy documents of several hundred pages. Generally speaking, they could be described as reflecting authoritative and public discourses. In some cases, these discourses overlap, reproduce, and facilitate each other, normalising a particular vision of education and its problems (see chapters 5, 6, and 9), but they can also reflect opposing understandings of the same practices and questions (see chapters 8 and 10).

Naturally, the predominance of one type of source over others in a particular historical period affects the way in which the questions posed in the dissertation are approached in different empirical chapters. Thus, for example, chapters 5 and 6 focus more on the authoritative discourse, while chapter 8 pays more attention to the public debate. In chapters 7 and 9, on the other hand, the material enabled a comparison of authoritative and public discourses. Where possible and relevant, I have also considered how similar questions and practices are problematised in the academic literature. This includes, for example, the question of ethics associated with internal tutoring, which is explored in chapter 10.

It is also worth discussing whose voices the various types of empirical sources represent. In this regard, it must be said that I see problematisations as a product of both the individual work of thought and collectively held beliefs, assumptions, fears, and desires. A distinction can thus be made between individual and collective actors. The first category includes individual social actors, politicians, private tutors, renowned figures of Russian education, culture, and science, and lesser-known or even anonymous participants in public debates. By collective actors, I refer to governments, institutions, scientific communities, NGOs, and the mass media. This is not to imply that different constellations of collective actors have a shared understanding of how things are and ought to be. However, one needs to be aware that the majority of sources analysed in this dissertation, both authoritative and informal, represent more or less organised, permitted and controlled (through censorship) forms of critique. In other words, they can be said to represent publicly recognized ways of reasoning about education, the desired society and the common good rather than the thoughts of individual actors.
Despite the varied nature of the sources used in different empirical chapters, together they constitute a valuable dataset for reconstructing the history of problematisations of private tutoring and their role in the formation and transformation of education in Russia.

Analysis

At the outset, it is important to clarify that analysis of authoritative and public discourses should not be confused with critical discourse analysis. Whereas the latter is concerned with the use of language and the ways in which people shape their arguments, the former draws on Foucauldian understanding of discourse as forms of knowledge that “make it difficult to speak outside the terms of reference they establish for thinking about people and social relations” (Bacchi, 2009, p. 35). Of course, in this tradition, discourse is understood as something made up of language and signs also. However, as Foucault (1972) points out, what discourses do is “more than use these signs to designate things. It is this more that makes them irreducible to the language (langue) and to speech. It is this ‘more’ that we must reveal and describe” (p. 49). In short, a Foucault-inspired analysis of discourses (knowledges) aims to make visible the “unexamined ways of thinking [emphasis added] on which the accepted practices are based” (Foucault, 2002a, p. 456).

Apart from the adjustments, discussed above, in analysing the empirical material I have generally followed the template suggested by Bacchi. To better connect the WPR’s questions to the aim of this study, I discuss them in a different order below. The corresponding WPR question is indicated in brackets.

One of the assumptions made in this dissertation is that prevailing beliefs about education and its desired ends have an impact on whether private tutoring (or any other educational phenomenon) is recognized as a problem and how it is treated. Therefore, to understand why tutoring practices are seen as legitimate or problematic in different historical and cultural contexts, I first examined the wider context in which private tutoring becomes a target of reflection (Q3 in the WPR). Accordingly, each of the empirical chapters begins with a general description of the political, ideological, and educational conditions in which the policy and public debate evolved.

In the second stage, I looked at what is being problematised (Q1 in the WPR). Is private tutoring perceived as a problem or as a cause or consequence of other problems? Which aspects of tutoring practices (e.g., curricular, political, economic, juridical, social, and moral) are deemed problematic? What do they communicate about the nature of the problem that demands scrutiny?

It is important to note that one and the same document may contain several conflicting and even contradictory problematisations. An example can be useful here (Figure 2).
Figure 2 shows a quote from Moscow City Duma deputy Yevgeny Bunimovich, who was a proponent of modernisation reforms in the early 2000s (chapter 9). It illustrates how references to private tutoring serve to justify the need for changes in public education. Moreover, in this example, private tutoring appears mostly as a symptom or even as a solution to other educational and societal ills. On the other hand, when tutoring is compared with a veiled form of corruption, it is discussed as a problem in itself.

Although I tried to illuminate this plurality and show how different issues relate to each other in various ways, for the sake of comparability, the analytical focus was on recurring themes and motifs. In the example in Figure 2, these recurring motifs are the gap between secondary and higher education and the question of ethics and corruption associated with private tutoring. This focus on continuity has helped me explore how similar issues were conceptualised in diverse political and ideological contexts.

In the next stage, I explored what norms and values underpin education policy and the particular problematisation of private tutoring (Q2 in the WPR). What facts, truths and knowledge were involved in diagnosing the problem (cf. Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016)? What rationalities, programmes and strategies made this problematisation intelligible and operable? To answer these questions, I have analysed empirical sources that indicate why private tutoring is or is not a problem. In some instances, the answers can be found in policy documents. In the nineteenth century, for example, many of the collected orders, decrees, and statutes were accompanied by an opinion from the State Council and explanatory letters from the Ministry of Education detailing the essence of the issue, its history, previous legalisations, and references to international experience. In the Soviet and post-Soviet period, reform ideas were usually elaborated in public debate and particularly in the mass media. By inquiring into these debates, I was able to illuminate how policies could operate as silences and how the dominant visions of societal and educational

---

27 The quote comes from Bunimovich (2000). PT stands here for private tutoring.
problems were disseminated, naturalised, opposed, and challenged (cf. Q4 and Q6 in the WPR).

Since this study is interested in understanding how public education and private tutoring form and transform each other, it is important to consider not only how the problematisations of private tutoring change in relation to historically and culturally situated visions of education, but also to examine the implications of these problematisations for the formation of public education. This corresponds to question 5 in the WPR concerning the effects produced by specific problem representations. As Bacchi and Goodwin (2016, p. 23) point out, “effects ought to be thought about as political implications rather than as measurable ‘outcomes’”. They suggest that in answering the corresponding question in the WPR template policy, analysts can focus on discursive effects, subjectification, and lived effects.

Discursive effects draw attention to the specific rhetoric and vocabularies (terms, concepts, binaries, classifications) established by a particular problematisation and to the limits they impose on what can be said and thought. As I noted in the introductory chapter, to invoke different binaries, such as public/private, formal/non-formal, regular/irregular, visible/hidden, light/shadow, teaching/cramming, education/tutoring, is to put into play certain assumptions about how things are or ought to be. Whilst the different sides of these binaries do not necessarily contradict each other, one element of each is often considered more important and valuable than the other (Bacchi, 2009).

Considering the discursive effects produced by the problematisations of tutoring practices, I examined when and under what conditions the Russian words repetitor and repetitorstvo came into use and what meanings, values, and dispositions these terms embody. How do these notions constrain our ways of thinking about tutors’ work, their competences, and qualifications? To address these questions, in chapter 7 I delve into the etymology of the Russian word repetitor and discuss how its meanings have changed over time. Similarly, in the final chapter I detail how the problematisations of tutoring practices reflect a wider shift in Russian discourse, whereby education has come to be seen not as a “service to the state” but as a “state service”.

The term subjectification draws on Foucault’s concepts of power and dividing practices and on Hacking’s (1986) theory of “making up people”. It calls attention to the subjects “made up” or “unmade” by a given problematisation. Applying this question to the study of private tutoring, I examined whether the problem is attributed to individual or structural factors, who the policy actors and policy objects are, who benefits from a particular problematisation, and who is deemed responsible for undesired outcomes.

Analysis of lived effects, according to Bacchi (2009), prompts a consideration of the material consequences of particular problematisations on bodies and lives. These effects can be seen as a corollary of the first two types of effects translated into people’s real lives. Analytical attention is paid to how problematisations affect the conduct of individuals, or groups of individuals,
by structuring the field of possible action (cf. Foucault, 1986, 2002b). Education is a fertile field for the study of these kinds of effects because the ways it is conceptualised, regulated, and organised have immediate implications for people’s lives. However, I think that ethnographic research is better suited for a more in-depth examination of the lived effects. The effects that this dissertation considers lie at a more abstract level and concern the formation and transformation of education. In practice, this implied an analysis of policy changes made to eradicate or decrease the demand for undesirable educational practices. These changes were identified following analysis of informal sources, which often suggested ways of dealing with the problems associated with tutoring.

Limitations

This dissertation develops a genealogy of the relationship between public and private in education by focusing on specific educational practices, namely public education and private tutoring. While other forms of non-state, private, non-formal, or out-of-school education have not been entirely overlooked (see, e.g., chapters 5 and 6), they have not been studied in depth. Examining the history of problematisations of other educational practices in their relation to formal educational institutions could be a task for further research.

Second, as I have already pointed out, the status of private tutoring as something that should be prevented, changed, or eliminated varies over time. Accordingly, the findings presented in the empirical chapters depend on the type of sources and the methodological choices made in each case. Due to the varied nature of the empirical material, each chapter does not answer all the questions described above. For example, the question of alternative problematisation (Q4 in the WPR) is barely covered in chapters 5 and 6, partly because of the sheer number of political documents and partly due to the absence of alternative viewpoints, not least caused by censorship. In these cases, policy silences and alternative problematisations are made visible through comparisons with subsequent historical periods. In the same way, the question of effects (Q5 in the WPR) is approached differently: while chapters 7 and 11 focus more on discursive effects, the material used in chapter 10 allows conclusions to be drawn about the subjects produced by the ethical problematisation of internal tutoring.

Despite slightly different emphases, in all chapters I have sought to explore how various problematisations of private tutoring reflect a dominant vision of education and simultaneously shape educational practices, both within and outside public institutions. However, I am by no means claiming to offer an exhaustive account of the history of problematisations of private tutoring in Russia over the last three centuries. After all, it is not possible to cover the
innumerable ways of thinking, reasoning about and taking care of a phenomenon.

Third, the ways in which private tutoring has been problematised in Russia and the effects of these problematisations for the formation of education are reconstructed here at the level of discourse and on the basis of published materials, both formal and informal. Other arenas that could have been relevant for exploring the ways of thinking of private tutoring, such as education philosophy and theory (cf. Durkheim, 2006), have been left outside the scope of this study. Furthermore, most of the empirical sources collected reflect national or federal policies and public debates represented in central newspapers. Thus, I do not explore the local, institutional, and individual levels where the very same questions and practices may be conceptualised differently. I leave the examination of potential differences for further inquiry.

It is also worth noting that access to the public arena is not equally distributed to the members of a society. That is to say, some publics may have no or very limited access to the central media and to political officials and therefore have little influence on what issues become public problems (see e.g., Fraser, 1997). Hence, some questions may not have been recognized as ‘problems’ and are not represented in the sources analysed in the chapters that follow.

Furthermore, although in most cases I give the names, positions, and occupations of those I quote, I am aware that I have not paid sufficient attention to the question of actors, that is, who problematises a certain issue and why. This is not because I thought it was unimportant or irrelevant, but because I felt that to go deeper into this issue would have muddled the focus of the research project. As mentioned, problematisations are considered here to be a product of individual thought; however, most of the collected sources represent collective beliefs and authorised ways of reasoning about education, rather than the thoughts of individual actors. For this reason, I have confined myself to dividing voices into authoritative and public discourses, and analysing, for the most part, the “what”, “how” and “why” questions rather than the “who”.

Finally, the conclusions drawn in this dissertation are inevitably affected by choices I made in collecting and approaching the material and by my intention to trouble current conceptualisations of public and private in international research and contemporary education policy. In order to give the reader an opportunity to critically evaluate the interpretative claims I make, throughout the empirical chapters I provide a substantial number of direct quotations. Longer excerpts are cited in two languages, which, I believe, will benefit readers familiar with the Russian language and, simultaneously, to preserve the linguistic dimension of policy rationalities, which unavoidably changes when primary sources are translated into another language. These materials appear in my translation unless stated otherwise.
This chapter examines how *private education* was problematised in the long eighteenth century when state education was just taking shape. This aim demands two caveats. The first is that in this and the following chapter I use the notion of ‘private education’ to refer both to more or less authorised private and home schools and to less formal teaching and tutoring at private homes. I do so for two reasons. Firstly, in the eighteenth and nineteenth century the boundaries between these forms of education were often indistinct: a schoolteacher could visit students at their homes or open a school at his own home in order to instruct a small number of pupils and earn extra income. Secondly, and more significantly, despite the difference in degree of formality, private teaching and tutoring were thought of and treated as parts of the same problem. However, when policy documents refer to a particular form of private education, I use the appropriate term.

The second caveat concerns periodisation. The chapter covers a period that exceeds the calendar definition of the eighteenth century. Indeed, before Napoleon’s invasion of Russia in 1812, most of the government’s educational efforts were aimed at attracting students, particularly young nobles, to the newly established state schools. By contrast, in the aftermath of the Patriotic War and a series of revolutions in Europe, education came to be seen primarily as a political and ideological weapon against dangerous foreign ideas (see chapter 6). For this reason, the timeframe of this chapter includes the first decade of the nineteenth century.

The chapter consists of five sections. I start with a brief description of the empirical sources. The next three sections examine three problematisations of private education in the eighteenth century: (1) the question of tutor competence, (2) the question of curricular conformity, and (3) the question of privilege and merit. The main conclusions are summarised and discussed in the final section.

---

28 See, for example, Catherine the Great’s *Statute on Schools* (PSZ, 1830i), which entitled schoolteachers to board students and teach them privately outside school hours.
Empirical Sources

The chapter draws on two categories of empirical sources. Included in the first category are policy documents (statutes, decrees, etc.) directly or indirectly regulating private education. The documents relevant to this chapter have been identified mainly through previous research on the history of education in early modern Russia and semi-official writings\(^{29}\) on the subject (Aleshintsev, 1908, 1912; Alston, 1969; Hans, 1931, 2012; Kapterev, 1915; Madariaga, 1979; Raeff, 1957, 1966; Rozhdestvensky, 1902, 1912; Stolpiansky, 1912; Voronov, 1849, 1858). Although most of these studies do not focus on private education, even brief mentions of various forms of out-of-school teaching and tutoring have proved useful in building a more complete picture of how they were conceptualised during the analysed historical period.

In this way, I found eight policy documents (Table 6) and retrieved them from the *Complete Collection of Laws of the Russian Empire* (PSZ, 1830e, 1867)\(^{30}\).

Table 6. Policy documents regulating or relating to private tutoring and similar educational practices in the long eighteenth century.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td>Decree</td>
<td>On the Attendance of Underaged Youths in St. Petersburg to the Herald Master, and in the Provinces to the Governors to Certify Them in Sciences; for Setting Terms of Study for Them and Assigning Them to Places When They Reach the Age of 20 (PSZ, 1830d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755</td>
<td>Decree</td>
<td>On the Establishment of the Moscow University and Appointment of its Curator and Rector (PSZ, 1830g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1757</td>
<td>Decree</td>
<td>On the Compulsory Certification of Foreign Teachers by the Academy of Sciences and the Moscow University (PSZ, 1830h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1764</td>
<td>Reform proposal</td>
<td>General Statute on Education of Young People of Both Sexes (Betskoi, 1764)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767</td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>Instruction to the Legislative Commission (PSZ, 1830b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1786</td>
<td>Statute</td>
<td>Statute on Schools (PSZ, 1830i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1808</td>
<td>Reform proposal</td>
<td>On the Improvement of General Public Education (Speransky, 1808/1910)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809</td>
<td>Decree</td>
<td>On the Rules of Promotion to the Civil Service and on Examinations in Sciences for Promotion to the Ranks of Collegiate Assessor and State Councillor (PSZ, 1830c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{29}\) By ‘semi-official writings’ I refer to historical essays written by individuals who worked for the Ministry of Education, such as Sergey Rozhdestvensky and Andrey Voronov. Rozhdestvensky was appointed by the Ministry specifically to document its history. Voronov worked as a school inspector in St. Petersburg in the early 19th century.

\(^{30}\) Hereinafter PSZ. The electronic version of the PSZ is available online via the National Library of Russia (http://nlr.ru/e-res/law_r/content.html) and allows thematic and chronological search across multiple volumes.
The official documents were complemented with biographies, memoirs and philosophical essays on education identified through the RNC (see chapter 4). These documents were used to explore whether and how private education was problematised in the wider public debate. They were also useful for revealing the policy silences and considering the effects of problematisations.

Shifting Visions of Education and Its Problems

The emergence of state schools in Russia is usually associated with the name of Peter the Great. This does not mean that there were no organised forms of education before his time. In Muscovite Russia, it took the form of “apprenticeship”, or “teachership” (Fedyukin, 2019), and occupied an important niche between the family and the nascent school (Kosheleva, 2019). However, the transmission of knowledge from master to apprentice was not sanctioned by the state. Nor were there formal curricula, grades, classes, examinations, certificates, or other attributes of a modern school. Moreover, until the reign of Peter and for some time during it, all initiatives to organise “schools” came from private individuals (Fedyukin, 2019; Kosheleva, 2019).

For Peter the Great, the creation of schools “from which people could go forth into church service, civilian service, and ready to wage war, to practice engineering and medical art” (as cited in Alston, 1969, p. 4) was necessary to strengthen the state apparatus. In keeping with the pragmatic need to produce useful servants of the state, the first educational institutions created during his rule were schools for the vocational training of young noblemen.

In contrast to Western Europe, Russian schools did not compete with the Church; the ecclesiastical schools were under the indirect supervision of the Holy Synod and depended financially on state subsidies (Raeff, 1966, p. 130). Nevertheless, Peter’s educational campaign was less than successful. From their inception until almost the end of the eighteenth century, state schools had to compete for legitimacy with private alternatives. Despite all government attempts to make education an integral part of compulsory state service, the nobility continued to send their sons abroad or hire private teachers and tutors for them31. It was under these conditions that the traditional ways of gaining knowledge through apprenticeship and tutoring came to be seen as a problem hindering the development of public schools, an obstacle to that was to be removed.

In the remainder of the chapter, I explore how the imperial government problematised private education and justified the measures taken to reduce the demand for it throughout the eighteenth century.

31 See, for example, Fedyukin’s (2019) study of school politics in early modern Russia, in which he cites several examples from the memoir literature documenting private tutoring as the main channel for learning languages and mathematics in eighteenth-century Russia.
The Question of Competence

Judging by the available records, in the first decades of the eighteenth century the government did not regard private education as a problem. On the contrary, the decree of 1737 officially allowed children of noble birth to be taught at home until they reached the age of twenty (PSZ, 1830d). The earliest identified policy documents which explicitly problematise private education come from the second half of the century (see Table 6).

In public discourse, however, private education had been problematised several decades earlier. For example, in his Dialogue of Two Friends on the Benefits of Science and Schools, the renowned Russian scholar Vasily Tatishchev (1733/1979)32 criticized noble families for hiring poorly educated and completely incompetent tutors to teach their children. He urged the government to improve public schools because, in his opinion, private education was “inconvenient”, as only a small portion of society could afford good teachers (p. 104). In other words, Tatishchev problematised two interrelated aspects of private education: the competence of tutors, and the structural inequality of educational opportunity.

Two decades later, the former problematisation appeared in authoritative discourse. In her decree on the establishment of Moscow State University, empress Elizabeth I mentioned the large number of private teachers working in private homes, arguing the following:

Великое число въ Москвѣ у помѣщиковъ на дорого момъ содержаннiи учителей, изъ которыхъ большая часть не токмо учить науки не могутъ, но и сами къ тому никакого начала не имютъ, и только черезъ то младыя дѣтa учениковъ, и лучшее время къ учению пропадаетъ, а за учение онымъ безполезно великая плата дается; всѣ жъ почти помѣщики имютъ старанiе о воспитанiи дѣтей своихъ, не щадя иные по бѣдности великой части своего имѣнiя и ласкаясь надеждою произвести изъ дѣтей своихъ достойных людей в службу Нашу, а иные, не имѣя знанiя в наукахъ, или по необходимости не сыскавъ лучшыхъ учителей, принимаютъ такихъ, которые лакеями, парикмахерами и другими подобными ремеслами

In Moscow, a great number of teachers are on landowners’ payrolls, most of them are not only unable to teach, but also have no experience in teaching. And due to that, the pupils’ younger years and the best time for studying are being wasted. But for that fruitless teaching they are being paid greatly. In the meantime, almost all landowners of ours make efforts to educate their children, sometimes sparing no expense in the hope of raising worthy men suitable for serving Us. Others, education themselves of the sciences or having failed to find better teachers, hire people who have spent their entire lives as footmen, barbers and in other similar trades.

32 Hereinafter, the first date in each reference corresponds to the date of the first publication of the consulted empirical source.
In this passage, the empress attributes the popularity of private teachers to an increased interest in education. However, she argues that most private teachers and tutors are themselves poorly educated and therefore unable to teach and prepare students for future service to the state. What is questioned here is not only the professionalism of the tutors but also their ability to act in the interests of the Russian Empire. This problematisation was used to justify the establishment of a state university in Moscow, which, it was stated, would make it possible to train competent teachers and ensure “the commonwealth of the whole nation” (PSZ, 1830g, p. 286).

Two years later, in 1757, Elizabeth issued another decree regulating who could be employed as a teacher or tutor. In particular, the empress demanded that all teachers of foreign origin pass an examination either at the Academy of Sciences in Saint Petersburg or at Moscow University and receive an appropriate certificate. Those lacking the certificate were prohibited from teaching privately and from having the right to run a school. In addition, parents who employed unauthorised teachers, were to pay a fine (PSZ, 1830h).

As with the previous decree, the problem this regulation sought to address was related to the question of competence. The introduction of special certificates was indeed intended to raise the standard of teaching in general and in private homes in particular. However, the rationale behind this decree was somewhat different. This time the problem was more clearly linked to a certain group of tutors, namely, tutors with foreign backgrounds. Moreover, unlike the previous decree, this regulation also problematised the behaviour of parents employing such tutors. Thus, in addition to the already established boundaries between competent and incompetent tutors, the modified problematisation suggested new ones—between foreign and Russian tutors and between responsible and irresponsible parents. It also entailed the development of new techniques—examination and certification—to select tutors with desirable traits and exclude those considered unreliable.

Naturally, by examining and certifying private teachers and tutors, the government could extend its surveillance beyond public schools. On the other hand, state certificates could also be used by private teachers to confer legitimacy to their services. Indeed, according to the historian Stolpiansky (1912), who studied advertisements published in the St. Petersburg News, after 1757 private teachers and private school owners did start referring to their certificates to demonstrate their competence. Importantly, judging from the ads, they offered lessons in the same subjects as public schools. Stolpiansky (1912)

---

33 The Russian texts are quoted using the orthography in the consulted source.
34 The St. Peterburg News (Sanktpeterburgskie Vedomosti) is the oldest regular newspaper printed in Russia.
notes that in the 1860s, boarding school owners were mostly teachers employed in or retired from public schools (p. 15). Thus, it can be assumed that another effect produced by the problematisation of tutors’ competence was a considerable unification of the curricula of public and private education.

However, informal sources indicate that, despite the prohibition, noble families continued to hire tutors without asking for certificates. This is evidenced in Nikolay Novikov’s (1783/1951) treatise *On the Education and Guidance of Children*:

No one will deny, however, that even now there are many wanderers in our country under this [teacher’s] name. The necessity of learning foreign languages and the insufficient number of our own good teachers, compelled parents to give high pay to tutors; this attracted into our fatherland many foreigners, who all their lives did not even think of educating and training children, still less read the necessary books; who themselves were educated very badly, and in their own countries they lived of the lowest trade. But here they all engage in the education of youth, and some are handsomely paid for that. This has undoubtedly attracted to our country many good men; but the bad ones still outnumber the good, and so it is very hard to find a good tutor. All this is known to parents, but many act so thoughtlessly in choosing a tutor for their children that they employ them without a university certificate, which would at least ensure that they were not choosing someone entirely incapable of such an important task.

Here Novikov criticizes undisciplined tutors and parents for ignoring government requirements. He suggests that the reason for this lies partly in the high costs of competent private tutors and partly in the individual characteristics of tutors and parents. The former—tutors—are portrayed as uneducated and greedy, and the latter—parents—as naive or careless. This passage also shows
that although parents did not attach much importance to state certificates, for some observers, institutional credentials had come to be regarded as an undisputable indicator of a teacher’s competence.

The Question of Curricular Compliance

By the time Catherine the Great ascended the throne in 1762, public schools were still few and poorly attended (Madariaga, 1979). In the meantime, the number of private schools continued to grow. Fedyukin (2019, p. 211) notes, however, that by the mid-eighteenth century many private schools “existed in the orbit of state schools, preparing their students for entry or possibly offering supplementary or parallel training, in addition to providing state schoolteachers with additional income”. Put another way, private schools came to play a supplementary role in relation to public ones.

Unlike her predecessors, who regarded education as a means of producing trained civil servants, officers, and administrators, Catherine saw it as a means of forming a new humanity, a new type of man—a citizen. Her adviser and author of the new curriculum reform, Ivan Betskoi, explained this shift as follows:

Искусство доказало, что одинь только украшенной и просвещенной науками разумъ не дълятъ еще добраго и прямаго гражданина [emphasis added]: но во многихъ случаяхъ паче во вредъ бываетъ. … По сему ясно, что корень всему злу и доброму воспитание. (Betskoi, 1764, pp. 4-5)

Art has proved that the mind, adorned and enlightened by science alone, does not of itself make a good and reliable citizen [emphasis added], but in many cases it can be harmful. … Therefore, it is clear that the root of all evil and good is education.

The understanding of education as a means of citizen formation is also evident in Catherine’s Instruction to the Legislative Commission:

348. Правила воспитания суть первыя основания, приготовляющи насъ быть гражданами [emphasis added]. 349. Каждая особенная семья должна быть управляема по примѣру большой семьи, включающей въ себѣ все частины. (PSZ, 1830b, p. 255)

348. The rules of education are the first foundations that prepare us to become citizens [emphasis added]. 349. Every individual family must be governed in the same way as a large family that includes all the particular ones.35

35 This part of the Instruction was apparently borrowed from the fourth book of Montesquieu’s The Spirit of Laws (1748/1751, p. 42) which states that “the laws of education are the first impressions we receive; and as they prepare us for civil life, each particular family ought to be governed pursuant to the plan of the great family which comprehends them all”.
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To shape future citizens, the government initiated several important reforms. Firstly, new types of schools were established throughout the empire into which boys and girls from all social classes, except the serfs, could enrol. The curriculum of these schools, promulgated in 1785 by the new Statute on Schools (PSZ, 1830h), put greater emphasis on moral education, which was said to be crucial for the formation of the “entire man”, that is, both the mind and the heart of each student.

Secondly, “to instil in the young hearts some uniformity of thought” (Betskoi, 1764, p. 5), all forms of education were to be based on the same rules. In accordance with this standpoint, the Statute on Schools (PSZ, 1830h) regulated in great detail what, when and how subjects should be taught, both in public institutions and outside them. This laid down unified principles for the formation of future citizens.

Without going into the detail about the content of the new curriculum, one point is worth mentioning. Although at that time French was widely spoken among the Russian nobility, it was excluded from general schools. Meanwhile, according to Voronov (1849, pp. 6–7), in the 1780s, French was the main language of instruction in private schools. Madariaga (1979) suggests that Catherine did not consider French useful for all and believed that those who wished to learn it could easily pay for lessons. In other words, Madariaga concludes, French was implicitly relegated to private tutoring (p. 25).

As mentioned earlier, it was not only public education that underwent greater regulation and unification. Despite its ambitions to provide schooling for all children, the government soon realised that educating “numerous people in houses designed especially for that purpose” was in practice impossible (PSZ, 1830b, p. 256). In order to maintain “uniformity of thought” within and outside state institutions, the government felt the need to create “a new breed of fathers and mothers” (novuyu porodu otsov i materei) (Betskoi, 1764, p. 5). For this purpose, Catherine, in the Instruction to the Legislative Commission, laid down some general rules intended to serve as a guide for all parents. These rules concerned primarily moral education, through which parents themselves could prepare “useful members of society” (PSZ, 1830b, p. 257).

The Statute on Schools (PSZ, 1830h) contains more detailed rules concerning home schools (domashnie uchilishcha) and private tutoring. By ‘private tutoring’ I refer here to additional lessons that schoolteachers were entitled to conduct with students boarding at their homes (PSZ, 1830h, p. 650). Firstly, according to the Statute, both these types of out-of-school instruction were subject to the oversight of the local Boards of Social Welfare (Prikazy Obshchestvennogo Prizreniya). Secondly, anyone wishing to open a home school or to teach privately had to obtain a certificate. Thirdly, private teachers and tutors had to follow the official curriculum in both content and teaching methods:
The manner of teaching in home schools must perfectly correspond [emphasis added] to that used in the public schools.

To achieve such homogeneity, private teachers were advised to use authorised textbooks. In addition, home school owners were required to report on students’ progress to local Boards of Social Welfare.

What these changes signal is that the problematisation of private education had shifted from the question of competence (although the requirement for a certificate did not disappear) to that of governance and curricular compliance. Catherine evidently shared Montesquieu’s (1752) idea that “the laws of education ought to be in relation to the principles of government” (p. 42). His metaphorical description of the ‘family’ as a model of government, quoted almost verbatim by the empress in her Instruction to the Legislative Commission, served to justify state paternalism in the absolute monarchy where all power is united in one person. In accordance with this view, Catherine did not want to forbid private education, but was determined to make it part of the “family” and steer it towards the same goal.

Clearly, Catherine’s vision of education with a common school and a common curriculum presupposed a unity of aspirations and needs that did not exist in reality. As Rozhdestvensky (1917, p. XXXVIII) noted,

Despite all efforts to set up a comprehensive system, by the end of the century public education was still in a deplorable state. As such, schooling was perceived as a whim of the state and still faced massive resistance: the lower classes saw no value in the kind and form of education offered by the state, whereas wealthier families were reluctant to send children to classless schools as they felt that their educational needs were different (Alston, 1969; Madariaga, 1979; Raeff, 1972).
The Question of Privilege and Merit

The state of education in the early nineteenth century is described in the political letters of Mikhail Speransky, reformer and advisor to emperor Alexander I.

Speransky (1808/1910) speaks of three types of civic education, each used by certain social classes. The first is tutoring at private homes, which, he says is used by wealthy gentry who can afford it. The second type, private boarding schools, is used by the less wealthy nobles. Finally, the third type, public schools, are attended mainly by children of poor parents of non-noble origin (p. 375). According to Speransky, the problem common to all three types is that they do not go beyond the rudiments necessary for promotion in service. Nevertheless, he believed that public schools were the most suitable, since private education suffered from two other disadvantages: 1) it was impossible to find good private teachers for large numbers of students, and 2) the state could not control private education and ensure “the uniformity of social rules” (Speransky, 1808/1910, p. 375).

At first glance, Speransky raises questions inherited from an earlier era, namely, tutor competence, unequal educational opportunity, and the lack of uniformity between public and private education. However, in contrast to the established view, Speransky sees the prevalence of private education as a symptom, rather than the cause, of the poor state of the public system. Consequently, instead of imposing new rules on private education, he thought it more effective to make schools and universities more attractive to the gentry. The new reading of old questions generated a new solution: education, declared Speransky (1808/1910), should become a moral duty and a necessary condition for entry into state service for all nobles.

It is important to keep in mind that in the Russian Empire a person’s social position was determined by the Table of Ranks (Tabel’ o rangakh), introduced by Peter the Great in 1722 (PSZ, 1830f). It was essentially a promotional ladder, consisting of fourteen parallel ranks for military, civil and court service. The idea behind the Table of Ranks was to enable any commoner to be ennobled regardless of his or her family status. Everyone was to start their service career at the very bottom of, or even below, the rank ladder and gradually climb it by demonstrating personal merit and talent to reach the higher ranks that conferred nobility (Raeff, 1966). Since education was part of the civil service, years spent at school (not performance or level of education) could contribute to rank promotion.

In Speransky’s opinion, the rules for rank promotion that were in force at that time hampered the development of public education. He observed that

---

36 Although the specific ranks varied throughout the imperial period, in general, the lowest 14th rank was stipulated for individual nobility, while the holders of the 8th rank and higher were endowed with the privilege of hereditary nobility. The promotion to rank 5 and higher was only possible upon the tsar’s approval.
students who had graduated from university were often entitled to a lower rank than their uneducated peers who already held positions in the civil, military or court service. This principle, Speransky (1808/1910) pointed out, privileged seniority over “actual merit and diligence” (p. 375) and had a negative effect on people’s perceptions of education:

Hence, the preference for private boarding schools and home education, in which all sciences are taught hastily and superficially. Hence, the estrangement from public schools, whose course is based not on brilliance, but on correct methods.

To eliminate “the root of evil” and instil an interest in education, Speransky believed it necessary to stop the race for ranks, which “despise everything not adorned by them”. He envisioned two solutions to this problem: to abolish ranks altogether, or to reconsider the principles of promotion, so that to reach a certain level of nobility was possible only after achieving a certain level of education. Realising the difficulties that the abolition of the Table of Ranks would cause, Speransky recommended the implementation of the second solution (p. 378-379).

As suggested by Speransky, civil service examinations were introduced in 1809. From now on, according to imperial decree On Examination for Promotion to Higher Ranks (PSZ, 1830c), to obtain a rank of collegial assessor (8th rank) and of state councillor (5th rank), both of which endowed the holders with the privileges of hereditary nobility, candidates had to pass state examinations in the basics of all sciences except medicine. In this way, the government hoped to “put an obstacle to the search for rank without merit and to give the true merits a new confirmation of Our respect” (PSZ, 1830c, p. 1054).

In the decree of 1809, a stronger bond between the level of education and a state service career was created. Without education, or rather without an official document certifying it, it became difficult, if not impossible, to achieve the desired social position and the privileges and benefits arising from it. Since neither home education nor private tutoring could provide privileges of this kind, their position vis-à-vis formal education institutions began to weaken.

37 It is worth noting that the idea of a direct link between education and social rank was indeed discussed already in the eighteenth century. It was argued that in a society where an individual’s status and wealth hinged on ranks, advanced study had little appeal unless rewarded by an honourable position in the Table of Ranks. However, until 1809 no measures were taken to make this happen. For references, see Raeff (1966).
Chapter Conclusions

In this chapter, I have identified several problematisations of private education and tutoring and discussed how they kept being modified throughout the eighteenth century in line with shifting visions of education.

One of these problematisations has to do with the competence of tutors. Under a pragmatic approach to education, tutor competence was ‘measured’ by their educational attainment and the ability to produce effective civil servants suitable for public service. The government was concerned that most private tutors were themselves poorly educated and therefore unable to train competent civil servants. To prevent this, it expanded the network of public institutions and introduced teacher certifications as a prerequisite for engaging in all kinds of teaching activities within and outside these institutions.

Catherine’s vision of citizenship-oriented education led to the problematisation of the content and pedagogy of private education. Concerned about maintaining “uniformity of thought” within one large “family”, she saw the best possible solution to the problem in the unification of all forms of education through a common curriculum.

Another problematisation discussed in this chapter is related to the question of privilege. This issue received particular attention in the writings of Speransky, who saw society’s resistance to public education as a symptom of another disease—the quest for ranks, titles, and privileges at the expense of superficial knowledge. At his suggestion, the government introduced civil service examinations, which changed the principles of social ranking by tying them to the level of education and merits.

Although the nobility met this policy change without enthusiasm, it came to play a crucial role in the further development of Russian education. In contrast to Speransky’s intentions, the reform transformed the school into an institution where the pursuit of individual advantage in the form of distinctions, rewards and ranks prevailed over the pursuit of knowledge. At the same time, the reform ultimately helped to confer legitimacy to state schools and make them more attractive to the nobility. As Aleshintsev (1908, p. 10) pointed out, “the government never again had to encourage society to educate, but rather only to restrain it”. As demonstrated below, in the next period, when education came to be regarded as dangerous for political reasons, the government had to impose “artificial barriers to curb the desire for education” (Aleshintsev, 1912, pp. 54–55).

---

38 Speransky was indeed declared a French secret agent (see e.g., Raeff, 1957).
6. Public and Private in a Nationalist Perspective: The Conservative Policy Turn in the Nineteenth Century

This chapter focuses on the period between the 1810s and the early 1850s (the reigns of Alexander I and Nicholas I) and reconstructs the lines of tension that led to several fundamental reforms in both public and private education. In fact, over these four decades, the government issued 62 laws and regulations on private education and tutoring. What questions required urgent answers? What values were at stake?

The specified period was characterised by a vigorous process of nation-building, which was triggered by a chain of revolutions and military conflicts within and outside Russia. In this chapter I explore how the changed political conditions led to nationalist and defensive approaches to education and how the previous problematisations of private education\(^ {39} \) were modified in the light of this new vision. One of the arguments I develop here is that the mimicking character of some forms of private tutoring is a product of persistent problematisations of ideological conformity rather than their “natural” feature.

My argument unfolds as follows. I begin by discussing the political and ideological climate in which the role of education was redefined. I focus here on the theory of “official nationality” formulated by Sergey Uvarov, Minister of Education from 1833 to 1849 and one of the chief ideologists of the era of Nicholas I\(^ {40} \). I then examine how the old problematisations of private education, namely, those of individual privilege and the competence of tutors, were rethought and melded with questions of governance and ideological conformity. The solution developed for the latter problem is presented in a separate section. The final part summarises the main conclusions and elaborates on the effects produced by the modified problematisations of private education.

Before turning to the analysis, I briefly describe the empirical sources and how they were approached.

---

\(^ {39} \) As in the previous chapter, I use the term “private education” to refer both to private/home schools and less formal education in private homes, since they were often treated as the same kind of ‘problem’. However, when policy documents refer to a particular form of private education, I use the respective term.

\(^ {40} \) This doctrine influenced not only education policy but also other areas of social, cultural, and political life in the period under review.
Empirical sources

Most of the empirical sources used in this chapter consist of policy documents from the Collected Proceedings of the Ministry of National Enlightenment\(^1\) (MNP, 1875l, 1875m, 1876d). Texts relevant to the purpose of this study have been identified from the Alphabetical Indexes to these collections (MNP, 1888, 1906). Initially, I collected all documents listed under the categories “home education” (domashnee vospitanie), “home tutors and teachers” (domashnie nastavniki i uchitelya) and “private educational institutions” (chastnye uchebnye zavedeniya) issued during the period under review, with the exception of those concerning specific institutions or specific provinces and regions of the Russian Empire. In total, I analysed 42 policy documents of this type. In addition, I made use of two general reforms of secondary and higher education curricula proclaimed by the Statute on Gymnasia and District and Parish schools of 1828 (MNP, 1875n) and the University Statute of 1835 (MNP, 1875i).

To get an insight into policy formation, I used the multivolume Journal of the Ministry of National Enlightenment [Zhurnal MNP]. The journal was founded in 1834 by Minister Sergey Uvarov. It contains, among other things\(^2\), laws, decrees, circulars, orders, directives, and annual reports. Most importantly, it provides more detailed descriptions of specific issues and documents not included in the Collected Proceedings of the Ministry of National Enlightenment.

As in the previous chapter, the policy documents were supplemented by informal sources (biographies, memoirs, and philosophical writings on education) identified through the RNC. However, since most of these sources were addressed to the authorities or sometimes written at their request, they should not be taken at face value. More often than not, the concerns they articulate do not differ from those put forward in policy discourse. The problematisations analysed below are therefore predominantly authoritative. Accordingly, informal sources are used here not to explore alternative visions of education and its problems, but to examine how official understandings of the matter were disseminated and naturalised in public discourse.

It should also be noted that, given the large number of policy documents and other relevant texts, I focus on recurring questions and notable modifications of previous problematisations, leaving isolated cases outside the scope of the analysis.

---

\(^1\) The collection contains decrees, statutes and other official documents issued by the Ministry of Education between 1802 and 1904.

\(^2\) The Journal of the Ministry of Education is one of the oldest Russian journals, the first issues of which were published in 1803. Along with the official section, it had special sections devoted to “Literature”, “Sciences and Arts”, “News about Scholars and Educational Institutions in Russia”, “News about Foreign Scholars and Educational Institutions”, “History of Education and Civic Education”, etc.
In Search of a National Idea of Education

The first half of the nineteenth century was a time of dramatic political change. The Patriotic war against Napoleon in 1812, the sudden death of Alexander I followed by the Decembrist Rebellion of 1825, a series of revolutions in Europe, and the Polish Uprising in the early 1830s forced the authorities to reconsider the risks of Westernisation and make a sharp conservative turn. Education could no longer be modelled on Europe as it had been in the previous century. Europe, and France in particular, came to be seen a source of revolutionary ideas that could threaten autocratic rule—a key element and necessary condition for the existence of the Russian Empire. To prevent further denationalisation of education and the “liberalisation of minds”, it was considered imperative to find a unique path of development and to re-discover the values that constitute “Russia’s distinctive character and belong to it alone” (Uvarov, 1843/1864, p. 2).

Salvation from “the dangerous spirit of philosophical freethinking” (Rozhdestvensky, 1902, p. 115) was found in the unity of faith, knowledge, and power. This idea was first proposed in 1818 by Alexander Sturdza, a governmental official and publicist who took active part in developing a new education policy. Arguing for the need for increased emphasis on the humanities and religion, he noted that it was important

чтобы народное воспитанiе, основу и залогъ благосостояния государственного и частнаго, … направить къ истинной, высокой цѣли – къ во- дворенiю въ составъ общества въ Россiи постояннаго и спасительнаго согласiя между вѣрою, вѣденiемъ и властью или, другими выраженiями, между христiанскимъ благочестiемъ, просвѣщенiемъ умовъ и существованiемъ гражданскимъ. (Sturdza, 1818, as cited in Sukhomlinov, 1881, pp. 34)

[to] direct the education of the people, the basis and guarantee of the public and private good, … towards the true and high goal—the establishment in Russia of a permanent and salutary harmony between faith, knowledge, and power, or, in other words, between Christian piety, enlightenment of minds, and civic existence.

A similar idea was put forward in 1833 by the newly appointed Minister of Education, Sergey Uvarov. In his inaugural circular, he famously declared that the “correct, fundamental education of people” must rest on “the joint spirit of Orthodoxy, Autocracy, and nationality” (Pravoslavie, Samoderzhavie,

43 See, for example, Catherine’s Instruction to the Legislative Commission (PSZ, 1830b), in which she claims that authoritarian rule is best suited to countries of the size of Russia.
44 As mentioned in the previous chapter, the idea that forms of education correspond to forms of government was borrowed from Montesquieu in the mid-eighteenth century and has influenced Russian education policy ever since.
45 Compare with Liberté, Égalité, and Fraternité, the motto of the French Revolution.
The Russian word *narodnost’* (“national spirit”; from *narod*—people, nation), commonly translated into English as “nationality”, was in fact “invented” in the 1820s as a counterpart and an ultimate alternative to the French concept of *nationalité*. Despite its uncertain semantics, the word *narodnost’* replaced the previously borrowed word *natsiya* (nation) and became one of the key political and ideological concepts from the early 1830s to the 1880s (Miller, 2008). Although it maintained the idea of a community consolidated around shared values, the word *narodnost’* blurred the undesirable liberal associations with popular sovereignty and constitutional rule rooted in the French revolutionary imaginaries. In Uvarov’s trinity, *narodnost’* took on a different meaning; it was directly linked to autocracy as the only suitable form of governance in Russia. As the Minister explained, along with orthodoxy, autocracy constituted “the sacred remnants of Russian nationality” (Uvarov, 1844/1864, p. 2)46. Thus, it can be concluded that orthodoxy and autocracy were regarded as attributes of the nationality.

### Reshaping Public Education

The re-discovery of ‘true’ Russian values gave a new direction to education policy. In the light of revolutionary threats, the idea of universal education and classless schools began to seem problematic. It was assumed that to give education to all was to ask for political change: “To teach the whole nation to write and read”, as the Minister of Education Alexander Shishkov (1824-1828) expressed it, “would do more harm than good” (Shishkov, 1824, as cited in Hans, 1931, p. 66). Arguing that educational needs are determined by social class, he noted:

> Науки полезны только тогда, когда, какъ соль, употребляются и преподаются в мѣру, смотря по состоянію людей и по надобности, какую всякое званіе в них имѣетъ. Излишество ихъ, какъ и недостатокъ, противны истинному просвѣщенію. (Shishkov, 1824, as cited in Rozhdestvenky, 1902, p. 166)

> The sciences are useful only when, like salt, they are used and taught in moderation, in accordance with people’s estate and the needs, which any rank has for them. Their excess, as well as their insufficiency, is hostile to true enlightenment.

---

46 For a more detailed analysis of the Uvarov doctrine, see, for example, Riasanovsky’s (1959) book *Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia 1825–1855*. 
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A similar sentiment is expressed in the Statute on Gymnasia and District and Parish Schools of 1828, which stipulates those institutions should be “adapted to varying estates and different educational needs” (MNP, 1875n, p. 203). In explaining this stance, Uvarov pointed out that “the passion of the young people for superfluous knowledge, the practical application of which is rarely successful … deceives the hopes of poor parents and the utopian expectations of young men” (MNP, 1866, p. 494).47

In order to temper the ever-increasing desire for education and to be able to control the composition of the educated class, the Ministry of National Enlightenment restructured the entire system so that it would better meet the educational needs of different estates. Echoing his predecessor, Uvarov said:

Различие потребностей разных со-словий народа и разных состояний неминуемо ведет к надлежащему разграничению предметов учения между ними. Система общественного образования тогда только может назваться правильно располо-женной, когда оно всякому открывает способы получить такое воспитание, какое соотвѣтственно роду жизни его и будущему призванію в гражданском обществѣ. (Uvarov, 1844/1864, p. 8)

The different needs of different classes and estates inevitably lead to a proper differentiation of the subjects between them. The system of public education can only be properly designed when it provides everyone with the means to receive an education that is compatible with his lifestyle and future mission in civil society.

In accordance with this conviction, the Ministry established three types of schools: 1) parish schools that provided elementary education for the children of the lower social classes, 2) district schools that functioned as secondary schools for the children of merchants and lower-ranking officers, and 3) gymnasia, or grammar schools, which were intended for the children of nobility and civil servants.

Although officially all schools were open to all children, in practice most Russians received no education; partly because the state did not have the resources to fund such a system (Chapman, 2001), and partly because there were limited opportunities to transfer from parish schools to district schools and then to gymnasia due to curricular differentiation.48 After the introduction of

47 It is worth noting that similar reasoning was common in other countries. According to Green (2013), at that time the ideas of educating lower classes seemed preposterous to both conservative and liberal thinkers in Europe.

48 The curriculum of the district schools focused on national history and the Russian language and culture. Other subjects, such as civics, physics, technology, Latin, and German were excluded as they were considered useless for children from lower urban classes. In contrast, the grammar school curriculum included Greek, Latin, French, logic, statistics, physics, and other subjects required for university entrance (MNP, 1875k).
entrance examinations and tuition fees\textsuperscript{49} (MNP, 1875n, 1876a, 1876b; Zhurnal MNP, 1837) these opportunities were further curtailed for less wealthy families.

Justifying these changes, Uvarov argued that children of non-noble origin “could not take full advantage of the means provided to them by the government to acquire knowledge” (Uvarov, 1844/1864, p. 7). However, as Rozhdestevnsky (1902, pp. 272–273) pointed out, the introduction of tuition fees was not so much an educational or economic measure but rather a political one; it was used as a means “to make it difficult for raznochintsy\textsuperscript{50} to enter gymnasia” (MNP, 1876b, p. 629). Obviously, with this restructuring of public education, the government hoped to put a stop to the further spread of pernicious liberal and revolutionary ideas and make public education more convenient and attractive to the nobility than any private alternatives.

**Modifications of Old Problematisations**

In the second half of the eighteenth century, the policy debates on private education evolved around one opposition—between the public and the private (chapter 5). The changed political and ideological climate of the nineteenth century brought new concerns about private education to the forefront. More accurately, the core set of problematisations remained the same, but it was significantly modified in line with the prevailing nationalist and defensive approach to education. In short, the opposition between the public and the private was supplemented by another—between the national and the foreign. Moreover, in authoritative discourse, ‘private’ and ‘foreign’ tended to overlap, attaching new meanings to old concerns.

Below I examine how questions of privilege and tutors’ competence were redefined and linked more closely to the questions of governance and ideological conformity.

**The Question of Privilege**

As noted in the previous chapter, the Speransky reform, which made a state career dependent on formal scholarship, never enjoyed popularity among the

\textsuperscript{49} Tuition fees were introduced in 1817 on the initiative of Uvarov, who argued that free education “causes pernicious carelessness in parents, especially in the lower classes” (Uvarov, 1817, as cited in Rozhdestvensky, 1902, p. 137). By the end of his term as education minister, however, Uvarov reconsidered the efficacy of this measure, cautioning that “a significant increase in tuition fees might make it difficult for the Ministry to keep education in public institutions ahead of home and private education” (MNP, 1876a, p. 633).

\textsuperscript{50} Literally, the word *raznochitsy* means “people of miscellaneous ranks”, but most often it was used to refer to educated people of non-noble origin.
nobility. After the Decembrist uprising it became even more obvious that it was “too democratic and erroneous”, as the poet Alexander Pushkin (1826/1962, p. 357) put it. Furthermore, according to Pushkin, state examinations for rank promotion laid the ground for corruption, as it became possible to buy rights and privileges without acquiring the necessary knowledge and skills.

Reflecting on the question of privilege, Pushkin noted that the government could have benefited from the peoples’ obsession with ranks if ranks had served “the purpose and asset of education” (p. 357). This, he believed, would attract young people to public institutions and deter them from the “criminal delusions” that often lead to “societal disasters” (p. 355-356). Pushkin argued that in order to make public education more attractive, the disadvantages associated with private education must be multiplied. Among other things, he suggested that students educated outside state institutions should be deprived of the right to take civil service examinations.

Like Speransky, Pushkin raises the problem of the superficiality of private education, suggesting that it could be solved by linking individual privileges to educational attainment. However, unlike Speransky (1808/1910), who was concerned that university graduates did not have the same privileges as home educated students, Pushkin asserts that the same privileges are the root of societal and educational problems. That is why, according to Pushkin (1826/1962), a young man who had not been educated in a public school should not be allowed to take the civil service examinations, through which he could accede to nobility and enjoy the rights and benefits arising from it (p. 357). Moreover, whereas Speransky’s reform aimed at encouraging advanced knowledge and ‘true merit’, Pushkin’s reasoning on the benefits of public education focused on preventing political and societal risks.

This reinterpretation of the question of privilege, exemplified in Pushkin’s letter to the emperor, was in many ways in line with the official view of education. As noted in the previous section, it was with the intention of limiting the opportunity to climb the educational, and hence social, ladder that the government established various types of schools for various classes and introduced entrance examinations and tuition fees (MNP, 1875n, 1876b; Zhurnal MNP, 1837).

In the meantime, private schools continued to admit students from all social classes, including commoners and serfs. To prevent “a contradiction in a person’s civil status and their mental qualifications” (MNP, 1875f, p. 1259), it

51 The December uprising was essentially an attempted coup d’état which took place on December 14th (26th), 1825, in St. Petersburg. Its leaders were mostly young members of the nobility with military background who demanded the abolition of autocracy and serfdom. The uprising was quickly suppressed, but it forced Nicholas to re-evaluate the course of westernisation which Russia had been following since Peter the Great.
52 Here, Pushkin is referring to the Decembrist uprising.
53 This suggestion was indeed implemented in the second half of the century (see chapter 7).
was necessary to ensure that private schools had the same admission rules as public ones. For that, the Ministry proposed dividing all private schools into different categories, so that those corresponding to prestigious grammar schools “could not admit serfs under any pretext,” (p. 1259). Meanwhile, according to the 1835 *General Statute of the Imperial Russian Universities* (MNP, 1875i, p. 983), a grammar school diploma was required for admission to universities and ultimately for promotion in rank.

The Question of Moral Competence

Since the mid-eighteenth century, the government had expressed concern about the foreign origin of most private teachers and tutors, arguing that they often lacked the necessary knowledge, skills, and teaching experience. For this reason, a decree was issued in 1757 whereby foreigners had to pass state examinations in relevant subjects and to obtain a certificate of teaching competence (chapter 5). What that decree problematised was not so much the foreign origins of private tutors as their inability to train future civil servants.

Neither foreign tutors nor the government’s cautious attitude towards disappeared in the nineteenth century. Private teaching and tutoring were condemned for being superficial, conducted “at random” and having neither a definite aim nor a plan” (Mordvinov, 1811/1902, p. 398). As noted by Minister of Education Razumovsky (1810–1816), foreign tutors were “driven only by self-interest” and “often pretended to know subjects of which they had not the slightest idea” (MNP, 1875h, p. 771). In general, however, the focus of the old problematisation of competence shifted from academic knowledge and experience to the tutor’s ability to instil national values in the minds of future citizens. Thus, when discussing the problematic aspects of private education, Uvarov emphasized that foreign teachers had as their main aim “not the benefit of the fatherland, but only the desire to improve their own wealth at the expense of society” (MNP, 1875d, p. 644).

The preoccupation with morals is symptomatic here. From the officials’ point of view, the revolutions in Europe were a prime example of a general decline in morals. To reduce the revolutionary potential of Western education on Russian soil, it was decided to pay even closer attention to the moral education of citizens. Nicholas I expressed this idea quite clearly in his Manifesto on the execution of the Decembrists. Encouraging parents to be more attentive to the moral education of their children and to avoid “the pernicious luxury of semi-knowledge … which begins in moral corruption and ends in total ruin” (PSZ, 1830a, p. 773), the emperor said:

---

54 The quote from Admiral Nikolay Mordvinov’s letter to the Minister of Education Alexey Razumovsky.
Да обратятъ родители все ихъ вни-
мание на нравственное воспитание дѣтей. … Тщетны будутъ всѣ усилия, всѣ пожертвованія Правительства, если домашнее воспитаніе не будетъ приуготовлять нравы и содѣйствовать его видамъ. (PSZ, 1830a, p. 773)

May parents give their full attention to the moral education of children! … All the efforts and sacrifices of the Government will be in vain if home education does not foster morals and cooperate with the purposes of the government.

By order of Nicholas I in 1831, the Ministry issued *Supplementary Rules to the 1828 Statute for Schools* (MNP, 1875b), which made special provision for the competence of private school owners and private teachers, “especially those of foreign origins” (p. 438). In particular, the decree instructed Russian Missions abroad

а) внушать симъ людямъ, чтобы, при отправленiи въ Россiю, они снабжали себя нужными документами о своемъ состоянiи, образованiи, вѣро-исповѣданiи и поведѣнiи, поставляя имь на видъ, что безъ таковыхъ свѣденiй они встрѣтятъ въ Россiи затруднiе опрѣделиться въ училища, или же в частные дома; б) развѣдывать самимъ о сихъ людяхъ и сообщать сюда все то, что они о нихъ узнаютъ, и в) неблагонадежнымъ или подозрительнымъ не выдавать паспортовъ на отъѣздъ въ Россiю. (MNP, 1875b, p. 439)

a) to urge these people before leaving for Russia to furnish themselves with necessary documents regarding their finances, education, religious denomination, and manners, warning them that without this information they will find it difficult in Russia to be employed as teachers or private tutors; b) to investigate these people and report to the authorities everything they learn about them, and c) withhold travel passports for entry into Russia of those who are considered unreliable or suspicious.

In addition, the inspectors of grammar schools in the provinces were required to scrutinise “the mindset and moral qualities of the owners of private schools” (MNP, 1875b, p. 438).

It is worth mentioning that the *Supplementary Rules* did not apply

а) къ Россiйскимъ подданнымъ, занимающимся обученiемъ одной грамотѣ, т. е. чтенiю и письму по-Русски; б) къ священно- и церковнослужителямъ Грекороссiйскаго ис-повѣданiя, обучающимъ также грамотѣ и Закону Божію, и в) къ родителямъ, родственникамъ, или другимъ лицамъ, обучающимъ чему либо дѣтей добровольно, не изъ платы, по родству, по дружбѣ, или по знакомству. (MNP, 1875b, p. 440)

a) to Russian nationals, who teach only literacy; that is, to read and write in Russian; b) to priests and clergymen of the Greco-Russian confession, who could also teach literacy and [Orthodox] faith; and c) to parents, relatives or other persons who are tutoring their children voluntarily; that is, not for a fee but due to kinship, friendship, or acquaintance.
This set of exceptions to the general rules demonstrates that the problem is not private education per se, but rather who teaches and what is being taught. Arguing that foreigners “cannot and will not act in the spirit of the government and the purposes prescribed by it” (Uvarov, 1844/1864, p. 14), the minister urged parents to be more vigilant in choosing private teachers:

Мы увѣрены … что каждый истинно Русскiй отецъ раздѣляет Нашу заботливость о водворенiи по всему про- странству Империи, согласнаго съ духомъ Нашихъ учрежденiй, и о предохранении юныхъ сердѣцъ отъ впечатленiй, противныхъ вѣрѣ, нрав- ственности и народному чувству. (MNP, 1875g, p. 755-756)

We are certain … that every truly Russian father shares Our concern for the establishment throughout the Empire of institutions consistent with Our spirit, and for the protection of young hearts from impressions contrary to [Our] faith, morals, and national sentiment.

So stated, the previous problematisation of moral competence of private tutors merged with the question of governance and ideological conformity, to which I turn next.

The Question of Governance and Ideological Conformity

The idea that foreign tutors were incapable of teaching in accordance with national values and the “spirit of government” was at the heart of the policy debate on private education. The authorities realised that if the monarchical order was to survive, they needed to prevent the nobility from “thinking [emphasis added] and speaking in a foreign way” (MNP, 1875c, p. 707). In this context, the notion of the “uniformity of thought”, inherited from the times of Catherine the Great, took on a new meaning; it now implied not only the unification of curricula, but also the ideological harmonisation of public and private education. This required the removal of undesirable foreign elements from schools and private homes so that “national education could be given priority over foreign education” (Uvarov, 1844/1864, p. 16).

As early as 1811, the Ministry of National Enlightenment issued a special regulation on private boarding schools, requiring that all classes in public schools should be conducted in Russian (MNP, 1875c). The decree stated that “the nobility, who formed the backbone of the state”, were often brought up under the supervision of people “who despised everything that was not foreign and had neither clear morals nor knowledge” (p. 706). What was considered even more problematic, however, was that foreigners could not foster nation-minded citizens:

Не зная нашего языка и гнушаясь оным, не имѣя привязанности к странѣ, для них чуждой, они юным Россiянам внушают презрѣніе к

Not knowing our language and despising it, not being attached to the country foreign to them, they [foreign teachers] inculcate in young Russians a disdain
языку нашему и охлаждают сердца их ко всему домашнему, и в нѣдрах России из Россиинина образуют иностранца. (MNP, 1875с, p. 706)

Thaddeus Bulgarin, a Russian writer, journalist, and publisher, expressed similar thoughts in his letter to the emperor. Sharply criticizing the nobility’s preference for French tutors, he noted:

Отданные с детства на руки французским гувернёрам (в числе коих весьма мало достойных воспитателей), молодые русские дворяне под их руководством учатся только многим языкам, получают поверхностное понятие об истории и других науках и, переняв совершенно образ мыслей своих воспитателей, на 17 или 18 году вступают в свет, не имея никакого понятия о людях и вещах и вовсе не зная России. (Bulgarin, 1826/1998, p. 46)

Reiterating authoritative reasoning, Bulgarin insisted that young people should be educated in public institutions rather than in homes where the government had no control over the content teaching (Bulgarin, 1826/1998, p. 52).

After a new chain of revolutions in Europe in the early 1830s, especially the unrest in France and Poland, the protectionist approach to education received a new impetus. In 1833 Uvarov promulgated stricter Measures Against the Proliferation of Boarding Schools and Private Education Establishments (MNP, 1875d). He put it bluntly:

Ожидать от иностранцевъ, чтобъ они, оставив вкоренённыя в нихъ нерѣдко съ самого дѣтства понятія, мнѣнія и предрассудки, въ воспитаніи юношества постигали духъ нашего правительства и дѣйствовали въ его направленiи, есть ожидать почти невозможнаго, особенно въ нынѣшнем расположения умовъ въ Европѣ. (MNP, 1875d, p. 643)

With these arguments, the minister pushed through legislation banning the establishment of new private schools in Moscow and Saint Petersburg. In other cities, such schools could be opened exclusively by Russian citizens and only “in case of necessity”; that is, if public schools were unavailable (MNP, 1875d, pp. 646-647).
Importantly, Uvarov believed that ‘right-minded’ private teachers and tutors could “assist the government in its aim of spreading enlightenment” (MNP, 1875n, p. 253), given that the curriculum of private education would “correspond as far as possible [emphasis added] to that of public schools” (p. 256) as the School Statute of 1828 demanded. The emperor, however, considered such vague rules insufficient for bringing all forms of education into full harmony and demanded more specific rules for private teachers and tutors. By his order, in 1831 the Ministry introduced Supplementary Rules imposing stricter requirements on the curriculum of private schools. From then on, the founders of private boarding schools had to “to commit in writing to educate the young people entrusted to them in accordance with the rules of the Statute on School and using the textbooks approved by the government” (MNP, 1875b, p. 440).

While private schools were relatively easy to bring into line with the national spirit—they could simply not be opened officially without state permission—less formal tutoring in private homes, as Uvarov (1844/1864) himself admitted, was “hidden from direct state influence by parental authority” and was therefore “more elusive and unreachable” (p. 16). It was therefore crucial to persuade parents to hire only government-approved educators.

Uvarov was not the first to call attention to the importance of encouraging parents to make the right choice of tutor. The question was raised earlier by Minister Razumovsky in his 1812 proposal On Examinations of Foreign Home Teachers (MNP, 1875h). Razumovsky pointed out that parents considered certificates necessary only in case when a tutor was supposed to teach languages and sciences, but not for moral education. For Razumovsky, this meant that parents did not have the faintest idea what moral education was all about:

Искать образца для нашей нравственности в чуждых нравах есть заблуждение, давно уже чувствуемое и истинными сынами отечества ис требляемое, или по крайней мѣре понищаемое. (MNP, 1875h, p. 776)

To seek a model for our morals in foreign manners is a delusion that has long been recognized and rejected, or at least condemned, by the true sons of our fatherland.

As a matter of fact, despite the existing prohibition, parents continued to hire tutors from abroad without asking for certificates. In 1824, according to Voronov (1858, p. 80), there were 186 unauthorised foreign teachers, mostly from France and Switzerland, working in private homes in St. Petersburg. To put an end to this, the university, on its own initiative, started publishing lists of tutors who had passed the exams and were allowed to give private lessons. However, as Voronov notes, until 1834, most parents paid no attention to these lists. Thus, to bring private teaching under control, other, more effective solutions were required.
Nationalisation of Home Education and Private Tutoring

From the very beginning of his tenure as minister, Uvarov set himself the task of establishing “a permanent link between home and public education” (Zhurnal MNP, 1834, pp. XIX). Summing up a decade later, he said:

Время усилить в частныхъ домахъ образование истинно отечественное и замѣнить имъ то, которое доселѣ приобрѣталось нерѣдко въ духѣ иностранного, отъ людей чуждыхъ нашимъ вѣрованіямъ, законамъ и обычаямъ. (Uvarov, 1844/1864, p. 17).

It was time to strengthen genuine national education in private homes and replace with it that which hitherto has been acquired in a foreign spirit, from people alien to our beliefs, laws, and customs.

Since previous regulations had proved unsuccessful, this time the Ministry decided to resort to “indirect measures” (Uvarov, 1844/1864, p. 16). That is, in place of direct coercion and the threat of fines and deportations, Uvarov thought it would be more effective to point out the benefits and advantages of working as or hiring a certified tutor.

In 1834, the government issued a special provision On Home Teachers and Tutors (MNP, 1875f), which envisaged the official state posts of home tutors (domashnie nastavniki) and home teachers (domashnie uchitelya/uchitevnitsy). While home tutors were authorised to teach and educate (vospityvat’) children in private homes, home teachers were only allowed to give lessons. As civil servants, both were entitled to a government salary and pension. Crucially, they were eligible for promotion in rank and could enjoy the privileges that public service entailed (p. 791-796).

This policy shift had multiple purposes. Firstly, it was supposed to attract Russian subjects to educate young people in private homes. According to Uvarov (1844/1864, p. 16), the status of state servants was to be a “lure for natural Russians, who by ingrained notions were accustomed to prefer civil service to all others”. Secondly, the official status of home teachers and tutors would give parents “guarantees of trustworthy instructors for their children and of government assistance” (MNP, 1875j, p. 785). Most importantly, this provision was ultimately intended to strengthen the state’s control over this branch of education (Uvarov, 1844/1864).

In return for these benefits, the government set several requirements for entry into the civil service. The prerogative right to apply for the post of “home tutor” or a “home teacher” was given to [Orthodox] Christians and Russian citizens “known for good moral qualities” (MNP, 1875f, p. 786). Foreigners could also be employed as private tutors or teachers on the recommendation of Russian missions abroad. However, they were not entitled to the benefits and privileges of public service unless they took Russian citizenship. Moreover, the educational level of applicants for the title of home tutors and
teachers had to be rather high. A home tutor had to have graduated from a Russian university or have obtained a degree from the Ecclesiastical Academy. To become a home teacher, a higher education was not required. However, the candidate had to prove, at a special examination held at universities, lyceums, or grammar schools, that they possessed not only the general knowledge necessary for teaching at primary level, but also “sound and solid knowledge of the subjects they were going to teach” (MNP, 1875f, p. 787). They were also required to give a trial lecture on the same subjects.

In addition, special requirements were imposed on the moral qualities of home teachers and tutors. Candidates had to submit reports on their conduct and manners from those institutions in which they had been educated, or from the authorities in their place of residence. Those dismissed for “bad behaviour”, as well as those who were on trial or had not been acquitted by court, were not allowed to take the examinations at all. Moreover, foreigners had to submit a certificate of consent from Russians missions abroad (MNP, 1875f, p. 788-789).

However, even these measures were found insufficient. Shortly after the 1834 decree, the Ministry issued Supplementary Regulations on Home Tutors and Teachers (MNP, 1875a) which further strengthened the link between public and private education. Aware of the role of reading in shaping students’ thinking and morals, officials were particularly careful when it came to teaching materials. Just like the owners of private boarding schools, home teachers and home tutors were obliged to use approved textbooks. Other books had to be authorised by censors “under strict control that these books would not have a detrimental effect on morals, national feeling, and the general way of thinking [emphasis added] of the educated youth” (MNP, 1875a, p. 802).

Placed under the direct control and regular supervision of the Ministry of National Education, private tutoring, or rather some of its forms, were eventually nationalised. Home teachers and tutors were now required to submit “reports on their work and lessons” to the headmaster at the end of each school year, detailing with which children they had worked, what textbooks they had used, and what results they had achieved. School inspectors, in turn, were instructed to “pay close attention, among other things, to the moral qualities, abilities and knowledge of home tutors and teachers” and report this to the Ministry (MNP, 1875a, p. 801).

It is worth mentioning that most of the subsequent regulations clarified or amended certain provisions of the 1834 decree without touching its fundamentals. It can thus be concluded that it did not matter to the imperial government whether education was provided in a state school, in a private institution, or by a private tutor, as long as it was consistent with the national values articulated in the curricula and textbooks.
Chapter Conclusions

In this chapter I have examined how changing political conditions in the early nineteenth century brought about a new, nationalist vision of education and how this vision, in turn, led to important modifications in the ways of thinking and approaching both public and private education.

I have pointed out that, prompted by several military conflicts within and outside the empire, which could call into question the legitimacy of an absolute monarchy, Russian government reconsidered the consequences of Westernization and the uncontrolled spread of liberal ideas through private education. The sudden ‘awakening’ of national consciousness forced educational authorities to seek a balance between ideological security and the need to educate citizens. The main priority of educational policy became protecting the country from undesirable Western influences and bringing all forms of education into uniformity. In general, the contradictions between public and private were reconceptualised as being about national and foreign values.

The new vision of education as a project to unify the nation affected the perception and treatment of many perennial questions. For example, the previously dominant question of tutor competence was overshadowed by concerns about the moral qualities of foreign tutors, their knowledge and loyalty to the country, and their ability to produce nationally minded citizens. Accordingly, a certificate of educational attainment was no longer sufficient to distinguish good and reliable teachers and tutors from ‘problematic’ ones. A modified understanding of teacher competence as a moral and unambiguously political category included new criteria—citizenship, religion, language, and loyalty to the Russian state.

The solution designed for resolving the contradiction between public and private as national and foreign, forged the path toward the nationalisation of private and home education and certain forms of private tutoring. By the 1833 decree, teachers and tutors, who had previously been private enterprisers, could now be on active duty in the Ministry of Public Enlightenment, provided they had passed the appropriate examinations and could prove their high moral character and loyalty to Russia. Inscribed into the state system, private teaching and tutoring had to mimic the formal curriculum in every detail. They have thus become a fully legitimate alternative to school education.

The changed political and ideological environment brought with it the awareness that ‘excessive’ or ‘incorrect’ education could be just as damaging as its absence: after all, it could provide impetus for critique of the prevailing order. This made earlier aspirations for universal education, the common school, and individual emancipation through education uncertain. In the face of a looming threat of revolution, these questions became subject to revision. It was proposed that students educated privately should be deprived of the right to take the civil service examination, and that undesirable social classes could not climb high enough up the educational ladder to qualify for such an
examination. This strategy allowed the government to control who could be
given entry into the public service, and to ensure political stability within the
empire. To the same end, the government restructured the entire education
system and created different types of schools for different students. While for-
mally preserving access to education for most social classes, except the serfs,
this system severely hindered upward social mobility through revised admis-
sion policies, tuition fees and curricular differentiation.

It comes as no surprise that, coupled with the increased demand for insti-
tutional credentials, this highly hierarchised education system created favour-
able conditions for the rise of supplementary tutoring, to which I turn in the
next chapter.
7. Public and Private *Supplementary* Tutoring in Nineteenth Century Russia

So far, I have examined policies in which private education was presented as a problem. The chapter at hand is of a different nature and has a twofold aim. First, it explores different manifestations of supplementary tutoring in the nineteenth century by examining the etymology and usage of the Russian word *repetitor*. In fact, it was in the nineteenth century that the word *repetitor* (from the Latin *repeto*, i.e., “to repeat something”) came into use in Russia and eventually acquired its current meaning. Presumably, then, it is to this period that the emergence of *supplementary* tutoring should be attributed. Since the subsequent chapters deal mainly with this form of private tutoring, it seems important to understand under what conditions and why it assumed a supplementary role in the midst of the nation-building age, when other forms of education were brought into unity and absorbed by the state system. What practices did the word denote at the time, and how were they related to other manifestations of private tutoring?

As a second aim, the chapter examines the conditions under which the emergence of *private* supplementary tutoring in nineteenth-century Russia became possible. If supplementary tutoring was considered the ‘answer’, to what questions was it supposed to ‘respond’?

The chapter is organised according to its aims. In the first part I trace the etymology and the use of the word *repetitor* in three different spheres of reference: policy documents, public discourse, and tutoring advertisements. I also consider related concepts that have been used to classify and categorise different manifestations of private tutoring. This part can be compared to what Foucault called a “history of ideas”. Unlike a “history of thought”, which focuses on the way institutions, practices, behaviours, and beliefs become subject to reflection and revision, a history of ideas, according to Foucault (2001, p. 74), involves an “analysis of a notion from its birth, through its development, and in the setting of other ideas which constitute its context”. The second part of the chapter reconstructs the historical and educational context in which private supplementary tutoring emerged and evolved. In addition, it elaborates on the reasons why this type of private tutoring is almost invisible in policy documents.

The chapter develops two arguments. Firstly, it suggests that supplementary tutoring originated in *public* institutions. Secondly, it argues that the
growth of private supplementary tutoring is linked to fundamental changes in assessment policy and the accompanying rise in the importance of educational merit.

**Empirical Sources**

In nineteenth-century Russia there were both public and private forms of supplementary tutoring. The analysis of the former draws for the most part on the same set of empirical sources as in the previous chapter, namely: *Collected proceedings of the Ministry of National Enlightenment* (MNP, 1875I, 1875m, 1876d) and *Journal of the Ministry of National Enlightenment* (Zhurnal of MNP). By searching specifically for the word repetitor in these volumes, I was able to find documents on supplementary tutoring practiced in state institutions.

To examine the conditions that made the rise of private supplementary tutoring possible, I commenced by analysing tutoring advertisements which began to appear in daily newspapers in the second half of the century. I suggested that in order to attract clients, advertisers needed to associate the norms and values embedded in education policies with the values, fears and desires held by their potential audience (i.e., parents and students). Consequently, a careful reading of this material can help to reconstruct the relevant sections of the curriculum to which the tutors are explicitly or implicitly referring.

Guided by these assumptions, I collected advertisements published in the daily newspaper *Novoe Vremya* (NV, “New Time”) between 1869 and 1881. As a first step, I retrieved all the announcements from the earliest available issues, except for duplicates. Since by the early 1880s the number of advertisements increased dramatically, I limited the sample to two issues and supplemented it with cases from other issues that I found interesting and information-rich, until I reached a point at which no new themes that could generate new insights could be identified. The distribution of collected advertisements by year is presented in Table 7 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of collected advertisements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>193</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

55 More precisely, 25 advertisements from issue #1392 from 1880 and 55 advertisements from issue #1979 from 1881.
Each of the collected announcements has been assigned a number so that it can be easily identified in my sample. I also use these numbers when quoting these sources in the chapter.

When analysing tutoring advertisements, I paid particular attention to how tutors present themselves (e.g., as teachers, students, tutors or repetitores), what educational services they advertised, and what ‘problems’ they promised to solve. This enabled me to identify policy ‘questions’ to which the emergence of supplementary tutoring could be seen as the “answer”. Some of them relate to old questions of curricular unification, differentiation, privilege, and governance. Others deal more specifically with assessment practices. The relevant policy documents, detailing these issues, were in turn collected from the official collections and periodicals presented above.

**Formal and Informal Tutoring**

As in the earlier periods, there were various forms of private tutoring in the first half of the nineteenth century. On the one hand, there was the more traditional, informal tutoring, which combined the teaching of academic subjects (primarily modern languages and mathematics), good manners and the general shaping of the child’s character. This type of tutoring can be compared with the work of the ancient pedagogues, outlined in the introductory chapter. As the public education system in Russia developed, tutors were increasingly hired to prepare children for entering state institutions of secondary and higher education. Consider, for example, a letter written by Tatishchev, in which he says he has hired a private teacher for his son:

Поскольку в мае будущего года мой сын отправится в Петербург в тамошнюю Академию для поступления в число ее воспитанников, то до сих пор я держал ему домашнего учителя, который наставляет его в латинском языке, началах французского, а также в истории. (Tatishchev, 1731/1990, p. 150)

As my son will be leaving for St. Petersburg to enter the Academy next May, I have up to now kept for him a teacher at home, who is instructing him in Latin and the basics of French, as well as in history.

Here Tatishchev uses the word “home teacher” (domashnii uchitel’) to refer to a tutor whose main duty was to teach languages and history and, as the rest of the letter suggests, to accompany and assist the boy during his studies. Tatishchev explains that the reason for hiring a tutor was the slow growth of the state schools. In this case, thus, private tutoring replaced the poorly developed public system.

The 1834 decree *On Home Teachers and Tutors* (MNP, 1875j) brought about significant changes in the relations between private tutoring and public
education. On the basis of this decree, the terms “home teacher” (domashnii uchitel’/uchitel’ntsa) and “home tutor” (domashnii nastavnik) came to refer to official professions. Unlike traditional tutoring, this type of out-of-school education was sanctioned by the state and functioned as legitimate and strictly controlled alternatives to state schools (chapter 6).

Besides this, as noted above, there were also other forms of tutoring, indicated by the notion of repetitor. According to the RNC (n.d.), this word began to appear in written sources by the mid-nineteenth century. It appears, for example, in an 1857 article by Konstantin Ushinsky (1857/1939), in which he compares the organisation of the “three elements” of the school—administrators, educators (vospitateli), and teachers—in Britain, Germany, and France. Arguing that the educational process loses its power when its elements are disconnected, Ushinsky finds the greatest unity of them in English educational institutions, especially in boarding schools where one person performs different duties:

Учители в таких заведениях являются вместе и воспитателями и исполняют те обязанности, которые в учебных заведениях другого устройства поручаются особенным гувернёрам, надзирателям или репетиторам. (Ushinsky, 1857/1939, p. 113)

Teachers in such institutions are also mentors [vospitateli] and carry out duties that in other educational institutions are left to governors [guvernioury], supervisors [nadzirateli] or tutors [repetitory].

In this description, mentoring, tutoring, supervision, and repetition appear as part and parcel of the educational process.

Around the same time, in 1859, the literary critic and journalist Nikolai Dobrolyubov published his article The Traits to Characterise Russian Common People. Here, the word repetitor is used in the following passage:

В началѣ ученья дѣти очень неохотно принимаются за всякiй урокъ, гдѣ имъ нужно много соображать и добиваться толку; они предпочитаютъ чтобъ имъ все было растолковано, и чтобъ съ ихъ стороны, требовалось только пассивное восприятие. Многiе родители и забо- тятся объ этомъ: цѣлую толпу учителей, гувернеровъ и репетиторовъ приглашаютъ, чтобъ разжевать и положить въ ротъ ихъ дѣтямъ всякое знанiе; зато такiя дѣти и останутся на весь вѣкъ обезьянами , иногда очень ученными, но неспособными возвыситься до самобытной человѣческой

At the start of their studies, children are very reluctant to accept any lesson where they need to think hard to achieve something; they prefer that everything be explained to them, and that only passive perception be required on their part. Many parents are concerned about this: they invite a whole crowd of teachers, governors [guvernioury] and tutors [repetitors] to chew up and put every piece of knowledge into their children's mouths; but such children will remain apes for the rest of their lives, sometimes very learned apes, but incapable of rising to the level of original human thought.
Clearly, for Dobrolyubov, all types of tutoring are harmful because, allegedly, they do not develop independent thinking and only require imitation and memorisation.

Two points are noteworthy here. Firstly, Dobrolyubov’s article puts forward a new problematisation of private tutoring, focusing on its pedagogical aspects. Secondly, unlike Ushinsky, who described formal education in Europe, Dobrolyubov talks about non-formal education in Russia.

To get a better idea of the practices denoted by the word *repetitor*, in the next section I examine its etymology and semantics.

*Repetitors* in the Service of the State

Various dictionaries suggest that the word *repetitor* was borrowed into the Russian language through German where it denoted an assistant professor, whose job was to prepare students for examinations by repeating what the professors had previously taught. The *Brockhaus and Efron Encyclopedic Dictionary* gives the following description:


As this description suggests, the responsibilities of *repetitors* varied depending on the country and type of institution. Whereas in Germany they helped prepare for examinations at higher education institutions, in France *répétiteurs* of various rank were appointed to lycées by the Minister of Education to supervise students outside the classroom and also assist in preparation for
lessons. According to Arnold (1892, p. 274) répétiteurs of higher rank were charged with reviewing and explaining teachers’ lessons.

In other words, in various European countries, supplementary tutoring aimed at repeating lessons, preparing for classes, helping with homework, and supervising pupils’ out-of-school activities and formed an integral part of public education.

Unfortunately, the dictionary entry cited above does not mention the role of repetitors in the Russian education system. The RNC was not helpful here either, as it does not contain policy documents. Nor does the word appear in the alphabetical indexes to the official collections of policy documents (MNP, 1888, 1906). Thanks to the possibility of digital searching across the volumes of the Collected Proceedings of the Ministry of National Enlightenment, I was able to do this part of the genealogical work myself: I found the first mention of a post similar to the German repetitor in the Statutes of the Imperial Universities of Moscow, Kharkov, and Kazan dated 1804, which stated that

Students who have completed three years of study and the necessary courses for continuing their studies in any department (if they wish to remain in the University) may continue their studies as candidates and take the position of repeleurs [povtoriteli] after passing the appropriate tests.

In documents of the later period the Russian word povtoritel’ (from “povtor”, i.e., repetition, rehearsal) is replaced by repetitor in similar contexts. For example, the Statute of the Lazarev Institute of Oriental Languages of 1848 says that upon graduation students are obliged to work six years “as tutors (repetitory), governors (governioury), junior teachers of all subjects or senior teachers of Oriental languages” (MNP, 1876e, p. 938).

Repetitors also served in secondary schools, primarily boarding schools set up in large cities for children of the nobility and officials living in the provinces. This follows from the statute On the Preliminary Foundation of the Moscow Noble Institute, adopted in 1833, which prescribes that “the number of teachers, tutors (repetitory) and governors (governioury) is determined by the number of boarders” (MNP, 1875e, p. 539); that is, one per fifteen students in accordance with paragraph 269 of the 1828 Statute on Schools (MNP, 1875n).

Indeed, the 1828 Statute on Schools (MNP, 1875n) provides a more detailed description of repetitors’ responsibilities. Although the word itself is

56 In modern Russian the word povtoritel’ is not used in this sense.
not even mentioned there, it is clear from the document that their role was performed by “room wardens” (komnatnye nadzirateli). Paragraph 272 of the statute stipulated that, apart from keeping students under “vigilant and un-interrupted supervision”, room wardens were expected to “keep informed daily of everything students have heard in class, make sure they are doing their homework and repeat what had been taught” (p. 248). To be eligible for this position, one had to obtain permission from the university and “a certificate of good moral character and exemplary conduct signed by reputable people” (p. 247). It was also desirable that room wardens be fluent in German and French. For these reasons, the Statute recommended appointing foreign language teachers from grammar schools to this position.

In general, it seems that, as in certain European countries, repetitors occupied a natural place in nineteenth-century Russia in higher education and elite secondary schools. Holding an official position, they served the state and were in return endowed with privileges and ranks. More tellingly, the use of different terms, including teachers, wardens, governors, home teachers, home tutors, and repetitors, points to a strict separation of their roles and thus to a profound segmentation and hierarchisation of different elements of the educational process as described by Ushinsky (1857/1939).

It is important to note that because these forms of private tutoring were sanctioned by the state, they were apparently not seen as a problem, but as a solution to other problems. As my analysis suggests, supplementary tutoring was found necessary not only to enhance students’ academic performance, but also to discipline them and ensure that they conformed to the values and purposes of the state. In boarding schools, tutors were responsible for educating (vospitanie) children, preventing bad habits, and instilling a love of sciences and the Orthodox faith. As Uvarov assured, by performing these tasks, tutors could act as “the main assistants [of the government] in the education of the youth” (MNP, 1876c, p. 50).

In a report from 1840, Minster Uvarov requested the government to consider introducing the post of ‘senior room wardens’ (starshie komnatnye nadzirateli). Referring to the provisions of the 1828 Statute on Schools, he noted that “mentors [guvernioury] have the post of tutors in academic subjects [repetitory po uchebnoi chasti]” (MNP, 1876c, p. 54). It is worth pointing out that in his report Uvarov used the terms room wardens (nadzirateli), governors (guverniory) and tutors (repetitory) interchangeably (MNP, 1876c).

Tutors of this kind were most probably found in other countries besides France and Germany. For example, according to the Swedish Academic Dictionary, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the words repetent (“Repetent,” n.d.) and repetitör (“Repetitör,” n.d.) denoted teaching assistants in higher educational establishments who helped students with homework.

See, for example, Uvarov’s 1840 proposal to raise the salaries of and award higher ranks to senior room wardens (MNP, 1876a).
Repetitorstvo as an Internal and External Practice

Given the intensity with which the imperial government fought against private education in the first half of the nineteenth century, it seems remarkable that in the 1870s it began to encourage grammar school students to give lessons in private homes. Indeed, according to the Rules for Students of Gymnasia and Pro-Gymnasia (Zhurnal MNP, 1874), high-performing and diligent students could obtain the official right to give such lessons. For this they needed special permission from the school, which, according to the guidelines, could be obtained first by students on the school’s gold board, then by those on the class gold board, and so on in descending order\(^{60}\) (p. 195). This was presented as an incentive for economically disadvantaged students.

It should be stressed, however, that students who gave private lessons outside school played a different role from private repetitors. The difference is discussed in the article Private Tutoring in Gymnasia published in 1879 in the Journal of the Ministry of National Enlightenment:

```
На частныхъ урокахъ ученики сами становятся какъ бы учителями: имъ предоставляется право вести занятия самостоятельными; они не опасаются, что преподавание ихъ будетъ идти въ разрѣзъ съ преподавающимъ учителемъ. Всѣ средства и педагогические приёмы ихъ будутъ направлены исключительно къ одной цѣли – такъ или иначе научить учащагося тому, чему слѣдуетъ. Совершенно другое дѣло при репетировании. Въ этомъ случаѣ, кроме общей цѣли – научить учащагося чему слѣдуетъ, – репетиторъ необходимо долженъ еще приспособиться къ методу преподавателя. … Словомъ, занятія его должны быть повтореніемъ занятій преподавателя, и только въ этомъ случаѣ было бы полезно репетиторство. (Belorussov, 1879, p. 16)
```

By giving private lessons, students become teachers themselves: they are given the right to teach lessons on their own, according to their own method. They need not fear that their teaching will be at odds with the teaching of the schoolteacher. All of their resources and pedagogical strategies are ultimately directed towards the one goal, one way or another—to teach the students what they need to learn. Rehearsal [repetirovanie] is an entirely different matter. In this case, in addition to the overall aim of teaching the students what they need to know, a tutor [repetitor] must also be attuned the schoolteacher’s methods of instruction. … In short, his classes must be a repetition of those of the teacher, and only in this case would tutoring [repetitorstvo] be useful.

\(^{60}\) According to the Rules for Pupils of Gymnasia and Pro-Gymnasia, teachers were advised to rank students according to their grade point average in academic subjects, as well as in conduct, diligence, and attention. The first category consisted of students with the highest grades in conduct and diligence and a minimum of “four” (on a scale of five) in all subjects. The requirements for the second and third categories were respectively one point lower. Students who had been in the first category for two semesters were put on the class “gold” board. If they had been there for more than a year, their names were temporarily placed on the school’s gold board. Finally, the names of those who had completed the entire gymnasium course with distinction were permanently inscribed on the school’s gold board (Zhurnal MNP, 1874, pp. 192–194).
The author of this article, Belorussov, describes private tutoring as an academic assistance provided by senior students to their younger peers for a fee. Belorussov (1879) argues that this type of tutoring means literally repeating what has been already taught and must be fully consistent with the goals and methods of the school. By contrast, the term ‘private teaching’ is said to imply greater autonomy in the choice of teaching methods. Leaving aside the discussion of private teaching, Belorussov noted that the encouragement of internal supplementary tutoring (repetitorstvo) was one of those government measures that had “good intentions but harmful consequences” (p. 18). In particular, he questioned its pedagogical value, arguing that tutoring “paralyses the development of students’ ability to work without supervision” which often results in rote learning (p. 19).

The distinction between private teaching and supplementary tutoring seems rather clear: whereas the former replaced school, the latter was ‘internal’ and, thus, could only replicate its content and pedagogy. It is also clear that external tutoring was considered more prestigious than internal, since only the most successful students were given the right to teach in private homes. It would perhaps not be wrong to suggest that in addition to greater teaching autonomy, external tutoring yielded greater income.

The difference in prestige between private teaching and supplementary tutoring was apparently so pronounced that they were advertised as distinct services:

#124. СТУДЕНТЬ университет даёт уроки и репет. по всём предмет. гимн. курса. (NV, 1881, # 1979, p. 5)
#159. СТУДЕНТЬ МАТЕМАТИКЪ даёт уроки по математикѣ и физикѣ въ объемѣ всѣхъ сред. уч. зав. Согласен быть репетиторомъ. (NV, 1881, #2061, p. 7)

Other texts suggest, however, that things were more complicated. For example, the Russian and Soviet artist Mikhail Nesterov noted in his memoirs of the early 1870s that he had to enrol in a gymnasium in the city of Ufa in order to gain some military service privileges. For this purpose, he wrote, “a tutor [repetitor] was invited, 8th grade gymnasium student Alexey Ivanovich Efimov, an excellent student who gave all his free time to preparing and tutoring the children of Ufa” (Nesterov, 1897/2006, p. 19). Here the term repetitor is used in reference not to “internal” tutoring that complements school, but to practices replacing it, or preparing for it.

---

61 Here and below capital letters are used according to the original text.
Indeed, preparation for school was also one of the common services advertised by private tutors:

#66. ПРЕПОДАВАТЕЛЬ гимназии предлагает родителям учащихся свои услуги по приготовлению и répetированію; принимает и пансионерами. (NV, 1881, #1949, p. 5)

This and other examples show that, unlike policy documents, where the word repetitor referred to practices taking place within public educational institutions, in popular usage it had other meanings and referred for the most part to external, out-of-school educational practices, which nevertheless had a clear link to public education.

The Emergence of Private Supplementary Tutoring: Exploring the Conditions of Possibility

Now I leave aside the question of the types of tutoring existed in nineteenth-century Russia and consider the conditions which made the emergence of supplementary tutoring possible. In the remainder of this chapter, I reconstruct the questions to which this practice could be seen as an “answer”. I also elaborate on the reasons for the lack of policy on this type of private tutoring.

The main source for the reconstruction of these questions was tutoring advertisements published in Novoe Vremya. On the whole, these advertisements look familiar to today’s reader: tutors promise help with homework, preparation for examinations of different kinds, and extra classes in mathematics and foreign languages (mainly German and French). Some things, however, may not be obvious. Why, for instance, do so many of them offer lessons in all gymnasium subjects? Does it mean that tutors deliberately overestimated their abilities? Or was it dictated by other conditions that they had to consider?

Curriculum Differentiation and the Question of Privilege

Tutoring announcements began to appear in daily newspapers in the late 1860s and increased in number by the early 1880s. This period coincides with Count Dmitri Tolstoy’s tenure as Minister of Education (1866-1880). Below I briefly outline the main features of his education policy to give an idea of the context in which these announcements emerged.

---

62 As noted in chapter 5, most of the regulations passed after 1834 clarified or amended certain provisions of the decree On Home Teachers and Home Tutors. However, I did not find any regulations on private supplementary tutoring for the relevant period.
Minister Tolstoy was a staunch adherent of classicism and made no secret of his intention to “close the way to gymnasia and universities to all but the aristocracy”. Replying to accusations of creating a system that primarily served the interests of a tiny elite, Tolstoy proudly declared: “Our gymnasia should produce aristocrats, but of what kind? Aristocrats of the intellect, aristocrats of knowledge, aristocrats of labour” (Zhurnal MNP, 1875, p. 132).

Under his administration, secondary education consisted of two main streams—academic (classical gymnasia, or grammar schools) and practical (real, vocational schools). Whereas the classical gymnasia were designed to funnel their graduates into universities and the state administration (and thus to higher ranks), the vocational schools prepared for a less privileged professional higher education. Accordingly, the gymnasia offered a non-utilitarian curriculum with the advanced study of Latin and Ancient Greek necessary for university studies. Meanwhile, graduates of vocational schools and girls’ gymnasia could not enter universities without having mastered ancient languages and mathematics on their own or in private preparatory courses which, according to Hans (1931, p. 129), were opened in most university towns of the Empire in the late 1860s.

Obviously, the differences in curricula between the schools complicated the transition between them. Since the grammar schools taught in Latin, which was excluded from the curriculum of other schools, preparatory tutoring was almost unavoidable for the majority of students (see e.g., McCelland, 1979). According to the Russian educational theorist Vladimir Stoyunin (1865/1892), private schools and boarding schools also started offering their services to prepare children for entry into gymnasia. Moreover, some of them were opened exclusively for this purpose. In his article On Private Educational Entrepreneurship, Stoyunin suggests:

Если бы въ то время кто-либо вздумал основать частное училище на строгихъ педагогическихъ началахъ, не объявивъ, что въ немъ будутъ готовить въ разныя привилегированныя школы, то едва ли бы его предприятие могло долго удержаться. (Stoyunin, 1865/1892, p. 277).

If, at that time, anyone had thought of funding a private school on strict pedagogical principles, without announcing that it would train students for various privileged schools, such an enterprise could hardly have survived long.

Preparation for secondary schools, including classical, vocational, military and girls’ gymnasia, was also one of the most common services advertised by tutors:

#1. ДѢВИЦА, имѣющая установленный дипломъ на званіе домашней наставницы, (жительствующая съ матерью) желаетъ давать уроки музыки, русскаго, французскаго, #1. A MAIDEN who is a certified home tutor (living with her mother) wishes to give lessons in music, Russian, French, German, and English and can also teach
The last two examples show that in addition to students (see examples #124 and 159 above), tutoring services were provided by persons authorised by the state to give private lessons (#1), as well as schoolteachers (#18, see also example #66 above).

In Stoyunin’s view, the emergence of “educational entrepreneurialism” is intimately linked to the question of individual privileges. He goes on to argue that private schools were trying to meet the very specific needs of the public:

These needs were not complicated: to obtain personal rights and privileges through state education, as this defined one’s entire life from the cradle to the grave; consequently, they were connected to the question of happiness, position in the world, career, and anything that might appeal to a person. Hence, the sole aim was to get into one or the other privileged schools. … Parents, sending their children to these training institutions, did not care about upbringing, development, or anything that education is concerned about. They only wanted their children to be admitted to public institutions.

It is worth recalling that, ever since the introduction the Table of Ranks by Peter the Great, the question of individual privilege was indeed central to Russian education policy. It was also key to the problematisation of private tutoring in the first decades of the nineteenth century. As discussed in the previous chapter, since promotion in rank was directly linked to educational attainment, the superiority of state schools over home education and private tutoring ceased to be in doubt. At the same time, by restricting access to schools, the government unwittingly created favourable conditions for supplementary private tutoring.
After the introduction of general conscription in 1874 (PSZ, 1876) the question of privilege took on added meaning. From then on, all men over twenty years of age, irrespective of their social class, were obliged to spend six to eight years on active service. Education was one of the grounds on which the draft could be suspended and the length of service reduced considerably. After completing basic education, for example, four to six years of active service were required, depending on the branch. By comparison, those who completed six (out of eight) years of gymnasia needed to serve for a year and a half. In other words, the government was encouraging individuals to enrol in state schools through direct appeal to personal privileges in military service.

Increased Importance of Institutional Merit

Justifying the highly selective character of secondary and higher education, Tolstoy declared: “We make only one distinction between our students—a distinction of merit” (Zhurnal MNP, 1875, p. 132). At first sight, the notion of ‘merit’ does not sit well with that of ‘aristocracy’. But, as shown below, this double move was a major feature of Tolstoy’s policy.

It is true that children from the lower classes were not formally barred from entering the prestigious classical gymnasia or other secondary schools. However, as pointed out above, students who could not afford a private tutor found themselves at a disadvantage. Furthermore, successful enrolment did not obviate the need for extra classes and remedial tutoring. This is evidenced by the following announcements:

#136. ФИЛОЛОГЪ, окончив. к. унн., опыт. препод. лат., греч., и нѣм, яз. и литературы, хор. знаком. съ программами преподаванiя лицеея и кл. гимн. готовить спец. и успѣшно къ экзам. и за короткое врѣмя даеть слабымъ учен. прочную основу. (NV, 1881, #1984, p. 1)

#165. ЗА 5 РУБ ВЪ МѢСЯЦЪ педа- гогичка, окончившая гимназiю с медалью, предлагаетъ репетировать у себя на дому дѣтей, посѣщающихъ женския учебныя заведенiя ежедневно отъ 5 ч. веч. (NV, 1881, #2009, p. 6)

#186. МАТЕМАТИКЪ И ФИЛО- ЛОГЪ готовить къ переводъ и приёмъныя испыт. въ воен. и класс. гимнази и реал. училища, а также къ #186. A PHILOLOGIST, a university graduate, an experienced teacher of the Latin, Greek and German languages and of literature, well acquainted with the curricula of the Lyceum and the classical gymnasia, prepares students specifically and successfully for examinations and in a short time gives weak pupils a solid foundation.

#165. FOR 5 ROUBLES A MONTH a [female] student of teacher training courses who has graduated with a medal from a gymnasium, offers to rehearse at her home children attending girls’ schools at 5 p.m. every day.
In these examples, tutors offer preparation for transition examinations and other supplementary services to students already attending public schools.

These and other announcements suggest that the emergence and growth of private supplementary tutoring is linked to the increasing importance of educational merit. As shown earlier, the first steps towards replacing birth privileges with institutional merit63 (Kett, 2013) were taken in the first decade of the century. This was done with the intention to make public schools more attractive for the nobility. The next step was taken in the 1830s, when the so-called “numbers system” (ballovaya sistema), a five-point grading scale, was introduced to assess students’ academic performance. It was supposed to protect students from teacher bias resulting from the lack of consistent and unified grading system (Glinoetsky, 1834/1882, p. 366). The decades after 1830s saw an unprecedented increase in the number of tests and examinations during and after each school year. Students’ diligence in preparing lessons and completing homework, their attention, ability, conduct, and academic performance came to be assessed on a daily, monthly, and annual basis (Zhurnal MNP, 1873, pp. 36–37).

The idea of meritocratic selection based on numerical assessments was presented as more “fair and transparent” than earlier forms of evaluation. Whereas previously each teacher had their own principles and criteria for evaluating students’ diligence and academic performance, with the introduction of the numerical system, it was stated, everyone could be graded regularly on the same scale. Hence, the results of examinations, especially oral, would “depended less on accidental causes and circumstances” (Zhurnal MNP, 1873, p. 33).

Eventually the five-point grading scale was used to determine not only academic achievement, but also a student’s place in the classroom and in the educational ‘table of ranks’:

In conversation among teachers and pupils, a boy was identified as a “two” or a “five”. Seating in the classrooms was according to this rank, so that everyone knew everyone’s place at all times within the scholastic hierarchy. (Alston, 1969, p. 148)

In other words, examinations and the new, standardised and quantified grading system came to serve as new ranking mechanisms, or in Foucault’s (1991a) terms, new techniques of disciplinary power.

However, the system, which fostered the ideal of individual advancement by merit, did not diminish in importance of material factors, as students’

---

63 According to Kett (2013, p. 6), institutional merits attach a special value to “exact”, specialised knowledge that may be assessed in examinations.
success on the educational ladder continued to depend on family affluence and the ability to buy additional tutoring services. Alston (1969, p. 148-150) suggests that because teachers were charged with daily, quarterly, and annual assessments, the time allotted to explain new material was severely limited. Hence, teaching new material was implicitly relegated to private tutors. At the same time, the responsibility for poor performance fell on the shoulders of parents, who had to find a way to provide remedial tutoring for their children.

In other words, institutional merit did not fully replace hereditary privilege or challenge existing power relations. On the contrary, the system of numerical scores, tests and examinations served to reproduce and legitimise the prevailing order through claims of objectivity and merit.

Standardisation of Final Examinations

In the nineteenth century, as aforementioned, it was not uncommon for tutors to offer their help in all secondary school subjects (see example #124 and #159 above), which to today’s reader might seem like a sales pitch. Of course, it cannot be ruled out that, eager to attract customers, tutors overestimated their qualifications. However, as I show below, this advertising strategy reflects the logic of the maturity examination, which was introduced in 1873.

The idea of maturity examination originated in the late 1860s, when the government noticed a steady decline in the number of students attending and graduating from secondary schools (Zhurnal MNP, 1868). According to the annual reports of the Ministry of National Enlightenment, one of the most common reasons for drop-out was poverty. As described earlier in this chapter, in order to improve the financial condition of students, the government encouraged the best of them to give private lessons. Another reason reported by the heads of gymnasia was the discrepancy between the final examinations and the non-unified rules for admission to higher education (Zhurnal MNP, 1868). It was pointed out that, while gymnasia were required to act more rigorously with regard to final examinations, institutions of higher education had their own admission requirements and could admit home-educated students without a gymnasium certificate (p. 237).

What was at stake there, was not so much a question of coordinating the different levels of education but rather who—the school or the university—had the “right to decide who counts as qualified for higher studies” (Zhurnal MNP, 1868, p. 213). This question was addressed in the new Rules for Examinations of Gymnasia Students (Zhurnal MNP, 1873), issued in 1873. The rules stipulated that anyone wishing to enrol in an institution of higher education had to pass the final examinations in a gymnasium and obtain a certificate.
of maturity, which also exempted them from additional entrance exams-
64.

In short, maturity examination was a standardised, centrally administra-
ted test held simultaneously in all schools in the same district. Regulated down to
the smallest detail, it was supposed to become the yardstick of objective as-
essment needed to eliminate the “curricular anarchy and abdication to ‘local’
needs” (Alston, 1969, p. 82).

Crucially, as school attendance was not compulsory, home educated stu-
dents and private school leavers could also take their final examinations at a
gymnasium and obtain a maturity certificate. However, unlike gymnasium
graduates, who only took examinations in core subjects, externs had to take
examinations in all gymnasium subjects, including ancient and modern lan-
guages, literature, history, mathematics, and natural sciences (Zhurnal MNP,
1873). This observation leads to the conclusion that by offering lessons in all
subjects, the advertisers of tutoring services sought to attract privately edu-
cated children wishing to pass the maturity examination and enrol in univer-
sity.

Chapter Conclusions

In this chapter I have traced the emergence and development of supplementary
tutoring in and out of public schools in nineteenth-century Russia. I did so
partly by examining the etymology and the use of the word repetitor in policy
documents and non-official sources, and partly by reconstructing the historical
and educational context that made the emergence of supplementary tutoring
possible.

The analysis shows that supplementary tutoring took shape in the public
education system, primarily in elite boarding schools and universities. Repet-
itors supervised students outside school hours and made sure they did what
the school required of them. They rendered possible the constant observation
of students and ensured that their conduct was in line with the purposes of the
state. For some university graduates, tutoring was an obligation; for school-
teachers and students, it was a financial incentive provided by the state; for
others it was an entitlement, a reward for academic performance, diligence,
and exemplary behaviour. In any case, internal, supplementary tutoring was
part of the service to the state.

There is still little known about this practice because it was rarely docu-
mented, and because of changing terminology that does not always separate
internal tutoring from other forms of academic assistance. It is also striking
that, with the exception of a few articles (e.g., Belorussov, 1879; Stoyunin,

64 For admission to colleges of applied sciences, students were required to pass both final exam
at vocational schools or military gymnasia and a special entrance exam at the desired institution.
1865/1892), this practice received little attention in public discourse. Instead, most of the informal sources attest to private supplementary tutoring.

Interestingly, although for nearly two centuries the imperial government attempted to tackle private educational activities, I found no policy regulating supplementary tutoring outside public institutions. On second thought, it is not surprising given that this kind of tutoring could not compete with public institutions by offering alternative content or any of the individual privileges conferred by prestigious gymnasia. On the contrary, it reinforced the legitimacy of centrally prescribed goals and values that schools were to protect and promote, and thus raised no concerns about curricular and ideological conformity. Accordingly, instead of introducing special rules governing supplementary tutoring, the government encouraged its development. As demonstrated in this chapter, the whole school system was designed in such a way that it presupposed additional assistance: it was virtually impossible to get into school and succeed without being tutored. In other words, supplementary tutoring was an important, albeit implicit, part of the formal curriculum.

Apart from government indifference, I have identified three factors that might explain the emergence of private supplementary tutoring: 1) the strict differentiation of curricula in Tolstoy’s classical education system; 2) assessment reforms, including the unification of the grading system, the intensified use of tests, and the standardisation of final examinations; and 3) the introduction of universal conscription. Each of these reforms, in turn, can be seen as an ‘answer’ to the question of privilege, which has been at the centre of government reflection since the eighteenth century (see chapters 5 and 6).
8. In the Shadow of Communist Values: Private Tutoring in Soviet Russia

It is difficult to imagine a discussion of Soviet education evoking a distinction between public and private. Whereas these concepts occupy a central place in modern Western thought, in the USSR, where “everything was officially ‘public’, privacy was unprotected, and the public sphere was étatized” (Sajo, 2002, as cited in Siegelbaum, 2006, p. 2), they could hardly be of equal importance. Indeed, communism as an ideal of social order envisaged the cultivation of collectivism and proletarian solidarity and the condemnation of capitalism and individualism. However, research on individual enterprise and everyday life in Soviet society challenges the assumption that the private sphere was either completely eliminated or existed only under the close surveillance of or in total opposition to the state (e.g., Feldbrugge, 1984; Finkel, 2007; Garcelon, 1997; Roucek, 1988; Siegelbaum, 2006; Yurchak, 2013; Zdravomyslova & Voronkov, 2002).

Nevertheless, little is known about the private when it comes to Soviet education. Although several studies mention that private tutoring existed during the socialist period (Būdienė & Zabulionos, 2006; Hrynevych et al., 2006; Kobakhidze, 2018; Kubánová & Zabulionos, 2006; Silova, 2010; Silova & Bray, 2006; Silova & Kazimzade, 2006), to my knowledge it has not been empirically studied so far. As a result, the growth of tutoring practices throughout the region is usually attributed to the market-driven reforms in education undertaken in the post-Soviet period (see chapter 2). However, as this chapter demonstrates, a large part of the ‘neoliberal’ tendencies in Russian education in fact have been visible since the mid-1950s.

65 For references, see chapter 1.
66 It should be noted that not all scholars share this view. Kharkhordin (1997), for example, argues that using the word “public” in the Soviet context is “profoundly misleading, if not outrageously erroneous” (p. 358). Drawing on Hannah Arendt’s distinction between “the public” and “the social”, he considers the Soviet society to be regulated by mechanisms of “social” rather than of a genuinely “public” character. By contrast, other scholars point out the importance of the private sphere in the USSR, arguing that privatisation processes had been underway since the end of the Stalin era (Siegelbaum, 2006).
For further discussion of the concept of “public” in the Soviet context, see also Finkel (2007), Oswald and Voronkov (2004). On the pitfalls of using binary oppositions, such as public and private, official and nonofficial, the state and the society, conformity and resistance, in descriptions of late socialist Russia, see also Yurchak (2013).
By drawing attention to this unexplored area, the chapter offers a new perspective on the formation of Soviet education. It examines how private tutoring was problematised in the central press and periodicals, and what concerns, if any, put forward by the public resonated in policy.

Although the material used in this chapter covers all 70 years of the existence of the USSR, the bulk of the analysis focuses on the period between mid-1950s and the late 1980s which is known as the period of “late socialism”. These thirty years of Soviet rule can be further divided into three shorter periods: Khrushchev’s “thaw” (1953-1964), Brezhnev’s stagnation (1964-1985) and Gorbachev’s perestroika (1985-1991). It was during these periods that, along with the relative liberalisation of the political climate, private tutoring became a natural part of everyday life for many Soviet citizens.

The chapter is structured as follows. It starts with discussing the historical conditions from the post-revolutionary years to the mid-1950s in response to which education policy of late socialist Russia developed. This section traces the ideological shifts in the official view on ‘the private’ in general. I then examine what concerns about private tutoring were brought to the forefront of the public debate between the mid-1950s and the late 1980s. The analysis is divided in three parts. First, I discuss issues related to different forms of equality, including access to (higher) education, geographical inequalities, inequalities in the assessment, and inequalities arising from unified versus differentiated curricula. In these cases, the increasing popularity of private tutoring is seen as a consequence of school deficiencies, associated particularly with the introduction of universal secondary education, rather than a problem in itself. Second, I discuss the conflict between pedagogical and economic values epitomised in tutoring practices. In this case, tutoring is seen as a ‘problem’ or a cause of societal and education problems. In the third part I return to the policy level to explore whether and how the government took care of public concerns. The main findings of the chapter are summarised and discussed in the final section.

**Empirical Sources**

As noted above, the distinction between public and private education was virtually irrelevant in authoritative Soviet rhetoric. It is therefore not surprising that regulations directly concerning private tutoring were issued only in the first and in last decade of the Soviet period (Table 8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Policy documents on private tutoring in Soviet Russia.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Decree on Hiring Home Teachers and Tutors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Law on Individual Enterprise of the Citizens of the USSR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In collecting the data for this chapter, I first searched for uses of the word *repetitor* in the digital archive of the journal *Current Digest of the Soviet Press* (CDSP), which contains a selection of Russian-language documentaries translated into English with references to originals. In this way I found about forty articles published in central Soviet newspapers, including *Pravda, Izvestiya* and *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, and in periodicals, such as *Literaturnaya Gazeta* and *Uchitelskaya Gazeta* (see Table 9 below). After that, I collected the original publications to which the CDSP referred. In the rare cases when the original sources were hard to come by, I used abridged and translated versions of the articles in the CDSP. To broaden the scope of this chapter, I searched the digital archive of the newspaper *Pravda* and *Pionerskaya Pravda* for additional material. In total, this selection strategy resulted in 67 articles from 9 different sources (Table 9).

Table 9. An overview of informal sources from the Soviet period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number of collected articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Pravda</em> (Truth)</td>
<td>Daily, all-union newspaper. The official press organ of the Communist Party.</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Izvestia</em> (News)</td>
<td>Daily, all-union newspaper, published by the Supreme Soviet.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Komsomol’skaya Pravda</em> (Komsomol Truth)</td>
<td>Daily, all-union newspaper, main organ of the Central Committee of Komsomol (the Leninist youth movement).</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Literaturnaya Gazeta</em> (Literature Gazette)</td>
<td>Weekly cultural-political newspaper. The official organ of the Union of Soviet Writers (a government-controlled organisation).</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pionerskaya Pravda</em> (Truth for Young Pioneers)</td>
<td>An all-union newspaper for children. In the USSR it was the press organ of the Central Committee of the Komsomol and of the All-Union Young Pioneer Organisation.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sovetskaya Rossiya</em> (Soviet Russia)</td>
<td>Political newspaper. The organ of the Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the Russian Soviet Republic.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Molodoy communist</em> (Young communist)</td>
<td>A monthly socio-political journal of the Central Committee of Komsomol.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Uchitelskaya Gazeta</em> (Teacher Gazette)</td>
<td>The organ of the Ministry of Education and of the Central Committee of the Trade Union of Education Workers, Higher Education and Scientific Institutions.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDSP</td>
<td>A selection of Russian-language Soviet press translated into English.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67 Except for articles published in *Pravda*, the scanned copies of articles found through CDSP were kindly provided by the staff of the National Library of the Republic of Karelia (Petrozavodsk, Russia) to whom I am most grateful.
Some comments need to be made here. First, as data collection was constrained by what archives were available for digital searches outside Russia, most of the articles come from Pravda. This does not necessarily mean that private tutoring was not an equally common topic in other publications. Second, although the collected sources cover almost the entire period of the Soviet rule, the main focus of this chapter is on the post-Stalin era, when a public debate on the planned education reform was initiated. Third, geographically, the analysis is limited to the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (RSFSR), although its findings are certainly relevant to other parts of the USSR.

Naturally, the official media outlets reflect government policy and serve as a tool for shaping public opinion. Put differently, they are used to produce, disseminate, and legitimise specific problematisations and decisions. For this reason, in collecting data, I considered even brief mentions of private tutoring important for understanding the role of this phenomenon in the formation of Soviet education. To make sense of the public debate and locate it within the broader policy framework, I also collected documents describing the essence of the regulations mentioned in the debate. Among these were references to specific provisions on private tutoring; however, I was not able to trace the texts of all these regulations and quote them in the ways they were reprinted in the newspapers.

References to regulations concerning public education were easier to follow up. These policy documents were gathered mainly from the collection of documents on Soviet education Popular Education in the USSR (Abakumov et al., 1974). A thorough analysis of formation of these policies, not least by examining the transcripts of the USSR’s Supreme Soviet meetings (Verkhovnyi Sovet SSSR, 1959, 1986), reveals that many of them were legitimised through warnings about the undesirable consequences of private tutoring. Hence, these policies can also be seen as a response to various tutoring practices and indirect attempts to eliminate them.

The Public and the Private in Soviet Education: Ideological Metamorphoses

In the previous chapters I have shown that by the end of the nineteenth century there existed multiple forms of private education, such as private boarding schools, preparatory schools, preparatory courses, home-schooling, and private tutoring, which constituted either legitimate alternatives or formal or less formal supplements to schooling. As such, tsarist policy allowed the coexistence of different actors in education, including the Orthodox church and private bodies, as long as they could prove their commitment to Russia and its traditions and values. The state education system was, however, not
comprehensive, leaving early childhood and adult education remained in private hands.

After the Bolshevik revolution, the Soviet government took new steps towards further nationalisation of education. To fulfil the intentions of the revolution and disseminate its ideas, it was deemed necessary to eradicate illiteracy and increase the accessibility of education for all. Universal and unified public education was believed to be a prerequisite for engaging the masses in the revolutionary process and creating a “new Soviet man”. The state took on lifelong responsibility for the upbringing and education of every citizen; shortly after the revolution, in December 1917, the Commissariat of Enlightenment announced that “public (free-of-charge) education of children should begin the day they are born” (Narkompros, 1974a, p. 327).

In the first post-revolutionary years, the government created a unified network of institutions for children and adults of all ages and all social classes. The complex and differentiated system of imperial schools, which promoted competition rather than solidarity, individual achievement rather than common interests, intellectual rather than manual labour, elitist rather than collectivist social order, was to be replaced by proletarian schools with greatest uniformity possible. The unified labour school, introduced in 1918, was envisioned as a single, undifferentiated institution, covering primary and secondary levels and accessible to all. However, this system was not entirely closed for private initiatives. Indeed, according to Article 11 of the Regulations of the Unified Labour School, the state could provide support to private schools, “given that the value of such school is recognized by the local departments of public education” (VTSIK, 1918/1974, p. 134).

At first sight, state support for private schools represented a departure from the principle of the unity of the Soviet school. However, this deviation had economic rather than ideological motives. The near collapse of the country’s economy, plagued by wars and civil unrest, demanded a temporary retreat to a market economy with partial permission for private enterprise. In 1921, Vladimir Lenin introduced the New Economic Policy (NEP), which again made the coexistence of the public and private sectors possible. Although the NEP was primarily an agricultural policy, the idea of partial privatisation of education did not seem unthinkable. Indeed, under the NEP, private investment in education in the form of tuition fees for children of non-proletarians was seen as a necessary contribution to the public system (see e.g., Durinin, 1922).

Even private tutoring was allowed as long as it was limited to individual instruction. Tutoring in larger groups, on the other hand, was seen as an informal substitute for private schools and therefore considered unacceptable:

---

68 The literacy campaign is known as likbez, which is an acronym for likvidatsiya bezgramotnosti, that is, elimination of illiteracy.

69 For an analysis of the concept of ‘new Soviet man’, see, for example, Soboleva (2017).
In addition to the absolutely fundamental need for a state monopoly on education, tutoring of more than two or three students per group (and there are cases when a tutor teaches several dozen students per group) should also be definitely forbidden, as this is essentially a private school.

In the 1920s, advertisements for tutoring continued to appear, albeit in considerably smaller numbers, in national newspapers, offering quick preparation for university entrance exams and extra tuition in school subjects for low achievers (see e.g., “[Tutoring Advertisement],” 1924a; “[Tutoring Advertisement],” 1924b).

In 1924 the People’s Commissariat of Labour announced a new regulation initiative:

\[\text{Наркомтруд СССР в целях регулирования труда домашних учителей и репетиторов, а также для содействия в подыскании им работы, решил организовать при секции просвещения на биржах труда посреднические бюро по найму репетиторов и домашних учителей. Регистрация в бюро никаких льгот и прав безработных не дает. ("О Naime Domashnikh Uchitelei i Repetitorov", 1924)}\]

In order to regulate the work of home teachers and tutors and to assist them in finding employment, the USSR People’s Commissariat of Labour decided to set up intermediary bureaus for the recruitment of tutors and home teachers in the education section of the labour exchanges. Registration at the office does not grant any benefits or rights of the unemployed.

This and the other sources mentioned above illustrate that under the NEP, participation in private tutoring was not only permitted but actively encouraged by the authorities.

The NEP was, however, abolished in 1928 by Joseph Stalin, who argued that a communist society should be built on the principles of Marxism-Leninism, collectivism, and common ownership of the means of production. This marked a new shift towards greater state control in all spheres of life, including education. All undertakings outside state channels were strongly discouraged or prohibited by law, resulting in the word ‘private’ (chastnoe) virtually disappearing from the Soviet lexicon (Siegelbaum, 2006, p. 4).

With the introduction of compulsory primary education in 1930 (TSIK SSSR & SNK SSSR, 1930/1974), all forms of educational activity not formally sanctioned and directly controlled by the state became illegal. This does
not mean that supplementary tutoring ceased to exist; rather, as illustrated below, it was nationalised\textsuperscript{70}.

In 1930 the government decreed that the least privileged families and underachieving schoolchildren should be given ample opportunity to participate in preparatory and remedial classes free of charge. Responsibility for providing these classes was delegated to teachers, parents’ councils, senior students, and Young Pioneer organisations (TSIK SSSR & SNK SSSR, 1930/1974, p. 113). In the 1930s and 1940s, advertisements for such tutoring groups (\textit{repetitorskie gruppy}) appeared in \textit{Pravda} and \textit{Pionerskaya Pravda}. Those groups were set up at schools, usually during the summer holidays, and promised an individual approach to each student who needed to retake the transition examinations (see e.g., Nechaeva, 1939). The following example is taken from an article published in \textit{Pravda} in 1940, which states that in Leningrad many of the thirty thousand pupils who failed the transitional exams are preparing for a retake in summer tutoring groups:

Учительница Мария Сергеевна повторяет с группой шестиклассников правила грамматики. К доске подходит Валя Хлебникова. На весенних испытаниях она оскандалилась. Аккуратно посещая занятия в репетиторской группе, Валя уже сделала большие успехи. ("Repetitorskie Gruppy", 1940)

The teacher, Maria Sergeevna, is reviewing the rules of grammar with a group of sixth graders. Valya Khlebnikova comes to the blackboard. She embarrassed herself at the spring tests. By carefully attending classes in the tutoring group, she has already made great progress.

Likewise, \textit{Pionerskaya Pravda} published small pieces about tutoring groups, which were more akin to a subtle form of advertising (see e.g., “K Osennim Ispytaniyam v Shkole Nado Khorosho Podgotovit’sya”, 1939). For example, in a letter to the editor, a girl writes that during the school year she had difficulties with mathematics. In order to catch up, she is going to attend a tutoring group which she has learned will be open for underachieving pupils: “I shall be very eager to attend those classes and will do my best to get into the 6\textsuperscript{th} grade” (Pionerskaya Pravda, 1934, p. 1). Another entry states that such groups were run by only the best schoolteachers, who had put up a special programme to ensure that every student would pass the exams (Nechaeva, 1939). Still other notes attest that tutoring groups were open even during wartime (Lipchin, 1941; Savin, 1941).

The death of Stalin in 1953 and the subsequent softening of state control in the Khrushchev era—hence, “the thaw”—marked another phase in the relationship between the individual and society, with the gradual expansion of the boundaries of acceptable behaviour for a Soviet citizen. It was in this context

\textsuperscript{70} It is likely that there were also ‘private’ forms of tutoring, but these were naturally more discrete.
that the public debate on education in general and private tutoring in particular gained momentum, drawing the attention of prominent public figures, education authorities, academicians, schoolteachers, and parents. Individuals not only from the RSFSR but also from other socialist republics, including Estonia (Koop, 1979), Georgia (Chkhikvishvili, 1979), Lithuania (Zabulis, 1980), Latvia (Artyukhov, 1983) and Azerbaijan (Ragimov, 1984), commented on the prevalence and roots of private tutoring in different parts of the USSR.

One may wonder how it was possible that private tutoring was discussed so openly in a context where other private initiatives were severely restricted or forbidden. After all, such a discussion might have called into question the public nature of education that the authorities continued to claim. Moreover, it could have exposed the failure of the government that had gone to great lengths to eradicate private enterprise altogether and ensure equal access to education. Nevertheless, the ‘problem’ was not silenced nor denied by the central mass media. On the one hand, this may indicate a change in the attitude of the authorities towards private enterprise and black-market operations in general. Indeed, the growth of the ‘shadow’, or secondary, economy in the USSR is often attributed to the transformations of leadership from the tyrannical style of Stalin to less repressive regimes during and after the Khrushchev’s rule (Feldbrugge, 1984; Rutgaizer, 1992). On the other hand, the public debate could be implicitly endorsed by the government as an initial phase of its campaign to promote the coming school reforms.

Private Tutoring as a Symptom of Inequality

The Gap between Secondary and Higher Education

One of the most popular views expressed in the central press was that private tutoring was filling the gap between secondary and higher education that had arisen following the adoption of the law on universal secondary education in 1961 (Verkhovnyi Sovet SSSR, 1974). Introduced at Khrushchev’s (1958) initiative, who lamented that Soviet schools were preparing people not for life but only for university admission, this law was supposed to “strengthen the ties between school and life” and bridge the gap between mental and manual labour. As the number of students completing upper secondary education

---

71 Although no official statistical data exist, the articles analysed in this chapter contain some indicators of the prevalence of tutoring practices in the RSFSR. For example, a survey of first-year university students conducted by Artyukhov (1983) shows that 70 percent of applicants got into Rostov State University thanks to their classes with a private tutor. In Moscow and Leningrad, the percentage was even higher. Another attempt to estimate the prevalence of private tutoring was made by Sociological Research Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences. According to Rogovin (1982, p. 6), Soviet families spent eight billion roubles on private tutoring over five years, which corresponded to the size of the entire country’s annual secondary education budget.
increased, so did the number of those who could continue their education. This led to an increase in the competition for admission to higher education (see e.g., Rutkevich, 1971), with the knowledge requirements for the final and entrance examinations becoming increasingly diverse. As a result, there appeared a curricular gap between different levels of education.

The nature and the size of this gap, however, was perceived differently. Scientists and higher education officials, for example, complained that the knowledge acquired at school was not sufficient for successful university studies. Supporting this view, schoolteachers pointed out that the school curriculum, especially in mathematics, was becoming increasingly simplistic, with tasks requiring reflection gradually disappearing. To compensate for such inadequacy of the curriculum, one teacher said, parents were forced to turn to private tutors and pay them huge sums of money (Nikiforov, 1985). Parents, on the other hand, considered the curriculum overloaded, but argued that despite this most “average students” still had to seek additional classes with a tutor to prepare for competitive entrance exams (Bogushevskaya, 1978).

Others insisted that there was no gap between the school curriculum and university entrance requirements. Consider, for instance, the following statement by Vyacheslav Yelutin, the Minister of Higher and Specialised Secondary Education of the RSFSR. When asked about the widening gap between school and higher education in recent years, which, according to readers, has precipitated tutoring activities, the minister replied:

Arnold Koop, Rector of the University of Tartu, also believed that the growing demand for private tutoring was not so much due to the differences in the requirements of secondary and higher schools, but rather to the standardisation
of entrance examinations. Being focused on ‘formulaic knowledge’ (shabloonnoe znanie), these examinations made it easier for tutors to ‘coach’ (nastavlivat’) students (Koop, 1979).

In another article, a schoolteacher claimed that entrance exams did not depart from the secondary school curriculum; however, they did demand greater independence and flexibility from candidates in the use of their knowledge, as well as better thinking skills than those required in school. In such circumstances, tutoring gave applicants a “margin of safety” (zapas prochnosti), turning entrance examinations into a competition of tutors:

The times when tutors were only sought after to “rescue” underachievers are long gone. Nowadays their services are increasingly being used even by strong students who feel that school does not prepare them for further studies after they graduate, because they know of cases when a graduate, having relied on excellent marks at school and not having built up a “margin of safety” through tutoring, finds himself/herself inadequate during competitive university examinations. In other words, much more often than it is commonly thought, the situation arises when a private tutor, rather than a teacher at a state educational institution, determines to a considerable extent the fate of a school leaver.

Nikanorov (1973, p. 5) pointed out that this trend was dangerous as it created unfair conditions for university admission. On the one hand, he said, a person with mediocre abilities, but with first-class tutoring, may well get into a university. On the other, a very gifted applicant who had no opportunity to use the help of a tutor may miss out.

The contradiction between the ideology of equal opportunities and reality was also discussed by Michail Rutkevich (1971), a member of the USSR Academy of Sciences. He noted that the law on universal secondary education had opened the university doors for every student. However, at the selection stage, a student’s fate was determined not only by the quality of education he or she had received at school—which, he argued, was uneven—but also by the quality of additional educational activities in which he or she participated. In other words, the increased—at least in theory—access to higher education
has paradoxically also increased the demand for tutoring services and made university entrance even more dependent on graduates’ ability to pay.

This sentiment is echoed in another article, in which journalist Vasiltsova claims that many students owe their entrance to university to private tutors:


“The contest of tutors”—do you remember how at first this sounded like a joke? But only at first. Just listen to your acquaintances, sit in on the entrance examinations for university, where the parents of secondary-school graduates nervously await the results—it’s amazing but it’s a fact: people are no longer ashamed of having tutors, they are proud of them. The costlier the tutor, the more prestigious it is to have one. This means that our system of free education, equally available to everyone and based on competition in knowledge, has been invaded by the rouble. If you have money, you’ll get in; if you have money, you’ll graduate; if you have money, you’ll have everything—to be frank, this is the psychology of tutoring.

Here, Vasiltsova shifts attention from the curricular to the ideological gap, arguing that the proliferation of private tutoring signalled the arrival of a market paradigm ill-suited to socialist ideals. This paradigm, she asserted, transformed knowledge and academic degrees into a subject of profiteering.

Vasiltsova’s article, devoted entirely to the problems of tutoring in the USSR, provoked a mixed response from readers, where issues of curriculum uniformity were intertwined with ideological inconsistencies in Soviet education. While many readers shared Vasiltsova’s concerns about the commercialisation of education and how it had grown to be acceptable, others saw no cause for worry. One reader wrote, for instance, that “in a society that has not yet reached communism” paid tutoring was perfectly justified (“Repetitor Bez Illyuziy: Chitatel’ Analiziruet, Predlagaet i Sporit”, 1975). He went on to explain:

Мой взгляд на частную подготовку абитуриентов в вуз – я отношусь к этому положительно. Основание: пока у нас нет коммунистического общество. Так что – все за деньги. Доцент или профессор готовит, а я за благородный труд платчу и скажу «спасибо». И нечего шумиху

My view on private training of university entrants is that I am positive about it. My reason: we don’t yet live in a communist society, so everything costs money. A senior lecturer or professor gives one-on-one lessons, and I pay for his or her honourable work and say, ‘thank you’. And there’s no need to
наводить — подумаешь, у государства объявился конкурент!
(“Repetitor Bez Illyuziy: Chitatel’ Analiziruet, Predlagaet i Sporit”, 1975)

Similarly, commenting on the increased role of money in the post-war years, another reader noted:

В настоящее время по сравнению с довоенными и первыми послевоенными годами в нашей жизни возросла роль денег. За деньги можно приобрести кооперативную квартиру, купить автомашину, дачу. Имея деньги, с помощью репетитора можно подготовиться к поступлению в институт — это довольно честный путь. (“Repetitor Bez Illyuziy: Chitatel’ Analiziruet, Predlagaet i Sporit”, 1975)

In comparison with the pre-war and the first post-war years, the role of money in our lives has now increased. You can buy a cooperative apartment, a car, or a dacha for money. If you have money, you can, with the help of a tutor, prepare for university—it is quite an honest way to do it.

While the discussants quoted above do not express concerns about the growth of for-profit services in education, other readers agreed with Vasiltsova. Pointing to the risks of commercialisation of education, one reader noted:

В систему нашего образования влез рубль, и в этой системе он начинает работать против нас, начинает ломать, коверкать, разрушать самое важное, самое фундаментальное в человеке — его сознание. (“Repetitor Bez Illyuziy: Chitatel’ Analiziruet, Predlagaet i Sporit”, 1975)

The rouble has entered our education system, and in this system, it is now working against us, breaking, distorting, and destroying the most important, the most fundamental thing in human beings—their consciousness.

In her view, the emergence and the increasing acceptability of tutoring practices was indicative of a shift in public consciousness.

The complexity of the issue is epitomised in an article by Leonid Zhukhovitsky (1984), in which he asks whether it is fair that the fate of yesterday’s schoolchildren depends not on their preparation at school, where everyone follows the same curriculum, but on a new “unofficial but very significant institution—private tutoring”. Acknowledging that the question of fairness is not as simple as it sounds, he nevertheless argues that from the society’s perspective it is preferrable that better-qualified applicants get enrolled in higher education regardless of where they got their knowledge—at school or from a tutor. From this point of view, Zhukhovitsky finds tutoring to be justified. However, echoing the general sentiment, he argues that the question of fairness has another dimension that cannot be ignored:
Children’s chances of getting good preparation vary. City school or country school, strong or weak teacher; eventually, in a group of equally intelligent children, some get an advantage while others fall behind. In principle, tutors should equalise these differences and eliminate injustice. But, alas, they increase it. For the opportunity to be tutored by a good specialist is very much dependent on the size of the parents’ wallet. … It is a violation of the cherished principle of equal opportunity. It is a violation of justice.

Thus, for Zhukhovitsky, private tutoring is a complex and contradictory phenomenon in which the public good is blended with private gain and the conscientiousness of good tutors is tarred with shady enterprise. Consequently, while justifiable from one point of view, tutoring is completely unfair from another. Whatever the case, Zhukhovitsky argues, the roots of the problem lie in the curricular gap between secondary and higher education.

The Urban-Rural Gap

Another concern associated with private tutoring is related to the persistent spatial inequalities in university enrolment, that is, unequal opportunities of children from different geographic areas—urban and rural—to prepare for entrance examinations. This concern has been voiced repeatedly by many commentators.

In one of the earliest articles on the subject, the executive secretary of the admissions office of Moscow University elaborates on the reasons why the number of graduates from rural schools enrolling in higher schools remains low. He points out that, compared to their peers in larger cities, students in rural schools have no opportunity to prepare for competitive examinations, as there are neither preparation courses nor private tutoring available for them (Yemel’yamov, 1968).

Similarly, in the aforementioned article, Vasiltsova (1975) pointed out that monetary relations in education tend to reinforce existing inequalities between urban and rural students:

Репетиторство развито прежде всего в крупных городах. Значит, сельские школьники, и так в воле различных причин поставленные в невыгодные, по сравнению с городскими, Tutoring is particularly developed in bigger cities. This means that rural students, already disadvantaged in comparison with their urban counterparts for a variety of reasons, are thus
It was pointed out that students from the countryside found themselves in an unequal position as they did not have the opportunity to study with tutors. Correspondingly, for them entrance examinations posed a “barrier” (*shlagbaum*) that was in fact “run by a private tutor” (Artyukhov, 1983, p. 64).

A similar development was observed in other parts of the Soviet Union. Koop (1979) refers to a study conducted in the Estonian SSR that analysed trends in participation in private tutoring. The study showed that four-fifths of entrants using the help of tutors came from white-collar families, and only one fifth from working-class families. At the same time, children living in rural areas prepared for entrance exams on their own, without tutors or other support. This means, Koop concludes, that students from rural areas and working-class families did not have the same opportunities to enrol in postsecondary education as children of urban intelligentsia.

“Percent Addiction” and “Diploma Obsession”

In addition to widening curricular, ideological, and social gaps, the public raised concerns about two other undesirable consequences of universal secondary education, namely: “percent addiction” (*protsentomaniya*), that is, pressure on schools to award higher grades, and “diploma obsession” (*dipломоманиya*), that is, pressure for acquiring a university degree. What these phenomena have in common is that they both point to the growing importance of school grades and institutional merit for different stakeholders, which in turn increases the demands for various types of private tutoring.

Henrikas Zabulis (1980), Minister of Higher and Specialised Secondary Education of the Lithuanian SSR, argues, for example, that the law on universal secondary education was interpreted overly simplistically to mean that every pupil must obtain a school leaving diploma by the age of eighteen, and therefore the school had no right to leave their final year students without a satisfactory grade. A similar view is put forward in *Literaturnaya Gazeta*:

Ведь процентомания и репетиторство укрепились на почве именно всеобуча, так как обязательность среднего образования стала обязанностью вовсе не учащегося, но – школы и учителства. (Lyovshina, 1984)
According to Zabulis (1980), the expansion of compulsory education had created “either infantilism or outright parasitic attitudes among some young people”. Meanwhile, as access to secondary education became universal, the number of students progressing to the next school year, their average achievement and the number of graduates awarded medals came to be used as key indicators of school quality. It was said that, unable to select out students, teachers were forced to give underserved passing grades to weak students in order to keep statistics at an acceptable level (Kozhevnikova, 1972). Consequently, the weight of grades could vary greatly between and within schools:

Имея только обязанности, но не имея прав не учить того, кто не желает учиться в данный конкретный момент, учитель иногда вынужден за-вышать оценки, снижая уровень обучения для всего класса. (Lyovshina, 1984)

With only responsibilities but no rights not to teach someone who does not want to learn at a particular moment, the teacher is sometimes forced to inflate grades, thus lowering the level of instruction for the whole class.

According to journalist Glovatsky, parents and students lost faith in school grades and are therefore turning to private tutors:

Чего скрывать: сегодня и родители, и сами абитуриенты неуверены [sic], что оценки в документах об образовании всегда объективно отражают уровень знаний. Эта неуверенность, думается, явилась, с одной стороны, следствием погони за высокими от-метками в условиях сохраняющейся «процентомании». С другой стороны – это следствие стремления получить более высокий балл аттестата со сто-роны учащихся. (Glovatsky, 1983a)

It is no secret that today both parents and applicants themselves are unsure that grades in education documents always objectively reflect the level of knowledge. This uncertainty, we think, is, on the one hand, a consequence of the pursuit of high marks under the persisting “percent addiction”. On the other, it is also a consequence of students’ desire to get higher final grades.

In this example, the increasing popularity of private tutoring is described as an effect of ‘percent addiction’ and grade inflation, incited on the one hand by accountability mechanisms and on the other by students wishing to enter a prestigious university. Ironically, ‘percent addiction’ was one of the reasons why universities refused to admit students on the basis of secondary-school records alone (Rutkevich, 1971), even though such proposals were voiced frequently (see e.g., Ilyin, 1978). As one university teacher admitted,

В общем, у меня, да и у многих моих коллег и по другим предметам тоже, сложилась такая «формула» объек-тивной оценки знаний: оценка в

In general, I as well as many of my colleagues in other subjects, use the following ‘formula’ for an objective assessment of knowledge: the grade on
аттестате минус два балла. Есть, конечно, и исключения, но в большинстве случаев это так, увы…

(Артюхов, 1983, с. 60)

To prevent further grade inflation and to increase public confidence in school assessments, a Komsomol’skaya Pravda reader suggested revising the existing accountability mechanisms:

At present, all pupils from first to final year know very well that their ‘twos’ and ‘threes’ bring more trouble to teachers than to them. When will that end? Why can’t the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences or education authorities work out another system for evaluating schools?

Interestingly, while many saw ‘percent addiction’ as a reason for declining faith in grades and increasing demand for private tutoring, the persisting ‘diploma obsession’ that fuelled people’s desire to get into higher education at all costs, was stated as fact but rarely questioned (see e.g., Glovatsky, 1983a).

According to some observers, diplomomaniya emerged after the expansion of compulsory secondary education, which led to increased competition for degrees, diplomas, and certificates among those who sought to improve or maintain their social positions. This point is illustrated vividly in the following passage, which is worth quoting in its entirety:

Отметки, аттестат, диплом, свидетельство — для кого-то они, как положено, служат средством получения права на определенное занятие, а для кого-то становятся целью занятий, своего рода «знаком преимущества». Но и те, и другие к ним стремятся со все возрастающей настойчивостью. Болезнью нынешних родителей стала «дипломомания». В одном социологическом исследовании приводится впечатляющая картина: в семьях интеллигенции почти все хотят увидеть своих детей в институтах и 80 рабочих семей из ста жаждут того же. Не удовлетворяет школа, учител — ищут репетитора, ущемляя себя порой в самом необходимом. … Никогда еще
This quote is reminiscent of what Stoyunin (1865/1892) had written almost a century earlier. He pointed out that in those days successful entrance to prestigious secondary schools became a determinant of a person’s happiness, career, and status (see chapter 7). Clearly, the role of public institutions in rewarding valuable merit did not change in the communist, egalitarian (at least at the surface) ideological climate that pervaded Soviet education policy. As the above examples illustrate, at a time when growing distrust of school knowledge was accompanied by a steady rise in the value of institutional merit, private tutoring provided a desirable advantage to certain social groups who could afford it.

Curriculum Unification versus Individualisation

Before proceeding with the analysis of how the question of curricular unification was revised in Soviet times, it is worth recalling the basic principles of the Soviet school.

The labour school, introduced in the first post-revolutionary years, was designed as a single entity with a single curriculum providing the same conditions for all children throughout the country. In Bolshevik vision, such “deepest unity” was to be combined with “maximum diversity”, as declared by Anatoly Lunacharsky (1918/1990, p. 46), the People’s Commissar of Enlightenment. In his words, teachers were “to analyse the inclinations and peculiar traits of every single student, and ultimately reconcile individual needs with the possibilities and demands of the school” (p. 44). In keeping with the spirit of socialist education, the main purpose of “subtle individualisation”, according to Lunacharsky, was to enable people to develop their individual abilities for the sake of the common good (pp. 44–45). While individuality was said to be the highest value, in the context of economic hardship and widespread illiteracy, it was considered more important “to reduce, if possible, the number of backward [students]” (p. 45), than to meet the needs of academically gifted and talented students.

In the 1930s and 40s, education underwent a series of reforms promoting selectivity, specialisation and vocationalism. In fact, according to Hans (2012, p. 162), many features of the old tsarist regime, against which the Bolsheviks had fought, were restored during Stalin’s rule. Nevertheless, there was no reduction in the degree of unification. On the contrary, centrally determined
curricula and the re-introduction of grades, medals, and maturity examination signalled a further increase in uniformity and standardisation (Archer, 2013, pp. 631–632).

During Khrushchev’s thaw, in the late 1950s and especially in the 1960s, the all-important principle of uniformity and one-size-fits-all curriculum came under increasing criticism. Front-line teaching and the lack of individual approaches were declared the main problems of the mass school. For example, the eminent mathematician Andrey Kolmogorov (1967) wrote that even individual lessons and additional assignments for high-achieving pupils did not go beyond the average standard. Similar views were expressed by first-year university students, who stated that “both preparatory courses and school lessons were designed for an average or even weak student. But for those aspiring to higher education, this was clearly not enough” (Artyukhov, 1983, p. 62). To compensate for the lack of individual approach in schools, students and parents turned to private tutors, who could offer lessons “tailored to each student’s abilities and potential” (p. 62).

In the context of the growing ‘percent addiction’, perhaps unsurprisingly, teachers were less concerned about high achievers than about potential repeaters and dropouts. As one teacher pointed out:

Мы не можем уделить достаточно внимания талантливым, способным. Вся наша энергия направлена на то, чтобы подтянуть отстающих до уровня средних. … Репетиторство, слушание лекций, курсов, спецзанятия (помимо уроков!) – вот дополнения, к помощи которых не редко прибегают те, кто готовится в вуз. (Gaynulina, 1970)

Students with learning difficulties were also said to suffer from a lack of individual attention and to seek help from tutors. As Lev Landa (1970), Doctor of Psychology, pointed out, “in the overwhelming majority of cases, children [with a psychological diagnosis] can be ‘cured’ only if they are schooled individually. Schoolteachers are, of course, deprived of this opportunity”. In their place this task falls on the shoulders of private tutors:

Сегодня функции и психологов-диагностов и методистов подчас выполняют частные репетиторы. Но это не выход из положения. Следовательно, такая помощь должна осуществляться не в «частном секторе», а в государственном учреждении, на

We cannot pay enough attention to talented, gifted [students]. All of our energies are focused on pulling the laggards up to the average level. … Tutoring, listening to lectures, courses, special classes (apart from ordinary lessons!)— these are supplements that are not uncommon for those preparing for university.

Students with learning difficulties were also said to suffer from a lack of individual attention and to seek help from tutors. As Lev Landa (1970), Doctor of Psychology, pointed out, “in the overwhelming majority of cases, children [with a psychological diagnosis] can be ‘cured’ only if they are schooled individually. Schoolteachers are, of course, deprived of this opportunity”. In their place this task falls on the shoulders of private tutors:

Сегодня функции и психологов-диагностов и методистов подчас выполняют частные репетиторы. Но это не выход из положения. Следовательно, такая помощь должна осуществляться не в «частном секторе», а в государственном учреждении, на

We cannot pay enough attention to talented, gifted [students]. All of our energies are focused on pulling the laggards up to the average level. … Tutoring, listening to lectures, courses, special classes (apart from ordinary lessons!)— these are supplements that are not uncommon for those preparing for university.

See chapter 7.
научной основе и под контролем, а если нужно, и руководством научных институтов. Причем за умеренную плату. (Landa, 1970)

scientific basis, under supervision and, if necessary, under the guidance of scientific institutions. And for a modest fee.

Yevgeny Yamburg, who was a school headmaster at the time, shared this opinion. He noted with despair that children who had suffered serious illness or psychological trauma, and who could not master the school curriculum at the same pace as everyone else, were often not getting the help they needed in school. This was not because teachers were unable or unwilling to give them proper attention, but because it would mean bypassing all the other children in the class. He argued that such children could be brought to “a common denominator” if they were treated individually, just as competent private tutors did (Yamburg, 1985).

In another publication, a teacher from Moscow pointed out that despite a number of reform initiatives, very little was being done for students with learning difficulties. Teachers simply lacked the skills to work with such children, while the creation of remedial classes went too slowly, especially in villages and small towns. She therefore suggested that,

может быть, стоило бы подумать и об организации в школах групп систематической помощи неуспевающим на хозрасчетных началах. Да, обучение, как и медицинское обслуживание, у нас бесплатно. Однако существуют же хозрасчетные медицинские учреждения. Точно так же родителям, дети которых в этом нуждаются, должна быть предоставлена возможность воспользоваться дополнительной платной педагогической помощью. Это, кстати, ослабило бы позиции частного репетиторства. (Klenitskaya, 1986, p. 3)

maybe we should also think about setting up systematic help groups in schools for underachievers on a self-financing basis. Yes, education, like healthcare, is free in our country. But there are also self-financing medical centres. Likewise, parents whose children need additional educational services should have the opportunity to use such services for a fee. That would, by the way, weaken the position of private tutoring.

Reading these lines, one cannot help marveling at how fee-based educational services came to be considered acceptable in a society that declared itself socialist. Whereas in the early 1970s Landa proposed developing evidence-based methods of psychological assistance in state institutions, the teacher in the latter example suggests a market-based solution to the same problem. In both examples, private tutoring is described as a desperate, though not perfect, solution to the school problems faced by children with special educational needs.

In this section I highlighted one dilemma arising from the principle of curricular uniformity. By failing to provide opportunities for the individual
treatment of pupils who fall behind, this principle was said to force parents to seek help from private tutors. Next, I discuss how the shift towards greater differentiation brought about new forms of inequality, while generating new demands for private tutoring.

Curriculum Differentiation and the Question of Privilege

With the slowdown of economic growth in the 1960s, the acceleration of scientific and technological progress, and the increased need for technically skilled workers, the ideal of a common school was once again redefined. Ironically, while scientists in the US suggested that the reasons for the Soviet triumph in space lay in school training, especially in teaching of mathematics and science, Soviet educators complained about the “absolutely unsatisfactory level of school preparation for higher technical education” (Bessonov, 1957, as cited in Mayofis & Kulikin, 2015, p. 258). In order to keep up with the technological innovation, the creation of special type of school for students with exceptional abilities in mathematics, physics, chemistry and biology (TSK KPSS & Sovet Ministrov SSSR, 1958/1974b, p. 50), was proposed so that these students’ preparation for technical higher education would not remain the task of private tutors (Bessonov, 1957, as cited in Mayofis & Kulikin, 2015, pp. 257–258).

Although the proposal was rejected by the Supreme Council in 1958, with Brezhnev’s rise to power some years later, the growing differentiation between and within schools became a fact. In addition to the expanded network of schools and classes with specialised mathematics and foreign language teaching, the 1960s saw the introduction of optional subjects, all-Union academic Olympiads (Dunstan, 1975; Gerovitch, 2019; Mayofis & Kulikin, 2015), and the return of school medals (Sovet Ministrov SSSR, 1959/1974), Arguably, the provision of special forms of schooling heralded a break with the ideological commitment to equality that was to be achieved through a single school and a common curriculum.

The controversy that growing differentiation and individualisation provoked is also reflected in the wider public debate. On the whole, it evolved around one fundamental issue—the role of special forms of schooling in reducing or prolonging inequalities. Opponents saw this as a shocking ideological departure from the most fundamental principles of the Soviet school. From their vantage point, “any division of children into more or less educable was immoral, harmful to society, and therefore not pedagogical” (Teplyakov, 1958, as cited in Mayofis & Kulikin, 2015, p. 268). Any form of “streaming education” was seen as contrary to the general communist spirit of the Soviet school. As deputy Omarova of the Kazakh SSR pointed out, schools

---

74 For a discussion on how the Soviet school promoted excellence, see, for example, Dunstan (1978).
with a special profile would place “a certain proportion of young people in a special, exceptional position”, turning school enrolment into a competition between parents rather than between students (Verkhovnyi Soviet SSSR, 1959, p. 302).

The fiercest critics compared these schools to tutoring and cramming centres set up by the state (see e.g., Alexeev, 1971) arguing that they catered for a tiny proportion of children from white-collar families. It was noted that, together with special-interest clubs organised by Young Pioneers’ Palaces, Olympiads and other extra-curricular activities, special schools could only reinforce inequalities by limiting the chances of a wide selection of students (Alexeev, 1971). Ultimately, as another article pointed out, since such schools and clubs were only available in big cities, they further widened the urban-rural gap (Kossakovsky, 1972). Replying to this critique, Rutkevitch (1971) wrote that specialised schools should not be equated with private tutoring: “The purpose of the former is to develop teenagers’ creativity, while the purpose of the latter is simply rote learning” (p. 3).

For their part, proponents asserted that focusing on talented children would not lead to their isolation from the collective. For example, Irakli Abashidze, a speaker from the Georgian SSR, argued that specialised schools posed no threat to the school, where everyone knew their place. Rather, he argued, this hazard lies outside the school:

Барчушки, зазнайки, белоручки и эгои-стры вырастают в атмосфере излишней индивидуальной опеки, в таких условиях, например, когда родители могут не считаться со школой, нанимать учителей и ежедневно твердить ребенку, что он «вундеркинд». Мы должны предвидеть, что если общебюджетная школа не создаст условий для дополнительных забот об особо одаренных учащихся, то это может привести к поощрению «частной инициативы» в этой области. А ее давно следовало бы пресечь, чтобы не страдала наша талантливая молодежь, не имеющая «особых» условий, и чтобы на ниве «частного» преподавания не подвизались всякие любители нечестного заработка. (Verkhovnyi Soviet SSSR, 1959, pp. 344–345)

Utterly spoiled, arrogant, lazy, and selfish persons grow up in an overprotective environment, where, for example, parents can disregard the school, hire teachers and tell the child every day that he or she is a ‘wunderkind’. We should foresee that, if the regular school fails to provide extra care for exceptionally gifted students, this can give incentives for “private initiatives”. This should have been suppressed long ago, so that our talented youths would not suffer for not having “special” conditions, and so that the sphere of “private” teaching would not be exploited by all sorts of unscrupulous money-grabbers.

75 In fact, special schools and classes with in-depth study of some school subjects were set up only in large cities and towns and recruited mainly the children of the intelligentsia. For a more detailed account of the social composition of special schools and their selection policies and procedures, see Dunstan (1988).
Here, Abashidze warns that if a school does nothing for talented children, they will resort to private initiatives. He saw twofold benefits of specialised schools: they create special conditions for children who need them and at the same time deprive dishonest private tutors of an important but unfair source of income.\(^76\)

However, even supporters were far from believing that the creation of different types of schools could lead immediately to universal equality. Kolmogorov (1967), for example, held that the popular perception of social injustice associated with special schools was correct, since students from the top few schools and students who had a tutor had obvious advantages on entrance examinations. However, he did not think that this injustice could be remedied by full-frontal instruction in mass schools or by changing the competitive nature of the entrance examinations.

On the other hand, along with the flourishing ‘percent addiction’, the establishment of schools with in-depth study of certain subjects further undermined the authority of ordinary schools. For some parents, as one teacher observed, sending a child to a ‘special’ school became a matter of prestige (“Repetitor Bez Illyuziy: Chitatel’ Analiziruet, Predlagaet i Sportit”, 1975). Indeed, classes in these schools were often taught by prominent professors and university staff, who had a large degree of autonomy in shaping the curriculum. Such ‘shadow pedagogy’, as one teacher called it, was very different from mainstream schools and largely outside state control (Smirnov, 2006)\(^77\). This does not mean that it was necessarily opposed to school pedagogy, but it is just as obvious that it was not entirely in line with the rigid, curriculum-bound school teaching. As such, these schools occupied a peculiar position between public and private educational environments.

Although admission to these schools did not in itself guarantee a place at a university, their graduates often passed entrance exams without difficulty (Dunstan, 1978; Gerovitch, 2019). Naturally, to be put on the same footing in terms of educational prospects, parents were keen to get their children into these schools at all costs. Eventually, the demand exceeded the supply. To tackle this, schools conducted informal tests and interviews to determine children’s abilities and select the worthiest of them. In theory, anyone had a chance to get in, but in practice children of officials and intelligentsia were prime beneficiaries (see e.g., Muladzhanov, 1987). This forced unprivileged manual workers to pay for tutoring classes if they wanted their children to pass the tests and get into special schools\(^78\). In sum, what was presented as a means

---

\(^76\) In this rather brief description of the public debate on gifted education, I focused specifically on arguments that drew legitimacy from explicit references to private tutoring. For a more nuanced account of public discussion on this matter, see, for example, Mayofis & Kulikin (2015).

\(^77\) On the pedagogy of math schools, see, for example, Gerovitch (2019).

\(^78\) Although this type of tutoring was not explicitly discussed in the empirical sources, participants in most recent sociological surveys born in the 1970s and early 1980s report that they had private tutors during their pre-school years (RANEPA, 2020, p. 10).
of levelling up inequalities and improving the quality of education in the face of rapidly growing technological demands, in fact promoted differences in wealth and personal connections and cultivated the creation of intellectual elite.

The Pitfalls of “Under-the-Table” Lessons

As shown in the previous sections, private tutoring was portrayed in the Soviet press mainly as a corollary to or a by-product of reforms in public education, which were said to have led to curricular inadequacy. However, these ‘problems’ do not pertain to private tutoring per se. As Davit Chkhikvishvili (1979), then Rector of Tbilisi State University, put it: “Private enterprise in education, although an undeniable evil, is not a cause but only a consequence of [schools’] shortcomings”. Accordingly, the public criticism described above was directed primarily at the presumed demand mechanisms that seemed to engender tutoring services. In contrast, this section focuses on the problematic aspects of private tutoring as described in Soviet newspapers.

The Question of Competence: Pedagogy versus Profit

One recurring question in the public debate was the competence of private tutors. While some commentators saw tutoring as an “honourable” job (“Repetitor Bez Illyuziy: Chitatel’ Analiziruet, Predlagaet i Sporit”, 1975), others expressed doubts about the professional suitability of private tutors and the pedagogical value of their work. Tutors were particularly criticized for cramming and for fostering students unable to think for themselves. The economist Valery Rutgaizer described this as follows:

We shall not dwell on the purely pedagogical aspects of tutoring, which, if done by unskilled “teachers”, suppresses independence, weakens interest in learning by one’s own efforts, [and] is often reduced to mere coaching. It is no accident that some young people, having been tutored and then enrolled in higher education, are forced to continue to seek help from their “mentors”. This is why we sometimes end up with specialists who are accustomed to being looked after all the time but who have never learnt how to think for themselves.
Professor Chkhikvishvili (1979) shared this view. Comparing the growing tutoring industry to private schools, he argued that they, unlike public schools, did not carry out any positive, educational functions but rather led to formalism and rote learning.

Statements of this kind are highly recognizable from the nineteenth century (see chapter 7). What makes them remarkable, though, is that they are fundamentally different from what tutors claimed. In an interview with Vasiltsova (1975) one tutor emphasized:

Мы не стремимся повторять на занятиях школьную программу. Зачем? Мы учим их тому, чему в школе не учат, – МЫСЛИТЬ. Мы даем абитуриенту системное мышление, общее видение предмета. (Vasiltsova, 1975) We don’t want to repeat the school curriculum in our lessons. Why should we? We teach them what they don’t learn in school—to THINK. We give the prospective student a systemic way of thinking, a general view of the subject.

While acknowledging the diversity of tutoring practices, some critics expressed the belief that “there were tutors and there were Tutors” with a capital T: the former do not teach to think, whereas the latter are “capable of remediying a disease” which the school has not cured (Artyukhov, 1983, p. 64).

Glovatsky (1983a) elaborated on this in his investigation of the tutoring market. On the one hand, he noted, tutoring is a part-job for staff of research institutes and department heads with high academic decrees. In this case, the competence of tutors is not a cause for concern. However, such a situation, Glovatsky argued, can still be problematic because “hazardous second-rate tutoring work” must compete with regular teaching.

On the other hand, according to Glovatsky (1983a), many advertisers of tutoring services provided misleading information about their degrees and professional qualifications. In some instances, their real profession had nothing to do with the subjects they intended to teach (see also Glovatsky, 1984; Vasiltsova, 1975). Instead of teaching, they discussed with their clients how to write and effectively use cheat sheets in entrance examinations without getting caught. Other advertisers proved not only incapable of teaching but also involved in criminal fraud (Glovatsky, 1983a, 1984). Glovatsky (1983a) saw the root of this problem in the lack of clear rules for the submission and registration of tutoring advertisements. Hence, advertisers could claim to be assistant professors or PhD candidates without fear of being asked to show diplomas or other proof of their academic titles and degrees.

Being aware that “the problem of private tutoring cannot be solved in an easy way”, as there will always be competition for admission to higher education institutions, Glovatsky suggested:

Наши мнение сводится к тому, что иметь преподавание на дому может лишь педагог высшей школы, I believe that the right to teach students at home should only be granted to higher-school instructors who have
получивший разрешение вуза, где трудится. Он может быть зарегистрирован Горсправкой и дать объявление через рекламный отдел только при наличии этого разрешения, а также регистрации в финансовых органах. … Меры эти необходимы, ибо наше общество должно быть уверено, что обучение и воспитание, даже если оно совершается вне стен учебного заведения, делается надлежащим образом. (Glovatsky, 1983a)

Although the very existence of private tutoring was semi-legal and considered directly contrary to communist values, the above quotation shows that in the 1980s it was generally accepted, provided it was carried out “correctly” and by authorised instructors.

At first glance, the question of tutors’ competence in the Soviet context did not undergo significant changes compared to imperial times. Even the solution proposed by Glovatsky and its justification are in many ways similar to the one proclaimed by Elizabeth’s decree of 1757 (PSZ, 1830h). However, subtle but crucial nuances in the reasoning allow one to notice an important modification in the understanding of what is perceived as moral in the teaching profession. In contrast to the nineteenth century, when the moral qualifications of tutors were assessed in nationalist terms, in the USSR they were embedded in economic terms. True, ethical concerns for private profit-making in education had existed since at least the eighteenth century (chapter 5). But in the USSR, where capitalist values were officially condemned, it took on a different connotation. Even if the idea of education outside school became more tolerated in the last three decades of Soviet rule, the sale of goods and services for the sole purpose of private profit was still perceived as something “violating and counteracting the state’s social policy in education” (Vasiltsova, 1975).

The issue of dishonest profits and sizable capital operations involved in the tutoring business indeed occupied a separate place in public discourse. For example, Glovatsky (1983a) wrote that tutoring could at times bring in profits that no capitalist could dream of. Vasiltsova, similarly, pointed out that tutors felt no emotional attachment to their work and treated it as a purely commercial practice:

Репетитор «в разрезе» – картина весьма пестрая. На одном полюсе высокоплачиваемые работники Всесоюзных НИИ – зав. секторами, даже начальники отделов, имеющие учёные степени, на другом – те, кто при всем желании не мог бы дать выпускнику средней школы и минимуму

Tutoring on average is a very mixed picture. At one pole, there are highly paid employees of National Research Institutes—heads of sectors and even heads of departments, who have academic degrees; at the other pole, there are people who are not in position to give a high school graduate even a
minimum of knowledge, because they themselves do not possess it. But no matter how different the richness of knowledge inside the brains of those at the extreme poles is, the impetus, or impulse, that led them to embark on a tutoring career in the first place is very much the same. This impetus is by no means a desire to enlighten the young generation. Long gone are the days of private tutoring in a family-like atmosphere when a schoolteacher or a student acquaintance helped a half-educated youth to “get his head together”. Today knowledge is capital, and tutoring is above all a job, and a profitable job at that.

Furthermore, Vasiltsova (1975) remarked that while ‘average tutors’ used to work individually, in the 1970s tutoring became a “factory” with a large number of employees\(^7\). Obviously, this required a solid investment, which did not always pay off. To recoup and multiply the investment, tutors used various advertising tricks. Some of them promised university admission, others offered a sort of a money-back guarantee: “Only those who passed the exam successfully pay for their tuition”. Still others claimed to treat each student individually, when in fact classes were conducted in large groups (Vasiltsova, 1975).

Similar denunciations of incompetent and unscrupulous tutors could be found in the second half of the eighteenth century (see e.g., Stolpiansky, 1912). However, unlike in imperial times, when tutors’ competence was ‘measured’ by their citizenship, faith, and loyalty to the country, in the Soviet context the moral critique of competence was more closely linked to their ability to behave as good economic actors without compromising the pedagogical ideals and “moral and political convictions” (Glovatsky, 1983b) of the Soviet state.

Suggested Solutions

The Soviet press of the 1960s and early 1980s raised a number of problematic questions concerning private tutoring. Although it was a semilegal practice—it was neither allowed nor outright forbidden—in the public debate its existence seemed to be legitimised by narratives about the perennial educational problems, such as the gap between secondary and higher education, the

\(^7\) According to Vasiltsova (1975), some tutors rented several apartments and hired staff, usually relatives and close friends, to answer phone calls and to duplicate and post the advertisements.
declining quality of general education, curricular inadequacy, etc., all considered to have arisen from or to have led to a rise in various types of inequalities. As the roots of these problems were believed to be the shortcomings and deep ideological contradictions of adopted education policy, their solution presupposed a substantial revision and restructuring of public education. The basic assumption underlying most of the policy recommendations made by the public was that private tutoring could not be completely eliminated, but that its position could at least be weakened after a careful examination of the gaps in public education it was filling (see e.g., “Repetitor s Bol’shoi Polyanki”, 1984).

The proposed measures can be summarised as follows: 1) improve the overall quality of secondary education, 2) revise the curriculum, 3) revise the existing accountability mechanisms, 4) revise the system of entrance examinations by strengthening the authority of school grades, 5) introduce special quotas of university places for applicants from rural areas, 6) develop closer links between secondary and higher education by involving academics in school activities, 7) meet individual student needs through greater diversity in curricula, methods, and school types, and 8) expand and make more accessible public alternatives to private tutoring (preparatory courses, elective subjects, extra-curricular activities). On the whole, these suggestions, and especially the last two, imply that in order to reduce the demand for private tutoring, public education must become more tutoring-like. This position is encapsulated in the following quote:

Мне представляется, что в пику бурно развивающемуся частному репетиторству надо, не откладывая, стимулировать качественное и конкурентоспособное государственное репетиторство. И при этом держать такой уровень, чтобы вытеснить с рынка знающих врача и халтурщика, сегодня торгующего разумным, добрым и вечным почти монопольно. (Zhukhovitsky, 1984)

It seems to me that to counteract the booming private tutoring, we need without delay to stimulate high-quality and competitive state tutoring. And at the same time, we need to keep up the level that will squeeze out of the knowledge market the rogue tutor, who today sells the reasonable, the good and the eternal almost monopolistically.

By comparison, others argued that “tutoring [emphasis added] must assume state forms” (Glovatsky, 1983a), that is, it should be sanctioned and controlled by the state. To this end, it was proposed, among other things, to introduce the certification of tutoring activities. Pointing out the need for clear rules as to who could engage in tutoring, Rutgaizer (1981) argued, for instance, that those wishing to become tutors had to pass special examinations and obtain an appropriate license. Similarly, Glovatsky (1983a) suggested that the right to tutor students at home should be granted only to university lecturers who have permission to do so. According to him, such permission would solve several
ethical, pedagogical, and political problems at once. Most importantly, Glovatsky believed, it would put an end to *khaltura* \(^{80}\) and extortion:

Для высшего учебного заведения такая информация необходима, так как репетиторы не могут включаться в состав приемных комиссий. Не будет лишней такая информация для администрации и общественности других организаций. Это исключит возможность заниматься репетиторством лицам, не имеющим соответствующей подготовки, стоящим на учете по болезни в медицинских учреждениях, а также с чуждыми нашему строю морально-политическими убеждениями. … Только в этом случае можно быть уверенным, что халтура и вымогательство в частном репетиторстве будут решительно пресечены. (Glovatsky, 1983b)

For higher education institutions, such information is necessary because tutors should not be included in admission committees. The administration and staff of other organisations will also benefit from such information. This will prevent persons who are not properly trained, who are on the medical register due to illness, or who have moral and political convictions alien to our system, from engaging in tutoring. … Only then can we be sure that *khaltura* and extortion in private tutoring will be firmly suppressed.

In addition, to discourage quick profiteers, a progressive tax on tutors’ income was proposed (Glovatsky, 1983a; Rutgaizer, 1981).

In the next section, I examine what problems, if any, raised by the public resonated in authoritative discourse.

Policy Solutions: Constituting New Concerns

My analysis of the Soviet press shows that private tutoring was not seen as a problem in itself. On the contrary, the majority of publications touching upon this issue, sometimes just in passing, mainly discussed other educational problems of which private tutoring was considered a symptom. Accordingly, to tackle the challenges posed by the growing tutoring industry, the government created public alternatives to pre-entry coaching in the form of preparatory courses and faculties (TSK KPSS & Sovet Ministrov SSSR, 1969/1974a). To meet the needs of academically gifted students and to lure them away from private initiative, it revived differentiation between and within the schools through elective subjects and expanded the network of free extracurricular activities.

Nevertheless, until the 1980s private tutoring was barely a distinct object of policy concern. According to one publication in *Pravda*, it was partially

---

80 The Russian word *khaltura* can refer to 1) an unofficial side job, often unrelated to one’s main occupation, done to earn extra income, and 2) work done carelessly or in a hurry by someone who is not properly competent.
regulated by a 1963 law legalising small firms (*byuro uslug*) providing personal assistance and paid services. However, these provisions were interpreted and applied differently in different parts of the USSR:

В Киеве оказывают репетиторские услуги, в Москве — нет: запретило Министерство Просвещения РСФСР. Не вдаваясь в педагогические аспекты проблемы, скажем лишь, что репетиторы-то все равно существуют, только в Киеве гораздо ведет строгий методический контроль их работы, а в ряде городов Российской Федерации они выступают как частные лица. ("Problemy i Obsuzhdeniya: Okazhite Firme Uslugu", 1978)

In Kiev these firms provide tutoring services, but in Moscow they don’t: The RSFSR Ministry of Education prohibited it. Without getting into the pedagogical aspects of the problem, we can merely say that tutors exist in any case, but in Kiev the City Department of Public Education maintains strict methodological control of their work, whereas in many cities of the Russian Federation, they act as private persons.

Another attempt to regulate the tutoring market was made in 1983, following a series of critical articles in *Sovetskaya Rossiya* (Glovatsky, 1983a, 1983b). First, the executive committee of the Moscow City Soviet adopted a special provision, according to which tutors had to present a higher education diploma and proof of all academic degrees and titles in order to advertise their service through the Moscow City Reference and Information Office (*Mosgorspravka*). It was also decided that a tutor could advertise his or her services with the permission of local education departments in the place of their residence. Importantly, a tutor could only be authorised to teach subjects included in the general secondary school curriculum. To prevent abuses, the USSR Ministry of Higher and Specialised Secondary Education obliged universities to find out which teachers were engaged in tutoring and to exclude them from admission commissions81 (Glovatsky, 1983b, 1984).

Clearly, the problem this solution was designed to address was primarily related to the personal and professional qualities of tutors. At the same time, it construed another problem, namely that of curricular compliance. By restricting private teaching to the framework of school curriculum, the authorities prevented any deviation from the centrally prescribed goals and content of education. It is worth emphasizing that this question did not feature in the public discourse, yet it took centre stage in policy making.

An important milestone in the history of policies on private tutoring was the *Law on Individual Enterprise* (Ob Individual’noi Trudovoi Deyatel’nosti Grazhdan SSSR, 1987), which came into force in 1987. Aimed at defining and regulating the rights and obligations of citizens engaged in individual

---

81 This regulation proved ineffective. According to Glovatsky (1984), the rules proposed by the Executive Committee of the Moscow City Soviet were largely ignored because the authorities failed to specify who was responsible for providing tutors with the required certificates and made no provision for tougher sanctions against those who placed unauthorised advertisements.
entrepreneurship, it provided for a contractual relationship between individuals and public institutions and organisations involved in the “production of goods and provision of paid services”. The law considerably extended the lists of activities permitted for self-employment in various fields and areas in which the state previously had supreme responsibility. Along with the various types of craft, repair- or domestic services that were said to be necessary to meet public needs, these lists envisaged the provision of private tutoring (Ob Individual’noi Trudovoi Deyatel’nosti Grazhdan SSSR, 1987, Article 18:4).

Arguably, the law marked an important ideological shift, signalling that ‘private’ was no longer seen as contradicting socialist values. On the contrary, it was repeatedly emphasized during the governmental debate on the bill that its adoption was in the public interest because it would meet the society’s needs for goods and services. The following transcript of the meetings of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, clearly shows that private tutoring came to be considered beneficial to both society and to tutoring providers if it was properly regulated:

Это позволит привлечь к активной и полезной для общества трудовой деятельности многих квалифицированных преподавателей и специалистов, обладающих большим опытом и знаниями, в том числе и находящихся на пенсии, и одновременно будет способствовать улучшению их материального положения. (Verkhovnyi Soviets SSSR, 1986, p. 325)

This will attract many qualified teachers and specialists who possess extensive experience and knowledge, including those who are retired, to an active and useful service to society, while at the same time improving their financial situation.

It is worth noting that, compared to the 1930 Law on General Compulsory Elementary Education (TSIK SSSR & SNK SSSR, 1930/1974), in which extra tuition was discussed as necessary for certain groups of schoolchildren (see above), the rationale of the Law on Individual Enterprise puts the emphasis on improving the financial situation of tutoring providers.

By the nature of the law, the problems it sought to address were first and foremost economic; by regulating the conduct of citizens engaged in private tutoring, it was supposed to combat so-called “unearned” income and unemployment. However, clarifications to the relevant article indicate that private tutoring was not treated as a purely economic issue, but also as a political one. In particular, paragraph 2 of Article 19 prohibited “teaching of subjects and courses not provided for in the curricula of general education schools, vocational-technical schools, secondary specialised and higher education institutions of the USSR” (Ob Individual’noi Trudovoi Deyatel’nosti Grazhdan SSSR, 1987). This means that anything outside the formal curriculum was deemed contrary to the public interest. This restriction makes visible the internal contradictions of the law: while allowing market relations in education,
the government constrained their content, reserving the prerogative right to determine what to teach for itself.

Chapter Conclusions

Soviet education is widely recognized as the ultimate system serving the public good\textsuperscript{82}. Indeed, since its earliest inception it has steadfastly promoted collectivist and egalitarian values as a counterweight to the capitalist values of the old imperial government and the West. The proletarian revolution brought with it the promise of a new society, free from elitism, careerism, competition, and individualism. Education played a pivotal role in this communist utopia. In order to create a “new Soviet man” for the new society, it was deemed essential to make education accessible to the masses, as well as to ensure its uniformity. As a result, in early post-revolutionary years, the process of nationalisation, which had begun in tsarist times, reached its apotheosis: the state claimed responsibility for every citizen from an early age. Imbued with the communist rhetoric of ‘the common’, education policy left little, if any, room for private initiative.

However, such a generalised picture of Soviet education is not accurate. The seventy-four years of Soviet education were characterised by several ideological shifts, which corresponded to the changing views of an ideal society. As noted by Kulikin et al. (2015, p. 11), already “in the 1950s and 1960s, the state utopia of creating the future person and society was privatised, and the state was no longer perceived as an absolute monopolist who could be entrusted with such work”. Some of the shifts that emerged in the late socialist system meant a revival of imperial values, while others gave rise to institutions and practices that continue to exist to the present day.

Private tutoring is just one of many examples of things unimaginable on paper yet hardly surprising for many Soviet people (cf. Yurchak, 2013). Being in a legal limbo, it constituted a private sphere that escaped direct state control. In this respect, an analysis of this practice allows for a fresh look at Soviet education policy, its tensions and internal shifts, fundamental values and their gradual erosion.

In short, it can be said that certain problematisations—such as curriculum unification versus differentiation, admission to higher education, the pursuit

\textsuperscript{82} See, for example, the introductory chapter of Chankseliani and Silova (2018) on post-socialist transformations in education. Comparing the purposes of education and the role of the state in accomplishing them in Soviet and post-Soviet contexts, Chankseliani and Silova conclude that, whereas in the Soviet Union education was a state responsibility, in post-socialist societies, education is not accountable to the state, but to stakeholders. This transformation, they argue, leads to a redefinition of education from a public good to a private good (p. 11). However, this understanding of the public good does not take into account the paradoxes, tensions, and contradictions inherent in the very notion of ‘public good’. Ultimately, the question is what constitutes the public good in the context of a totalitarian regime.
of individual privilege in the form of institutional merit, tutor competence, and profit-making versus public good—were inherited from imperial times. Yet, compared with the nineteenth century, when these questions were discussed mainly in a nationalist style, in Soviet Russia the bulk of public discourse evolved around the core communist values of equality and solidarity.

In authoritative discourse, the question of social justice was clearly linked to the question of curriculum uniformity. The communist project imagined a mass school with a uniform curriculum as a weapon against inequality and social exclusion. However, the actual provision of education was not always in line with these ideals. This is evident in the debate about the urban-rural gap, which indicates that children from rural areas did not have the same educational opportunities as their counterparts in the urban centres. This gap was said to be widening due to the lack of private tutors, preparatory courses, and other supplementary educational activities in rural areas. Neither were the needs of schoolchildren met by a rigid formal curriculum, the main object of which was the ‘average’ student, rather than those performing well above or below the norm. In other words, it was said that the uniform curriculum disregarded the needs of certain categories of children, pushing them to seek help or additional intellectual challenges in private tutoring.

In general, under Khrushchev’s thaw, education policy was fraught with a tension between uniformity and “latent diversity” (Kulikin et al., 2015). With increasing international competition sparked by the successful launch of Sputnik in 1957, the desire to produce highly skilled workers and dedicated intellectuals paved the way for the creation of new types of schools for academically gifted students. Promoting a spirit of competition rather than solidarity, critical thinking rather than “uniformity of thought”, and excellence rather than ‘average’ (see e.g., Dunstan, 1978), these schools differed from ordinary ones in terms of curriculum and pedagogy. This can be interpreted as evidence of the erosion of communist values and the collectivist orientation of Soviet education. In fact, the establishment of specialised schools enabled a production of ‘distinction’ (Bourdieu, 1986); these schools gave the children of officials and white-collar workers privileged access to better quality education. This inevitably led to the exclusion of certain social groups and new tensions between the masses, intelligentsia, and officials. Whilst in authoritative discourse, the notions of differentiation and excellence were reconciled with those of fairness and equality, in public discourse specialised schools were discussed as organised forms of tutoring for a selected few. Competitive enrolment in these schools could not but limit equality of opportunity and create a new target group for tutoring services, namely preschool children.

Symptomatically, although tutors were often expected to solve educational problems that teachers, parents, and students encountered, private tutoring was rarely discussed as an educational practice. In most cases, questions
relating to its pedagogy were explicitly avoided\(^83\). Instead, much of the public debate revolved around the ideological compatibility of teaching “the reason-able, the good and the eternal” on the one hand and the search for profit on the other. According to some commentators, in the mid-1970s, a private tutor became “a sign of the times” (znamienie vremeni), someone who parents talked about openly and proudly (Vasiltsova, 1975). This change in attitudes towards commercial educational services was interpreted as an erosion of the basic moral and political convictions of Soviet people.

The burgeoning development of tutoring services across the Soviet Union did not go unnoticed by the authorities. However, in a context where private enterprise was still ideologically unacceptable, imposing regulations (except for a total ban) on private tutoring would have meant recognizing its existence and thereby also acknowledging the government’s inability to provide for the needs and desires of every citizen. Hence, the government adopted what Lee et al. (2010) calls the “causal treatment approach”; that is, rather than banning or regulating “underground” education\(^84\), the main reform effort was put on reducing the demand for it. As a result, public education incorporated some features of private tutoring, including individualisation and public forms of preparation for entrance examinations.

By contrast, during perestroika the government adopted another approach to private tutoring. This time, it was not treated as a symptom of other problems, but as a solution to economic concerns. The Law on Individual Enterprise was enacted to bring the booming shadow economy under control and to encourage the development of certain private services. Naturally, the legalisation of tutoring, along with other commercial activities, reflected a fundamental change in the official view of the compatibility of private enterprise with the idea of education as a common good. At the same time, the way in which the law regulated private tutoring reveals the contradictions between economy and ideology: by limiting tutoring services to the formal curriculum, the government set clear boundaries on what could be taught outside public institutions. Importantly, whereas the public emphasized the role of private tutoring in exacerbating different types of inequalities, the Law on Individual Enterprise is silent on the issue. Or rather, as the following description of the basic principles of the law illustrates, the concepts of equality and social justice were adapted to the new political and economic context:

Во-первых, предусмотрено, что государство при регулировании индивидуальной трудовой деятельности обеспечивает ее использование в

First, it is stipulated that the state, when regulating individual enterprise, ensures that it is used in the public interest. … Second, a provision is made for

---

\(^83\) Often, the commenters openly admit that they do not intend to discuss “purely pedagogical issues” of private tutoring. See, for example, quotations from Rutgaizer (1981) and Ilyin (1978) in this chapter.

\(^84\) By analogy with underground economy.
... Во-вторых, предусматривается снятие всех необоснованных ограничений на занятие теми видами индивидуальной трудовой деятельности, которые являются полезными для общества, способствуют более полному удовлетворению потребностей населения в товах и услугах. В-третьих, развитие индивидуальной трудовой деятельности регулируется таким образом, чтобы доходы от этой деятельности соответствовали затратам личного труда граждан по принципу социальной справедливости. (Verkhovnyi Sovet SSSR, 1986, pp. 321–322)

This quotation shows that, translated into economic terms, social justice meant equal opportunity to engage in commercial activity and fair (i.e., progressive) taxation. It also shows that the legislation of some forms of private enterprise was justified by appeals to the public interest. However, when it came to educational services, these interests were again related to the uniformity of curricula. In other words, while encouraging the increasing differentiation of curricula within the public system, the government could not allow private tutoring to deviate from public education. These measures enabled the authorities to claim that the law was consistent with the socialist system of values even though the former ideological framework of education policy was considerably modified.
9. Neoliberal Modernisation of Public Education in Post-Soviet Russia: A Farewell to Private Tutoring?

This chapter examines the formation of education policy in Russia in the early 2000s. More precisely, it describes three reform initiatives launched by the government to modernise the content, structure, and financing mechanisms of public education. What makes the analysis of this reform package relevant for this dissertation is the fact that private tutoring constituted a significant part of its justification rhetoric. In this respect, the reforms can be seen as an indirect attempt to eradicate, or at least prevent, the undesirable effects of private tutoring.

The first part of the chapter examines how three main reform initiatives—standardised testing, the twelve-year school and per-capita funding for higher education—were presented and legitimised in policy documents, official statements, and interviews. More specifically, it looks at how policy makers, both international and domestic, constructed, presented, and naturalised the problems to be addressed. Particular attention is paid to references to private tutoring and their role in shaping policy. In order to place the dominant problematisation in a wider context, I also provide a concise overview of how similar questions were conceived and dealt with in Imperial and Soviet Russia. In the second part of the chapter, I analyse how the proposed reforms were opposed and challenged in the public debate. By comparing and contrasting different problematisations both diachronically and synchronically, the chapter sheds light on alternative problematisations and possible policy silences.

Empirical Sources
The chapter draws on three types of empirical sources covering the period from 1999 to 2003:

1. Policy documents, transcripts of parliamentary hearings in the State Duma, and interviews with politicians in which they present and legitimise education reforms. The transcripts were obtained from the website of the State Duma (http://cir.duma.gov.ru/duma) through digital searches with the Russian equivalents to ‘tutor’ and ‘tutoring’ (repetitor,
repetitorstvo). Interviews with politicians and official statements were collected from the newspaper articles described in paragraph 3 below.

2. Transcripts of roundtable meetings, public speeches and statements given by the opponents. Most of them come from the collection of speeches, reports and articles titled Education That We May Lose (Obrazovanie, kotoroe my mozhem poteryat’), edited by Viktor Sadovnichy (2003a), rector of the Lomonosov Moscow State University. The rest comes from the journal Russian Education and Society, which publishes materials selected from Russian periodicals, newspapers, reports, and academic papers translated into English. My search for publications between 1999 and 2003 containing the word repetitor* resulted in 34 articles from which I selected 19 based on their relevance for this chapter.

3. National media coverage of reforms. In selecting sources in this category, I sought to include both liberal and pro-governmental media outlets. With this in mind, I collected and analysed materials published in the socio-political newspaper Novaya Gazeta (New Gazette) known for its opposition agenda; the financial resource Kommersant (The Businessman) devoted mainly to politics and economics; Rossiiskaya gazeta (Russian Gazette), an official governmental organ that publishes policy documents, statements, and government announcements; and the tabloid Trud (Labour). A keyword search on repetitor* in each of these publications, restricted to the period 1999 to 2003, yielded 48 articles (see Table 10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Number of collected articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kommersant (The Businessman)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novaya gazeta (New Gazette)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trud (Labour)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossiiskaya gazeta (Russian Gazette)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This initial dataset was then supplemented by the digest Society and Education Reform (Obshchestvo i reforma obrazovaniya), edited by Anatoly Pinsky (2000a), advisor to the Minister of Education. From this digest I selected 14 articles in which the word repetitor is mentioned. Additional three articles were taken from another collection Liberal Idea and Educational Practice (Liberal’naya ideya i praktiki obrazovaniya), comprising Pinsky’s (2007b) own writings on education.

As noted in chapter 4, the collected empirical sources, both formal and informal, contain more than one problematisation, which sometimes compete with and even contradict each other. For the purposes of this chapter, I focused primarily on those related to private tutoring, and concentrated on recurring
themes. Thus, the analysis presented below illuminates only part of the broader debate on the concept of modernisation of Russian education.

Before proceeding with the analysis, it is necessary to consider the context in which the reforms in question were developed. In the next section I discuss why, despite the ideological shift that accompanied the transition from a planned to a market economy, and despite the growing acceptance of commercial education services in late Soviet period, the word ‘private’ was still conspicuous by its absence from the policy discourse of the early 1990s.

Found in Transition: Non-State Education in the Post-Socialist Society

The last decades of Soviet rule created favourable conditions under which private tutoring grew to be a legitimate complement to public education (chapter 8). This is not to say that ‘private’ in education became ideologically normalised. Although official attitudes to profit-making in education appeared to change during perestroika, the existing policy framework did not allow either private schools or home-schooling. Indeed, a 1988 Law on Cooperatives (O Kooperatsii v SSSR, 1988) made it legal for individuals to establish private enterprises. However, cooperatives could not run schools. What they could establish, though, were so-called tutor cooperatives (repetitorskie kooperativy) which, unlike public schools, were not authorised to issue school leaving certificates (Zhukov, 1990) and, thus, could not compete on equal footing with state schools.

In 1990, the educational periodical Uchitelskaya Gazeta (Teacher’s Gazette) published an article School Under House Arrest, or the Light and Shadow of Shadow Pedagogy (Shkola pod domashnim arestom, ili Svet i teni tenevoy pedagogiki), in which Vladimir Zhukov, Doctor of educational sciences, defended the right of cooperatives to establish schools. He explained that the cooperative school would not compete with public education, but only “correct its deficiencies, to close the gap between the level of training of a school graduate and a full-fledged university entrant” (Zhukov, 1990). He added that “in the conditions of total nationalisation of social structures”, such schools, along with individual tutoring, could form the “embryo of an alternative school”. Just like alternative schools, Zhukov argued, private tutoring is based on an individual approach, is essentially outcome-oriented and gives students and parents the opportunity to have a more decisive influence on the educational process.

Looking ahead, it can be noted that many of the features of private tutoring and “alternative” schools listed by Zhukov (school choice, individualisation, and orientation towards pre-set outcomes) became parts of public education policy in the post-Soviet period.
The emergence of more or less organised private forms of education in the late 1980s and early 1990s was consistent with the general spirit of education policy at the time. This becomes apparent in the reform projects drafted by Eduard Dneprov, the Minister of Education in 1990-1992, who argued that to be able to develop and improve public education “the state must create a competitor for itself” (Dneprov, 2006, p. 100). Accordingly, he and his associates advocated the decentralisation and denationalisation of education. In their vision, non-state (негосударственное) education would become an “innovative engine” and “organic complement” to public education (Dneprov, 2006, p. 59).

The use of the term ‘non-state’ is not coincidental. Aware of the ideological hostility towards anything ‘private’, Dneprov deliberately avoided the very word when drafting the new Law on Education:

С самого начала Министерство образования России взяло целенаправленный курс на развитие негосударственного сектора образования. Именно негосударственное, а не частное образование. Мы должны были щадить нашу социальную психологию, наше общественное сознание... У нас на слово «частное» постоянно дикая аллергия, поэтому я никогда, ни разу, ни в одном выступлении, ни в одной статье его не упоминал. (Dneprov, 1992/2006, p. 100)

From the very beginning, the Russian Ministry of Education has been committed to the development of the non-state education sector. Just so, non-state, not private education. We had to spare our social psychology, our social conscience... We have a permanent allergy to the word “private”, so I have never, not once, not in any speech, not in any article, mentioned it.

Besides being ideologically more neutral, the term ‘non-state’ was also considered broader than ‘private’. According to Dneprov (2006, p. 196), it could refer both to private (частное) educational institutions and those run by various public (общественное) organisations and enterprises.

Although Dneprov’s policy was met with strong resistance, notably among conservatives, his Law on Education (Об образовании, 1992) was passed in 1992. In essence, the law marked a revival of private or, more accurately, non-state education in Russia. Among other things, it enshrined the right of the individual to receive education suited to his or her needs and capabilities in institutional settings, at home, through self-education, or a combination of these forms. In addition, public institutions were entitled to offer paid educational services, including private tutoring (репетиторство), advanced classes

86 It is worth noting that in Russia, ‘family education’ or ‘home education’ is not equivalent to parent-led education. Although it takes place at home, external teachers and private tutors, or both, are often involved.

87 In public discourse, these services were often compared with legitimised forms of private tutoring (репетиторство в законе) (see e.g., “Все Нужные Для Жизни Знания Человек Плучает в Кассе”, 2003).
for gifted students and other fee-based programmes not provided for by the federal educational standard (Article 46). The law also established that *individual* educational activity was to be regarded as an entrepreneurial and could be carried out only after registration with the tax authorities (Article 48). By encouraging alternative pathways of acquiring knowledge and welcoming commercial activities into the public system, the law removed the ideological constraints inherent in the Soviet era, and further scaled back the state’s responsibilities in the field of education.

Apart from the adoption of a new education law immediately after the collapse of the Soviet Union, education did not receive much political attention until the turn of the millennium. A new wave of public debate about education in general, and private tutoring in particular, coincided perfectly with another period of intense policy change, which Russian education entered in the early 2000s. Before turning to these reforms, I first discuss the role of international bodies in constructing policy problems and place these problems in their historical context.

**International Agencies and the Co-Construction of Policy Problems**

The turbulent early 1990s gave way to an eight-year period of stagnation, when the government paid little attention to education. This period is often referred to as the “policy of no policy” (Froumin & Remorenko, 2020). While Russian officials were dealing with other problems encountered in the transition from socialism to a market economy, international organisations raised concerns about the state of general education in Russia, which was said to be a “ritual rudiment from Soviet times” (Bakker, 2012). The authorities were criticized for failing to produce reliable state-wide statistics that could support democratic quality control, applied research and evidence-based decision-making (OECD, 1998; The World Bank, 1995). In particular, the review by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) pointed at serious deficiencies in the quality of assessment tools and selection mechanisms for higher education (OECD, 1998, pp. 82–89). It was alleged that poor examination consistency between school-leaving and university entrance examinations could lead to a “high degree of variation in students’ preparation” across the country, jeopardising equality of access to higher education (p. 60-61).

To prevent these unwanted consequences, international agencies suggested adapting Russian education to the needs of the emerging market by developing a unified testing tool for selecting school graduates for post-secondary studies across the whole country (OECD, 1998). Furthermore, to achieve greater coherence in the system, the government had to move from vertical to horizontal
“curricular authority” by setting state educational standards and developing mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating their implementation (The World Bank, 1995). In addition, to improve the financial situation of public institutions in a protracted crisis, the World Bank suggested that former socialist countries could consider introducing tuition fees and incentives for market-based instruments in higher education (Berryman, 2000). Together, these measures were thought to reduce the financial burden on the state, ensure efficiency, and improve the overall quality of higher education in the context of the macroeconomic downturn.

In other words, the ‘problems’ to be solved were already pre-constructed by international organisations. What the Russian government had to do was to find and, perhaps more importantly, justify ways of solving them for a domestic audience. As shown below, the widespread practice of pre-university tutoring provided an important rationale for making each of the proposed reforms seem desirable and justifiable.

The Admissions Market in “Shadow Russia”: A Historical Perspective

Many of the problems pointed out by international experts were clearly related to existing assessment practices, and especially to the examinations used in the transition from secondary to post-secondary education. As illustrated in the previous chapters, the question of consistency between these levels of education is a recurring one and has been at stake in Russia since the nineteenth century (see chapter 7). At that time, secondary school principals were concerned that “universities, not gymnasia, had the right to decide who counted as qualified for higher studies” (Zhurnal MNP, 1868, p. 213), since each higher education institution had its own admission requirements (p. 237). To combat this, in 1873 the government introduced a nationwide examination, the so-called maturity examination, which was supposed to unify the system and eliminate “curricular anarchy and abdication to ‘local’ needs” (Alston, 1969, p. 82). A certificate of maturity received from a gymnasium was also intended to serve as the main selection tool for higher education.

With the arrival of the Bolsheviks, school grades and examinations were abolished, and university admission became non-competitive (Narkompros, 1918/1974b). However, at the end of the 1950s, the question of curricular gap was re-emphasized. In the public debate, private tutoring was discussed as a rather common yet undesirable link between schools and higher education institutions, exacerbating inequalities (see chapter 8). In order to break this link, it was suggested, among other things, that university admission should be based on the results of school leaving examinations (e.g., Ilyin, 1978).
In the 1990s, tutoring for university admission took even more “perverted”\textsuperscript{88} forms, increasingly becoming a hidden form of corruption—a phenomenon widely discussed in the press (see e.g., Ivanova, 2001; Ivanyushchenkova & Pigareva, 1998; Sergeev, 2000; “Uchen’e – Svet, Yesli Deneg – t’ma”, 2001; “VUZ: Vsem Vse Uzhe Zaplachenos,” 2000; “Vzyatki v Vuzakh Berut i Naturoy”, 2000). In their sociological study \textit{Shadow Russia (Tenevaya Rossiya)}, Klyamkin and Timofeev (2000) argue that by the end of the 1990s higher education had a reputation of “a grandiose shadow market” (p. 144). Bribes, extortions and clientelism—all disguised as tutoring—were among the common characteristics of the so-called “the admissions market” (\textit{rynok zakhislenii}). One of the respondents described this market as follows:

Вообще, распространенное мнение, что вступительные экзамены – самая коррумпированная сторона вузовской жизни, абсолютно верно. Чаше всего теневые отношения здесь выражаются в том же репетиторстве. Люди, работающие в приемных комиссиях или как-то связанные с приемными комиссиями, берут себе учеников-абитуриентов. Цена за такие занятия, конечно, в два раза выше, чем просто за занятия по предмету. (Klyamkin & Timofeev, 2000, p. 554)

Another respondent noted that in many cases it was “almost impossible to determine where normal tutoring ends and corruption begins” (Klyamkin & Timofeev, 2000, p. 561).

Below, I discuss how the issue of ‘admissions market’ was addressed in the authoritative discourse.

\textbf{Policy Visions: “Light Without Shadow”}

Inequalities and corruption associated with private tutoring did not go unnoticed by the authorities. At a meeting of the State Duma, Oleg Smolin, deputy chairman of the Committee on Education and Science, discussing a proposal to grant non-competitive admission to certain categories of school graduates, pointed out:

В последние годы поступление в вуз стало почти невозможное без... In recent years, getting into higher education has become almost impossible

\textsuperscript{88} Among other “perversions”, Education Minister Vladimir Filippov mentioned preschool tutoring for admission to prestigious schools (“Skol’ko Deneg Nuzhno Na Reformu, Podschitat’ Nel’zya,” 2001).
Arguing that education in Russia was one of the most corrupt areas in need of a thorough overhaul, in 2000 the Russian government embarked on a wide-ranging modernisation reform. The main reform ideas were outlined in several policy documents, presented in Table 11 below.

Table 11. *Policy documents presenting the main reform ideas.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Main Directions of the Socio-Economic Policy of the Russian Government for the Long Term(^{89}) (Center for Strategic Research, 2000).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Concept of Modernisation of Russian Education for the Period until 2010 (MO, 2002a).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In short, these documents identified socio-economic growth, innovation, and the global competitiveness of the Russian economy as the main objectives of education development (Gounko & Smale, 2007; Suominen et al., 2018). Correspondingly, the proposed changes envisaged greater use of market mechanisms for the governance of education.

The reform package was developed through close cooperation between the Ministry of Education, led by Vladimir Filippov, the Ministry of Economic Development, led by Herman Gref, and the Higher School of Economics (HSE), led by Yaroslav Kuzminov. Among reform developers was also the former Minister of Education Eduard Dneprov\(^{90}\). In their vision, the modernisation of Russian education had to be based on three “pillars” (Gounko & Smale, 2007), including: (1) standardisation of the final attestation through the

---

89 Also known as *Strategy 2010.*

90 For an analysis of policy actors and their role in the development of the USE, see Zaytsev et al. (2020).
Unified State Examination (USE), (2) expansion of general education from eleven to twelve years, and (3) introduction of state vouchers, known by the acronym GIFO\textsuperscript{91}, to finance higher education.

It is worth mentioning that the last two reform initiatives remained at the experimental level\textsuperscript{92}, while the USE was signed into law in 2009 after several years of pilot-testing. Nevertheless, as this chapter demonstrates, examining the ways they were presented to the public provides valuable insight into the role of private tutoring in shaping public education policy.

In the next three sections I outline the main ideas behind the proposed reforms and show how each was anchored in calls to get rid of pre-entry tutoring.

The USE as a Panacea for Persistent Educational ‘Ills’

A Fair and Transparent Assessment tool

The USE is arguably the most profound education reform undertaken in post-Soviet Russia. It was first introduced in 2001 on an experimental basis in several regions and then promulgated as law in 2009. In short, the USE is a standardised and centrally administrated written achievement test that serves as the unified tool for final certification and selection for higher education. It was designed to replace the former system of separate graduation and entrance examinations, which, it was argued, had exhausted the credibility of both the schools and the universities. The following excerpt from \textit{Novaya Gazeta} is illustrative of this point:

Важнейшая цель такой замены — достижение максимальной объективности в оценке знаний выпускников. Сколько слез, обид, разочарований предстоит пережить вчерашнему школьнику, чтобы поступить в вуз, а сколько за это время умирает нервных клеток у его родителей, вынужденных платить немыслимые суммы денег репетиторам! Субъективность оценки знаний ребенка является главным бичом современной системы образования. (Syuzhety, 2001а)

This passage sums up quite clearly the essence of the problems associated with the old exam system, which the reform was supposed to solve. The single

\textsuperscript{91} GIFO states for \textit{Gosudarstvennoe Individual’noe Finansovoe Obyazatel’stvо}, that is, State Individual Financial Obligation.

\textsuperscript{92} GIFO was introduced in a limited number of regions and lasted for only three years.
exam was supposed to simplify the transition from school to university, ease
the psychological burden on graduates and applicants, make assessment more
transparent, and, at the same time, remove the need for different forms of pre-
entry tutoring, both private and public.

In the same way—and in much the same words—representatives of the
Ministry of Education lobbied for the USE. Consider, for example, the fol-
lowing excerpt from a roundtable discussion between Igor Borodulin, rector
of a Moscow university, and Vladimir Shadrikov, Deputy Minister of Educa-
tion. Reflecting on the shortcomings of the existing system of separate exam-
inations, Borodulin said:

What has happened is that tutoring and precollegiate training have, so to speak,
“squeezed” secondary-school graduates into the range of average values,
which, by the way, are quite sufficient for being admitted to a higher technical
school … Hence, we have essentially lost the ability to select students on the
basis of how the youngsters did in school: they come to us fully drilled in the
questions on the examinations. … The fact is that competition is not operating.
The tutoring services and all the other methods of precollegiate training have
completely eliminated it. It is possible now to abandon competitive exams93.
(Borodulin, as cited in “Ensuring the Quality of Higher Education: Russia’s
Experience in the International Context,” 2003, pp. 77–78)

Here, Borodulin claims that at the time it was no longer possible for universi-
ties to select students on the basis of their school performance, as most of them
were passing through the hands of tutors or other pre-entry services anyway.
Hence, he went on to say, the school certificate had virtually lost its meaning,
just as competitive examinations had lost their original essence. Replying to
him, Shadrikov noted that private tutoring is an “organic consequence of any
competitive system of selection” and will exist “as long as the system exists”.
Consequently, he assumed that in order to get rid of tutoring “the whole se-
lection procedure has to be changed” (“Ensuring the Quality of Higher Edu-

It is noteworthy that, in advocating this agenda, policy makers relied heav-
ily on the juxtaposition of present and future, lies and truth, and shadow and
light. As might be expected, the USE was associated in authoritative discourse
with the future, truth, and light, whereas the existing system was described as
“a shadow market” and “a system of lies”. For example, in an article titled
Education: Light Without Shadow, Yevgeny Bunimovich, Moscow City
Duma deputy, claimed:

Самое главное, что осталось от прежней системы образования, – это
ложь. То, что деньги уходят в тень, это большая ложь, которая
The most important thing that remains of the previous education system is lies. That the money is going into the shadows is a big lie that begins… with

93 Translation by M.E. Sharpe.
In contrast to the previous system, the USE was described as “a single tool that can measure everyone” (Klyachko, in “Pesnya pro Testy”, 2000) and thus can “guarantee equal weighting of school grades” (Bolotov, in Ekho Moskvy, 2001). Furthermore, as a more objective and fairer way of evaluating graduates’ knowledge and skills, the USE was expected to improve the quality of school education (Gurova et al., 2015; Minina, 2017; Suominen et al., 2018). Indeed, Filippov asserted that the notion of quality was directly related to evaluation and certification systems (Safronov, 2000, p. 69). He argued that a standardised, written, centrally administrated and independently assessed test would improve the quality of education, making the system less formal, more transparent, and more democratic (p. 70). Endorsing this view, Kuzminov pointed out that ultimately the USE would “reveal the truth about our education” (Startsev, 2000, p. 44).

**A Remedy for Corruption**

In addition to the educational benefits, there was also a moral justification for the changes to come. While none of the reform drafters believed that the USE would completely eradicate private tutoring, they hoped that it would at least remove “the shadow base” (tenevaya baza) of the education market (“Suuzhety”, 2001b; see also “Odnako, Do EGE Na Motorke Yekhat’ Nado!”, 2001). As Alexander Kiselev, First Deputy Minister of Education, noted, the uniform requirements would liberate university faculty working as tutors or participating in preparatory courses from moral dilemmas:

94 Tatiana Klyachko was vice-rector of HSE and one of the reform supporters. Viktor Bolotov, Deputy Education Minister, is known as “the father of the USE”.
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It is true that a unified exam will not put an end to bribery or to the practice of tutoring. If I am preparing for a unified exam based on unified requirements, that is one thing. It is quite another thing when I am working in a department and supervising a young person who will be coming to me to take his entrance exam. You have to agree that the moral responsibility is quite different.\(^{95}\) (Kiselev, 2003)

Similarly, other supporters of the reform asserted that once the examination requirements become the same for all, the need for expensive preparatory courses and tutoring classes with teachers of the post-secondary institution they wish to enrol in would disappear by itself. Simply put, parents would no longer have to pay for tutors, who “sell” not knowledge but participation in the admission process (“Pesnya pro Testy”, 2000). Kuzminov compared this form of tutoring to “bribes in instalments” (\(vzyatka v rassrochku\)) and expressed a strong belief that after the introduction of the USE it will “die out as such” (Startsev, 2000, p. 45). In essence, the USE would “eliminate the main niche of tutors” or at least make their bread “less nutritious” (Granik, 2001).

A Bridge over the Urban-Rural Gap

Crucially, the introduction of the USE was accompanied by a promise to bridge the urban-rural gap. Indeed, the USE-based admission system does allow simultaneous application to several institutions and for several programmes. This, it was thought, would significantly reduce the costs of application for students from rural and remote areas, increasing their chances of admission to the best universities in the country. Minister Filippov explained this point as follows:

Цель единого государственного экзамена — уравнять в шансах на поступление в лучшие вузы страны всех выпускников школ, независимо от их материального положения и места жительства. Не секрет, что абитуриент из отдаленных районов не едет сдавать вступительные экзамены в центр страны. Во-первых, у него часто нет денег даже на билет. А во-вторых, он знает, что при каждом престижном вузе есть армия репетиторов и подготовительные курсы, которые для него недоступны. (Filippov, in “Syuzhety”, 2001b)

The aim of the Unified State Exam is to level the playing field for all school graduates, regardless of their financial situation and place of residence, allowing them to get into the best universities in the country. It is no secret that applicants from remote areas do not travel to the capitals to take entrance examinations. First, they often have no money for a ticket. And second, they know that every prestigious university has an army of tutors and preparatory courses which are out of their reach.

In this passage the Minster draws particular attention to the uneven distribution of economic resources and educational opportunities between

\(^{95}\) Translation by M. E. Sharpe.
metropolitan centres and remote rural areas. Indeed, disparities between urban and rural schools, both in quality and quantity, have long been recognized as a policy problem (see chapter 8). Already in the Soviet period, the lack of private tutoring and preparatory courses in rural areas was seen as a factor deepening the urban-rural gap. Thus, from this perspective, levelling this type of inequality by means of the USE would also solve one of the perennial policy problems.

Extended Schooling as a Substitute for Private Tutoring

Apart from the standardisation of the curriculum and final examinations, the modernisation concept envisaged the transition from an eleven- to a twelve-years model of general education. According to the proposal, such restructuring was necessary for a number of reasons: it would (1) bring the Russian system in line with international standards, (2) improve the quality of general education, and (3) optimise the study load and thereby safeguard children’s health (“Draft Conception of the Structure and Content of General Secondary Education (in the Twelve-Year School),” 2001).

In an interview with Rossiiskaya Gazeta, Filippov explained that the idea was to make the first ten years compulsory for all, while the last two would offer specialised training for students wishing to enrol in higher education (Molodtsova, 2000). Adoption of this model, according to the minister, would create a free alternative to private tutoring, preparatory courses, and fee-based specialised school classes (Filippov, 2001; Molodtsa, 2001b). Put differently, it was assumed that extended schooling would bridge the gap between secondary and higher education, eliminating the demand for various intermediaries.

When advocating for a twelve-year school, reformers pointed to the democratising and modernising ideas of the 1992 Law on Education, noting that these had never been fully achieved. On the contrary, in the first post-Soviet decade, conservative tendencies based on outdated pedagogy and content continued to prevail (MO, 2002b). As Kuzminov put it, general education was still dominated by “false universalism”; that is, despite the declared individualisation, the Russian school was still stuck with the Soviet principle of ‘one size fits all’ (Matskyavichene, 2001). A twelve-year school could rectify this last vestige of the Soviet school by offering content adapted to the interests of different groups of students and by giving them a better chance to prepare for higher education.

---

96 This can be compared to what Soja (2010) calls “spatial justice” (see chapter 10).
Interestingly, while conservatives saw the loss of curriculum uniformity as the main reason for the growth of the tutoring industry in post-Soviet Russia (see e.g., Molodtsova, 2001a; “Mozhno Li Postupit’ v Vuz Bez Repetitora,” 1996), Kuzminov and his colleagues claimed that a lack of specialist knowledge of certain subjects was the reason why parents felt the need to buy additional lessons in the form of private tutoring and preparatory courses (Matskyavichene, 2001; see also Pinsky, 2007a).

The idea of a twelve-year school apparently played an important role in politicians’ vision of education and their fight against private tutoring. When asked about the consequences of not restructuring the school, Filippov responded that, without specialised training at the upper secondary level “the lie will continue to flourish” and “parents will again be forced to invite tutors, pay bribes and use connections” to ensure their children get into higher education (Molodtsova, 2000).

State Vouchers and Tuition Fees: A Single Solution to Economic and Moral Problems

Last but not least, the USE, it was argued, was supposed to lay the foundation for per-capita funding of higher education. The new principle of funding through GIFO was proposed by experts from the HSE, who suggested taking the USE scores into account to determine the value of the state voucher. That is, students with high scores would receive higher education for free, at the expense of the state; students with average scores would get partial state support, and students with low scores would have to pay tuition out of their own pockets. When enrolling students, universities would automatically receive from the state an amount corresponding to the applicant’s voucher value. This funding scheme would ideally encourage higher education institutions to compete for high-performing students by developing new programmes and improving the quality of existing programmes (Molodtsova, 2000; Mukhtarova, 2002).

The introduction of state vouchers was in line with the recommendations of international organisations to adapt the Russian education system to a market economy. At first sight, it had nothing to do with private tutoring. However, it was precisely by appealing to tutoring that policy makers justified the necessity and relevance of joint public-private funding of higher education.

One of the recurring arguments in favour of the new funding scheme was that in post-Soviet Russia, commercial education services, including private

---

97 In 1995, Gennady Zyuganov, leader of the Communist Party, lamented that the liberal reforms of the early 1990s had brought differentiation, individualisation, and freedom of choice in Russian public schools. The variety of programs, syllabi, textbooks, and pedagogical approaches, he said, resulted in 95 percent of students having to hire private tutors for entrance examinations (Zyuganov, 1995).
tutoring, had already become the norm. Presenting the concept of modernisation, the Ministry of Education emphasized that in the 1990s such services gave a significant impetus for the development of education, expanding students’ opportunities to choose the level and type of education and attracting additional funds to educational institutions. The popularity of these services, the ministry argued, testified to people’s willingness to pay for education even in the difficult economic climate of the 1990s (MO, 2002b, p. 99).

At the same time, it has been stressed that alongside the positive effects associated with private investment in the public sector, there are also negative ones related primarily to the lack of adequate state policy on for-profit education services. Vladimir Putin (2001) was quite articulate on this point in his presidential address to the Federal Assembly in 2001. Advocating the need for more opportunities for market mechanisms to work in education, he argued that unregulated and non-transparent market creates the illusion of free schooling:

Официальная бесплатность образования при его фактической, но скрытой платности развращает и учеников, и преподавателей. Мы должны четко разграничивать сферы бесплатного образования, сделав доступ к нему справедливым и гарантированным, и – платного, дав ему адекватную правовую основу. (Putin, 2001)

An education system that remains officially free while being fee-paying in practice corrupts both pupils and teachers. We must clearly set out the limits for free education, ensure fair and guaranteed access to this education and also create an adequate legal foundation for fee-paying education.98

Along similar lines, Pinsky noted that parents were de facto already paying for higher education, but that market, he said, was “deformed by a huge shadow sector” occupied by tutors associated with admission offices (Moskovskie novosti, 2000, p. 48; see also Matskyavichene, 2001; Rubleva, 2000). Indeed, according to estimates, at the time parents were spending about a billion dollars a year on tutoring and pseudo-tutoring—an amount equal to the state budget of all higher education in the country. “Removing this shadow”, Pinsky claimed, was one of the main economic ideas behind the reform (Moskovskie novosti, 2000, p. 50). Filippov elaborated on this point:

Вся программа модернизации образования направлена в первую очередь на привлечение дополнительных средств в систему образования – и бюджетных, и с помощью легализации разных теневых потоков, например репетиторства, также внебюджетных средств. (Filippov, 2000)

The entire program of modernisation of education is primarily aimed at attracting additional funds to the education system—both budgetary and extra-budgetary, as well as through the legalisation of various shadow cash flows, such as private tutoring.

98 Translation from the official Kremlin website http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/transcripts/21216
Such rechanneling of private funds, the minister promised, would help to raise teachers’ salaries and restore the economic independence of public education institutions (“Skol’ko Deneg Nuzhno Na Reformu, Podsчитать’ Nel’zya”, 2001).

An equally important moral dilemma, which GIFO was supposed to address, was protecting students from the “double standard” of formally free education (Zubov, 2001). Pinsky explained:

School graduates and parents will understand that either you study well in school and get into the free quota of 25-30 percent, or you get a state subsidy and pay extra. ... And most importantly, everything will be fair. And this is not just an economic factor, but a moral [emphasis added] one.

Kuzminov drew on the same reasoning, arguing that the reform proposal was not based on economic rationality in the first place but aimed at “restoring public morality and social justice” (“Образование: Свет Без Тени”, 2000).

Finally, it was envisaged that, in conjunction with the USE, the GIFO would help to reduce inequalities between urban and rural students and thereby “protect the constitutionally proclaimed right of citizens to a decent education” (Filippov, 2000, as cited in Pinsky, 2000b, p. 37).

To summarise, just like other proposed reforms, the GIFO was presented as a single solution to several problems: not only would it make higher education funding mechanisms more transparent and fairer, but also eliminate corruption and social inequalities and contribute to improving the quality of higher education. The pro-government media enthusiastically touted the benefits of GIFO:

In this way several problems will be “killed”. One is widespread bribery among university teachers. Universities and institutes would be interested in attracting the best students, for which they would be guaranteed state funding. And the ranking of universities will make sense—the more high-performing students they enrol the more money they’ll get—everything is transparent. Not like now, when financing depends not on the quality of teaching, but on the rector’s connections.
However, as I show in the remainder of this chapter, the reform package faced serious public resistance. Opponents were particularly distrustful of the idea of solving moral, social, and educational problems through market mechanisms.

Challenging Reform Ideas: Alternative Problematisations

The proposed reform package envisaged radical changes in the content, structure, and financing principles of public education in Russia, revealing complex and sometimes contradictory relationships between economic, educational, moral, and social issues. Alongside the democratic intentions of the USE to ensure fair selection to higher education, the proposed funding formula implied a partial transition to fee-paying higher education. With the USE, the government promised to increase its role in education as a quality guarantor, whereas the GIFO envisioned a reduction in state involvement in funding higher education. It is not surprising, therefore, that the reforms provoked a public outcry and were widely covered in the media. As Dneprov noted, “never before had there been such an abundance of media appearances on educational matters as at that time” (Dneprov, 2011, p. 277).

Motivating the policy change, the authorities raised issues related to private tutoring in various ways. The most prominent of these was the problem of inequality and the moral and ethical aspects of pre-university tutoring. In essence, the reforms were presented as a campaign against corruption in the admissions market. Hence, anyone who dared to disagree with the proposed solutions could be accused of corruption. The following passage from Novaya Gazeta is one of many examples illustrating this view:

Как бы то ни было, не стоит ожидать, что ректоры в большинстве своем станут сторонниками реформы, не выгодной им в первую очередь экономически. Цена вопроса — более миллиарда долларов в год, оставляющая населением на переходе «школа — вуз». Это своеобразная дань, выплачиваемая родителями теневому образовательному капиталу за возможность дать своим детям якобы бесплатное высшее образование. (“В Edinom Stroyu Protiv Edinogo Ekzamen”, 2001)

In any case, we should not expect the majority of rectors to support a reform that does not benefit them economically in the first place. More than a billion dollars a year is at stake, the money spent by the population on the school-university transition. This is a kind of a tribute paid by parents to the shadow educational capital for the opportunity to give their children a supposedly free higher education.
Apart from the rectors, all those involved in preparatory courses or admission examinations, while criticising the forthcoming reforms, were branded as “the tutoring lobby” (see e.g., Mezentsev, 2001) with a vested interest in preserving “the proverbial billion left in the shadows” (“V Edinom Stroyu Protiv Edinogo Ekzamena”, 2001).

As one might guess, among the main opponents were university rectors and teachers as well as prominent figures in Russian science and culture. More than two hundred professors signed a collective letter to the government expressing deep concerns about the reform initiatives. While most of them agreed that education needed to be modernised and corruption eradicated, they questioned the neoliberal approach to solving educational, social, and moral problems, without taking into account the specifics, traditions, and conditions of Russian education (Sadovnichy, 2003c, p. 35).

In what follows I summarise the points made against the reforms. In so doing, I highlight alternative problematisations and policy silences as they appeared in the public debate.

The Risks of Quasi-Market Solutions

Among the most frequently voiced concerns about the proposed reforms, as already mentioned, was the suitability of quasi-market mechanisms for the governance of science and education. In this respect, the idea of introducing state vouchers was particularly criticised. As discussed above, apart from the purely economic objectives, the GIFO was promoted by its initiators as an indirect tool capable of improving the quality of higher education through institutional competition. Although similar financial schemes exist in other countries, in Russia the degree of state support for individual funding of higher education was linked to the USE scores. However, concerned about the appropriateness of such a solution to the financial and educational problems, critics argued that an outcome-based resource allocation would literally turn academic performance into a marketable commodity. They also questioned whether it was morally acceptable that graduates receive a market price and how this would affect their psychological wellbeing (Smertin, 2002).

Another contentious issue that was raised by both supporters and opponents was related to the risk of privatisation of higher education. Whilst supporters accused the rectors of a covert privatisation of “their” higher education institutions, opponents spoke of the USE and GIFO as instruments of the...
commodification and privatisation of education. Nobel laureate in physics Zhores Alferov together with Sadovnichy expressed fears that quasi-market mechanisms would “transform schools and universities from public institutions working in the interests of society and the state into business ventures that only care about maximizing their profits” (Alferov & Sadovnichy, 2003, p. 86). Developing this standpoint, Sadovnichy noted:

Но фундаментальная наука не может выступать как товар, не может подстраиваться под спрос на рынке. Абсурдно звучит вопрос: «Сколько стоит закон всемирного тяготения?». Можно ли представить астрономию «рыночную» и «нерыночную»? (Sadovnichy, 2003c, p. 38)

But fundamental science cannot serve as a commodity; it cannot adjust to market demand. The question ‘How much is the law of universal gravitation worth?’ sounds absurd. Is it possible to imagine “market-oriented” and “non-market-oriented” astronomy?

Joining other critics, Sadovnichy (2003c) voiced serious concerns that the USE-GIFO system would lead to a complete disappearance of free post-secondary education, without improving its quality or eliminating inequalities. What needed to be done, in his view, was to wage an “uncompromising fight against shadow higher education” (p. 36), by which he meant the black-market trade in university diplomas and academic degrees.

Yevgeny Yudin, pro-rector of Bauman Moscow State Technical University, made a similar point, arguing that the reforms would lead to the privatisation of higher education, rather than an end to corruption:

Авторы идеи введения единого экзамена основным аргументом в ее пользу считают прекращение мздоимства в вузах. Хотя лично я более всего склоняюсь к тому, что единый экзамен — это первый шаг к переходу обучения в вузах на коммерческую основу. (“Pesnya pro Testy”, 2000)

The authors of the idea of introducing a unified exam regard stopping bribery in higher education institutions as the main argument in its favour. Personally, I am more inclined to believe that a unified exam is the first step in the transition to a commercial basis of higher education.

According to a widely held view, instead of the promised improvements, the reforms would have the opposite effect. Parents of graduates, for example, were of the opinion that the GIFO would boost substandard higher education. Others argued that by allowing unqualified but well-off students to enter higher education for money, the government was unwittingly stimulating a

speaks of the paradoxical situation when a rector, instead of managing state property, acts as a “tsar, God and a military commander” within the walls of his or her university. According to the article, all this was accompanied by a blossoming of tutoring services, corruption, and parasitisation of the property of state universities by for-profit ones created with the active participation or acquiescence of the rectors.
further devaluation of grades, qualifications, and academic degrees, which would result in even greater unemployment (Novikov, 2001).

Similar doubts were raised in relation to secondary education. As an article in Novaya Gazeta asserted, without a significant increase in salaries, “the bulk of the teachers will not rise to a qualitatively new level” meaning that “the reform will become a potted plant in the offices of individual enthusiasts” (“Pedagogicheskaya Dilemma”, 2000). Rutkevich (2002) claimed that under conditions of severe underfunding and general poverty, further commercialisation of education was predictable. Contrary to the popular belief that the rise of tutoring and corruption in the 1990s was evidence of the population’s ability to pay for education, Rutkevich argued that these phenomena were caused by insufficient state financing of general education and, in particular, low salaries forcing teachers to provide for-fee services. That is why, in his opinion, the proposed reform, involving further cuts in public expenditure, would only exacerbate the crisis in Russian education.

Nor did opponents believe that the USE would eliminate unequal rights in education. More likely, they contended, the new kind of exam would give soil to new types of tutoring, rather than eradicating the phenomenon as such:

Tutors will be hired for the USE, just as they are now hired for preparation for university exams. Only the price of this examination will be higher, because too much depends on it, and it is only possible to retake the USE the following year, and for a fee. Naturally, the candidate who employs the best tutors will have the best results on the USE on average. I’m not talking about the possibilities of bribing commissions, using connections and so on, which people with high incomes and positions have today, and which, of course, they will not lose.

In the same vein, others suggested that the GIFO+USE scheme would expand the range of paid educational services in and out of school, further widening the gap between rich and poor: “Today tutors are only hired for those who want to go to university, but with the introduction of the USE, all school leavers will need tutoring” (Kuzin, 2001).
A Silenced Question of Privilege

As noted, the reform authors portrayed the USE as a transparent and objective means of identifying and awarding academic merit. It was hoped that it would create equal opportunities to gain valuable educational credentials for all school leavers, irrespective of their socio-economic background.

However, the opponents criticized the very idea of combining final and entrance exams, pointing out that it was based on the taken-for-granted assumption that everyone is interested in continuing education after graduation. Alexander Solzhenitsyn, for example, argued that secondary education itself should be full-fledged, so that one could find employment without higher education:

Уже то неправильно, что совмещаются эти совсем не обязательно совмещаемые вещи. Среднее образование должно быть настолько полным, чтобы человек мог без расчета на высшее прожить с поднятой головой. Оно должно быть полноценным, фундаментальным. (Solzhenitsyn, 2003, p. 181)

Others explained why, regardless of the form of examination, people wanted to get into university at any cost. As can be seen from the examples below, this desire was not always driven by a “thirst for knowledge”. Explaining why he or she signed a petition against the reform, one parent said:

Через несколько лет моя старшая дочь будет поступать в вуз. И неважно, будет ли экзамен в институте или в школе – к нему все равно придется готовиться с помощью тех же репетиторов. Даже если эти вопросы полностью отдать на откуп средним учебным заведениям, родителям не удастся избавиться от дополнительных расходов – просто они будут растянуты по времени на десять лет. «Тяга к знаниям» объясняется просто – высшее образование дает человеку больше перспектив в жизни. (Novikov, 2001)

In a few years, my eldest daughter will be going to university. It doesn’t matter whether it’s an exam at a university or a school—she will still have to prepare for it with the help of the same tutors. Even if examinations are left entirely to the mercy of secondary education institutions, parents will not be spared the extra costs; they will simply be stretched out over a period of ten years. The reason for this “thirst for knowledge” is simple—higher education gives a person more prospects in life.

The author of these lines suggests that people seek higher education not so much because of a desire to acquire in-depth knowledge in a particular field, but because of the individual benefits, tangible and intangible alike, that higher education entails. Consequently, changes in graduation and admission
procedures will not eliminate the reasons why parents enrol their children in private tutoring and various preparatory courses, regardless of the cost of these services (Novikov, 2001).

Further, it was argued that the USE and GIFO would only benefit the state and test developers, not ease the financial burden on parents’ shoulders:


This and other examples show that, from the parents’ point of view, private tutoring is seen as a necessary evil, which will continue to exist as long as people’s life chances depend on the value of their institutional merit.

It is also important to mention that in Russia, enrolling in higher education not only determines a person’s future career and wealth, but also makes it possible for male students to avoid or at least postpone compulsory military service\(^\text{101}\). This point was stressed by respondents to a sociological survey cited in Trud. One of them, a mother of a first-year student, said:

Сейчас без образования никак нельзя. Даже секретарем «без корочки» на работу не возьмут. Да и лучше в вуз, чем сразу в армию или без дела по городу шляться. (Baskakova, 2001)

These days you can’t get a job without [higher] education. You can’t even get a job as a secretary without a degree. And it’s better to go to university than to go straight into the army or hang around town without a job.

Another respondent, a deputy of the Moscow City Duma, commented: “Parents believe that it is better to pay for education than to give a bribe at the military enlistment office to get a deferment from military service” (Baskakova, 2001).

Thus, in the opinion of the public, there were some indications that the stakes involved in the USE are likely to increase the pressure on those who

\(^{101}\text{As noted in Chapter 7, the link between educational attainment and terms and conditions of military service was established as early as the 19th century. This was done primarily to raise the educational level of the population and to make public education more attractive than private alternatives.}\)
take it. Accordingly, many did not believe that once the exam was introduced, corruption and dubious tutoring practices would disappear as such. Rather, opponents thought that tutoring would change its vector (Matskyavichene, 2001) and test assignments would become a commodity on the shadow market (Nikonov, 2001). Moreover, as one university teacher suggested, “the semi-legal work of private tutors” will be replaced by “the illegal activities of dean’s officers and examiners” (“Pis’ma Vlasti”, 2000). In other words, corruption would continue to flourish within university walls, and access to and success in higher education would still correlate with parents’ ability to pay.

Standardisation as Curricular Shrinkage

As I detailed earlier in this chapter, the reform’s authors claimed that a written exam (as opposed to an oral one) and external grading (instead of internal) would guarantee an unbiased and fair selection of applicants. However, opponents questioned the capacity of a standardised test consisting mainly of multiple-choice questions to assess students’ creativity, higher-order thinking skills and other abilities valued in higher education (e.g., Kudryavtsev, 2003). One journalist compared the USE with a game of “tic-tac-toe”, the results of which depend more on luck than on the ability to think, reason and argue (“Dvoynoi Nalog s Detei”, 2000). Sadovnichy, for his part, maintained that unlike traditional competitive examinations, tests, however sophisticated, do not allow students to demonstrate their intellectual capacity:

В том-то и идея [традиционного] экзамена, что он позволяет увидеть, как молодой человек мыслит, тест же проверяет, способен ли ученик хранить в памяти большой объем зазубренной информации… (Sadovnichy, 2003b, p. 175)  

The idea behind the [traditional] exam is to see how a young person thinks, whereas a test checks whether the student is able to retain a large amount of rote information in memory…

The Russian Union of Rectors worried that while the GIFO would limit the economic autonomy of higher education institutions, the USE would narrow their ability to make independent decisions regarding the admission of applicants (Rossiiskii Soyuz Rektorov, 2002). They contended that “the search for talented young people cannot be limited to a single formalised form of knowledge testing” (Sadovnichy, 2003c, p. 33). This viewpoint was endorsed by Solzhenitsyn (2003, p. 182) who sharply condemned the idea that admission decision could be made “on the basis of some nameless piece of paper” containing only the USE scores.

It is worth clarifying that the concept of modernisation envisaged not only a standardisation of the final assessment, but also of the whole curriculum.

---
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The intention was to create a benchmark to which school curricula and students should conform. In short, the introduction of educational standards would allow the authorities to adjust the content to the predetermined goals—rather than the other way around—which would make the education system “more sensible” (Ivanyushchenkova, 2001). However, according to critics, this could lead to cuts in public spending on anything beyond the ‘minimum educational standard’:

Что в него [минимальный образовательный стандарт] входит, открыто не говорится. Но Всемирный банк, который и финансирует нашу реформу, в докладе “Россия: образование в переходный период” вполне конкретно формулирует достаточный, с его точки зрения, для российского ученика «стандарт». Это — «...способность читать карты, говорить на иностранном языке, заполнять налоговую декларацию. Список может также включать способность воспринимать русское искусство и литературу». Но может и не включать... Все, что, помимо стандарта, «за счет родителей», написано в плане действий правительства. (Kuzin, 2001)

The author of this passage suggests that the standardisation of education is likely to bring about a truncated formal curriculum and that anything beyond market standards would be considered a luxury item for which parents will have to pay.

In general, the view that the reform would lead to a shrinking of curricular content, turning teaching into test-oriented coaching, was quite widespread. According to popular opinion, teachers would be forced to cram students with the knowledge and skills needed only to pass the test, paying less attention to the non-testable parts of the curriculum. Moreover, the so-called ‘educational standards’, or “standards of illiteracy”, as the prominent Russian mathematician Vladimir Arnold (2003, p. 117) described them, would lead to a significant drop in students’ knowledge, “because rote learning is not teaching” (Kuzin, 2001). This, in turn, could give rise to new, even more “perverse” forms of private tutoring:

Рынок репетиторов может теперь пополняться за счет предприимчивых учителей и любых педагогов, которые смогут подготовить школьников The tutoring market can now be replenished by entrepreneurial teachers and educators who can prepare students for the unified exam—they will teach them
к единому экзамену – научить аккуратно заполнять тестовые бланки и быстро выбирать правильный ответ, отсекая не только очевидную чепуху, но и ответы-ловушки, очень похожие на правильные. Тесты – это целая наука, которую репетиторы, судя по объявлениям на столбах, уже начали осваивать. (Smertin, 2002)

Несмотря на все неприятности и несправедливости при поступлении в институты-университеты-академии, принципиально неотменяемой остается их заинтересованность в талантливых и подготовленных абитуриентах. Умные головы, а не только родительские кошельки и связи, нужны самым престижным вузам, иначе от их престижа ничего не останется. Но при ЕГЭ вместо своей умной и светлой головы мальчики и девочки смогут предъявить только бумажку. А над бумажкой родителям придется так серьезно «работать», что гипотетический миллиард у российских семей не задержится. Причем деньги придется тратить не на репетитора, который «дерет», но все-таки знания дает и поступление гарантирует, а на фильмку грамоту, которая, во-первых, получена не за знания, а за натасканность в никому не нужных и засоряющих память тестах, а во-вторых, совершенно ничего не гарантирует, сколько бы нас ни уверяли в обратном. ("Lokhotron Dlya Abiturientov", 2002)

In sum, in public discourse standardisation was discussed not as a means of improving the quality of education and combating tutoring, inequality, and corruption, but as something that would inevitably reduce education to

to fill in the test forms accurately and choose the right answer quickly, cutting out not only obvious nonsense, but also answer-traps that look very much like the right ones. Tests are a whole science, which, judging by the advertisements on the lampposts, tutors have already begun to master.
coaching in examinable subjects, leaving all-round personal development out of the equation. As a result, the market for paid services would expand and, as Sadovnichy put it, “much more money would circulate in the shadows” (Ivanyushchenkova, 2000).

The Urban-Rural Gap: Toppling the Myth of Level Playing Field

Yet another problem that the modernisation reforms were supposed to solve concerned equal access to higher education for students from urban, rural, and remote areas. Pre-entry tutoring, widespread in cities and scarcely available elsewhere, was thought to be one of the factors exacerbating this inequality and violating the legally guaranteed equal right to education:

Can we really say that equal rights to an education are enjoyed by an adolescent from a remote rural area who has attended a low-enrollment school for a few years and has then been forced to stop going to school because the secondary school was so far away in the raion center, on the one hand, and, on the other, a school student in Moscow who has acquired a secondary education in a profiled class of a good school, a gymnasium or lyceum, backed up, in addition, by lessons with a tutor or in tuition-charging courses in an institute? (Rutkevich, 2002, p. 20)

As envisioned by the reform drafters, a standardised test would improve the chances of school leavers from remote and rural areas to gain admission to the country’s best universities “without the mediation of tutors and preparatory courses” (Filippov, in “Vladimir Putin Sledit Za Ucheboy: Protokol,” 2002). Opponents, however, argued that the problem was addressed from the wrong end: instead of guaranteeing equal access and quality of education, the government prioritised equal assessment of educational outcomes. In particular, Sadovnichy questioned whether it was fair to require the same of students from privileged urban schools and students from disadvantaged areas:

Единый по всей стране экзамен предполагает и единые требования. А как предъявить их в равной мере в городской и сельской школах, к выпускнику престижного столичного лицей и абитуриенту из небольшого городка далекой российской глубинки? (Sadovnichy, 2003b, p. 175)

Ar unified exam across the whole country also implies unified requirements. And how do they apply equally to an urban school and a rural school, to a graduate of a prestigious lyceum in the capital and an entrant from a small town in the far of Russian hinterland?

He pointed out that there were significant differences between and within urban and rural schools that could not be bridged by a standardised exam. In the same vein, Solzhenitsyn asserted: “For decades we could not raise the level of rural education to the level of the urban one. … If the [Unified State] Exam is

---
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demanding, we will weed out rural graduates anyway” (Solzhenitsyn, 2003, p. 182).

Referring to SAT\textsuperscript{104} research, one article pointed out that the results of any standardised test tend to correlate with the students’ socio-economic status (Smertin, 2002). By analogy, the USE is incapable of flipping the playing field because of the persisting income gap. Instead, it would expose social and educational inequalities, dismantling all illusions about equal opportunities:

Не секрет, что обучаться в вузах у нас в стране могут позволить себе далеко не все, а лишь выходцы из семей, чей средний доход в два-три раза выше, чем в среднем по стране. И не столько потому, что у них есть деньги на взятки и репетиторов, сколько потому, что родители могут себе позволить пять лет содержать ребенка, пока тот учится. (Smertin, 2002)

It is no secret that not everyone in our country can afford to go to university, but only those from families whose average income is two to three times higher than the national average. It is not so much because they have money for bribes and tutors, but because their parents can afford to support children for five years while they study.

Another article called the proposed USE-GIFO scheme “a scam for entrants” (\textit{lokhotron dlya abiturientov}), suggesting that it was essentially designed to eliminate free higher education. Particular criticism was levelled at the fact that the USE was proudly presented as “nothing less than a salvation for poor families and talented children from the provinces”. Yet, the reform drafters were silent, or mentioned only in passing, that the cost of the state voucher was calculated on the basis of average tuition fees, which were significantly lower than those of prestigious universities. The costs of maintenance were not taken into account, either. Thus, the article concluded, talented students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds would not be able to obtain higher education for free anyway, which makes the promise of equal access appear as a “shameless lie” (“Lokhotron Dlya Abiturientov”, 2002).

Chapter Conclusions

Developed with the involvement of international agencies, the modernisation programme launched by the Russian government in the early 2000s aimed at improving the accessibility, quality, and efficiency of public education. By and large, this programme was based on concerns inherent in the Soviet era (assessment practices, curricular unification and differentiation, transition from secondary to higher education, the urban-rural gap), but reformulated in the neoliberal language of standardisation, quality, competition, and

\textsuperscript{104} SAT (Scholastic Assessment Test) is a standardised test used for college admission in the USA.
accountability. True, in the USSR downsizing state responsibility by attracting private investment was ideologically unthinkable. Nevertheless, the Soviet government tolerated private tutoring and partly legalised it during perestroika in order to solve certain economic predicaments. Similarly, major changes proposed by the government after the turn of the millennium were motivated primarily by economic considerations. This time, however, pre-entry tutoring was treated as one of the causes of the economic ills, as it hindered the flow of money into the public system. Alongside solving educational problems, both the USE, the GIFO and the twelve-year school were envisioned as a means of withdrawing private money spent on preparation for entrance examinations and providing a public alternative to private tutoring in preparing for higher education.

Discussing tutoring mainly as a part of the shadow admissions market, policy makers offered a specific and highly seductive way of interpreting the proposed changes as a way of combating corruption—an economic and moral issue at the same time. The rhetoric of justice, truth, and light versus inequalities, lies, and shadows put the question of ethics and the formation of an entrepreneurial and ethical subject at the heart of the modernisation reforms.

Private tutoring was not the main object of the proposed policy change. Instead, the reforms sought to create conditions for a more equitable, transparent, and efficient public education. Each was consonant with the recommendations of international agencies and justified with the premise of globalisation and a market economy. As a matter of fact, private tutoring is not even mentioned in the respective policy documents but is implied in the rather vague notion of “paid education services”\textsuperscript{105}. However, when reform initiatives were packaged for domestic audiences, they were legitimised by the declared necessity of getting rid of the undesirable economic, social, and ethical consequences of private tutoring. Put differently, in authoritative discourse private tutoring figured as one of the main and immediate problems to be tackled. Hence, the message of the reforms was “Farewell, tutoring!”, as journalist Boris Startsev (2000) called his article devoted to the reforms.

Despite alluring promises, the proposed concept for modernising Russian education was met with harsh criticism. It was pointed out that changing the rules and mechanisms of academic competition without addressing already existing inequalities (such as differences in quality of education and income gaps) would have very limited, if any, equalising effect. From the opponents’ point of view, rather than improving the quality of education, the USE would change its very nature, turning education into teaching to the test. At the same

\textsuperscript{105} The ‘Concept of Modernisation’ (MO, 2002a) envisages the expansion of additional paid education services in public education institutions, “as a means of meeting increased educational demand” and for stimulating educational innovation. It also contains a rather vague statement on the necessity of legislative regulation of the sphere of paid education services in order to protect the rights of consumers. However, it does not specify what kind of services are meant and how exactly they should be regulated.
time, establishing a direct correlation between academic performance and the value of state vouchers would encourage education institutions to behave like businesses. Concerns were also raised about the unclear principles of educational standardisation, reinforced by the USE-GIFO nexus, which could eventually lead to further privatisation of higher education, stimulating—rather than restraining—the development of a tutoring market. To paraphrase Startsev (2000), from the critics’ point of view, the reforms would essentially mean “a farewell” to free public education.

It is noteworthy that even the most vocal supporters did not believe that the proposed measures would eliminate private tutoring. Their efforts focused not so much on tutoring as such, but on its “shadow basis” understood primarily in economic terms. Symptomatic of this approach is also the lack of (explicit) interest in the content and pedagogy of tutoring practices. This stands in stark contrast to the imperial and Soviet times when the question of curricular and ideological conformity was in the spotlight. This is not to say that in post-Soviet context this issue is entirely abandoned. Rather, it seems that in contemporary Russia, ideological and curricular conformity is ensured by the standardisation of curricula and by stakes attached to the USE scores.
10. (De-)Regulating Teacher-Supplied Private Tutoring: Dealing with an Ethical Concern

In Russia, the practice of teachers giving their students supplementary lessons for a fee is as old as schooling itself. In the eighteenth century, teachers were indeed allowed to provide additional instruction to students boarding in their homes. However, already at that time the public was concerned about the negative implications of this practice (see chapters 5 and 7). While in Soviet Russia the question of profit-making in education was ideologically unacceptable, the *Law on Education*, adopted immediately after the collapse of the USSR, welcomed the return of commercial activities to public institutions. Teachers could again engage in paid educational services, including private tutoring, provided they were registered with the tax authorities as individual entrepreneurs (*Ob Obrazovanii*, 1992, Article 48).

In the early 2010s, the government initiated a public discussion on a new education bill which, among other things, would have prohibited teachers from tutoring students in the same educational organisation. The proposed wording of the relevant paragraph read as follows:

Педагогический работник организации, осуществляющей образовательную деятельность, в том числе в качестве индивидуального предпринимателя, не вправе оказывать платные образовательные услуги обучающимся в данной организации. (Проект Федерального закона “Об Образовании в Российской Федерации”, 2011, статья 49:3)

A pedagogical employee of an organisation carrying out educational activities, including as an individual entrepreneur, may not provide paid educational services to students in that organisation.

Obviously, this ban reflects an ideological shift in the authoritative discourse; while the previous law treated private tutoring as a commercial activity, the draft law draws attention to the ethical aspects of this very practice. However, the adopted version of the law specifies that a teacher has no right to provide paid educational services “if this leads to a conflict of interest of a pedagogical employee” (*Ob Obrazovanii v Rossiiskoi Federatsii*, 2012, Article 48:2). In other words, the absolute ban was replaced by a conditional one. So, what happened in the process of policy drafting?
What distinguishes the current Law on Education from other legislations is that it was developed by means of crowdsourcing. This means that citizens could directly participate in the law-making process by commenting on the draft developed by the Ministry of Education. The draft law was made available for open discussion on the website zakonoproekt2010.ru, where articles and paragraphs were divided into small segments on which anonymous participants could vote, comment, and suggest improvements. This allows for an analysis of the comments on the bill and an investigation of how the problem presented by the law drafters was interpreted and challenged by the public.

In contrast to the previous empirical chapters, the analysis below is devoted to one single question, namely the ethical concern about tutoring supplied by in-service teachers to their own students. This task is approached in three ways and is structured accordingly. Firstly, I examine how teacher-supplied tutoring is conceptualised in research on shadow education. Secondly, I historicise the phenomenon by discussing when and why the ethical concern about internal tutoring arose and how it has historically been addressed in Russia. Thirdly, the bulk of the chapter focuses the formation of the 2012 Law on Education. Here, I delve into the public commentary on the bill and explore how citizens participating in the law-making process conceived and challenged the established ethical problematisation. The analysis uncovers issues that have been ignored by the Russian government and that are rarely addressed in international research on shadow education. The main conclusions are synthetised in the final section.

**Empirical Sources**

The empirical material for this chapter consists mainly of policy documents and could be divided into three categories. The first one comprises previous research on shadow education focusing on the phenomenon of internal tutoring. For the purpose of this chapter, I have reused the material gathered for the systematic literature review (chapter 2) and supplemented it with more recent scholarly works focusing on private tutoring provided by schoolteachers.

---

106 The term crowdsourcing was coined by Howe (2006) and is applied to a variety of activities in which individuals, institutions or non-profit organisations collect ideas, opinions, goods, or services from the online community (Brabham, 2013; Estellés-Arolas & González-Ladrón-de-Guevara, 2012). Initially, this method of information-gathering was mainly used by business organisations; more recently, however, it expanded to non-commercial sectors and policy making (Prpić et al., 2015).

107 The website is no longer accessible online.

108 The project attracted considerable public attention, with over ten thousand amendments in total, including, of course, to the article regulating the provision of paid educational services in educational organisations. Judging by the aliases, some comments were written collectively by faculties or teacher associations. In general, though, the participants were anonymous, making it impossible for an outsider to know whose voices were represented in the drafting process.
The second category consists of historical documents. To discuss the ethical concern of internal tutoring from a genealogical perspective, I reread policy documents and other relevant empirical sources collected for other chapters of this dissertation (especially for chapters 5, 7 and 9). This genealogical excursion was necessary to understand when and why the ethical problematisation arose and how it was dealt with at different periods of Russian history.

The third category includes policy documents from the post-Soviet period: apart from the two laws on education, it includes public comments on the draft law (Proekt Federal’nogo Zakona “Ob Obrazovanii v Rossiiskoi Federatsii”, 2011), collected in 2018 from the website zakonoproekt2010.ru. The specific paragraph under study received thirty-two comments, ranging from brief remarks to rather lengthy arguments about how and why the proposed ban should or should not be revised. These comments were coded thematically based on my previous understanding and analysis of policies on private tutoring in Russia. The codes were then grouped together into four themes, which are discussed in the relevant sections of this chapter.

Teacher-Supplied Tutoring in Previous Research on Shadow Education: Scholarly Conceptualisations of the Problem

The phenomenon of schoolteachers giving extra lessons to their own students is not unique to Russia and has been observed in many countries (Biswal, 1999; Bray, 2003; Dawson, 2009; Ille & Peacey, 2019; Kobakhidze, 2018; Popa & Acedo, 2006; Silova, 2010; Solodo & Jokić, 2013). It appears to be particularly prevalent in contexts where teachers’ salaries are low while the stakes attached to school grades and examinations are high. It exists both in laissez-faire environments and in countries where teachers are discouraged or prohibited from providing paid educational services to their students. In the latter case, however, schools may have informal agreements and refer students to each other (Dawson, 2009; Silova, 2010).

When the pursuit of profit or other tangible and intangible benefits for teachers becomes the main goal, internal tutoring may degenerate into a form of corruption. In order to reward students attending fee-based classes and punish those who refuse, teachers may use various “tricks” (Dawson, 2009), including grade inflation, disclosure of examination items, assistance during examinations (Bray, 2003; Edwards et al., 2019; Foondun, 2002; Ille & Peacey, 2019; Jayachandran, 2014; Kobakhidze, 2018). In post-socialist societies, according to Silova (2010), it is not uncommon for teachers to force students to attend paid classes under the threat of lowering grades. This and other forms of discrimination towards non-attending students are conceptualised as the enactment of a hidden curriculum (Bray et al, 2018).
Perhaps most controversial is so-called ‘forced’, or ‘coercive’ tutoring (Ille & Peacey, 2019; Silova, 2010), where additional classes become almost a compulsory part of the curriculum. This occurs when teachers intentionally omit important components of the formal curriculum or lower the quality of regular teaching in order to lure students into paying lessons (see e.g., Bray et al., 2019; Ille & Peacey, 2019). In this way, teachers deliberately create a gap between formal requirements and what students are actually taught in the classroom.

It has been argued that such an abuse of the teacher’s position violates the right to free education and contradicts one of its basic aims, which is “to produce ‘a good citizen’ respectful of the law, of human rights and fairness” (Hallak & Poisson, 2003, p. 10). However, as Dawson (2009, p. 71-72) observes, in some countries tutoring is the only way for schoolteachers to make the ends meet. In this case, he maintains, the issue is ‘forced corruption’ rooted in inadequate salaries.

Arguably, the notions of ‘forced tutoring’ and ‘forced corruption’ portray the phenomenon from different angles. The latter construes it as an effect of structural socio-economic injustice. Here, economic hardship is seen as a factor pushing teachers into ethically questionable practices. By contrast, the notion of ‘forced tutoring’ implies that it is a matter of individual choice and conscious abuse of a teacher’s position, incompatible with professional ethics.

To minimise the risk of corruption associated with this type of private tutoring, Silova, Būdienė and Bray (2006) recommend that national governments “prohibit teachers from undertaking paid private tutoring of their own students in mainstream school” and develop “a teacher code of ethics” that would “unambiguously define all non-ethical behaviour related to private tutoring” (p. 15). In addition, since unethical use of tutoring services is most pervasive in countries with low teacher pay, they insist on the need for adequate renumeration.

Interestingly, while most research findings point to socio-economic reasons for this phenomenon, two of the three recommendations focus on the development of rules and regulations governing teachers conduct. Thus, the emphasis of the scholarly problematisation shifts somewhat from structural to individual factors. Moreover, while some scholars believe in the effectiveness of government regulations to prevent and resolve ethically controversial situations, others doubt that prohibitions will bring about any significant results. Biswal (1999), for example, notes that an effective no-tutoring policy requires a costly monitoring system that is impossible to implement in developing countries. Similarly, in her study of private tutoring in post-Soviet Georgia,

109 Other recommendations are of more general character and concern other forms of tutoring. For instance, the scholars recommend that local governments should raise public awareness about the phenomenon of supplementary tutoring, introduce clear rules on registering and licensing exam-preparation courses and ensure that “all topics covered in university entrance are part of secondary school curricula” (Silova, Būdienė & Bray, 2006, p. 15-16).
Kobakhidze (2018) found that teachers, parents, and policy makers seem to hold the view that no rules is the best solution for all concerned.

**Historicising the Question**

As mentioned earlier, the practice of teachers tutoring their own pupils has existed in Russia since the establishment of public schools in the eighteenth century. In chapter 5, I mentioned that Catherine’s *Statute on Schools* of 1786 allowed teachers to engage in private tutoring with their students after working hours, provided that these students attended school (PSZ, 1830i, p. 650). Although this gave teachers the opportunity to earn extra money, the main purpose of that regulation was to ensure school attendance. In the nineteenth century, as I described in chapter 7, internal tutoring became part and parcel of public education. For schoolteachers, the entitlement to work as *repetitörs* was a financial incentive provided by the state itself. For the imperial government, on the other hand, it was an opportunity to supervise students outside school hours and ensure that their moral education was in full accord with the government’s vision of desirable citizens.

However, even at that time, this practice raised public concern. In chapter 7, I quoted an article in which the author doubts the pedagogical benefits of internal tutoring, arguing that it often led to rote learning (Belorussov, 1879). In another article, published in 1862 in the educational periodical *Uchitel’* [Teacher], an anonymous author problematises the pedagogical impact of tutoring on students and on the main responsibilities of teachers (“Privatnye Uroki”, 1862). On the one hand, the author writes, despite governmental attempts to prohibit teachers from providing private lessons, economic hardships force many of them to spend their leisure time tutoring those “who need to succeed in the shortest time possible in what they failed to do in school” (p. 461). On the other hand, the article claims, a situation in which teachers are forced to give tutoring classes after working hours is harmful for the teachers themselves, as it takes away time needed for professional development. Some teachers, having neither rest nor leisure, are exhausted by private lessons like a postman’s horse and “feel the whip on their battered flanks far more often that the hay (not to speak of oats) in the empty stomachs” (p. 461). For this reason, private lessons are compared to *aqua tofana*, the poison that leads to the professional (and sometimes even physical) death of schoolteachers (p. 460). However, the author contends that it would be wrong to blame teachers for engaging in private tutoring:

---

110 It is not clear from the description whether the author is talking about teachers who provide private lessons to students they teach in school, to external students, or both.

111 Unfortunately, I was unable to trace down any official documents on this matter.
Do we really have a right to condemn a teacher who gives private lessons? God forbid that! He has a wife and a host of children; he wants to be well fed, decently dressed and so on. … Even with a good pay of 300 or 400 roubles, how should he survive if he does not want to live worse than a day-labourer? What else is he to do but to give private lessons, provided he is lucky enough to find any?

Overall, the article calls for an urgent increase in salaries as the only possible means of preventing the spread of the “poisonous effects” of private teaching and tutoring.

While all forms of private education were forbidden during the Soviet era, post-Soviet Russia has witnessed a revival of tutoring both outside and within public institutions. The first Law on Education, passed in 1992, entitled schools to provide additional educational services on a commercial basis. Such services included tutoring (repetitortvo), classes for gifted students and other tuition-charging programs not covered by formal curricula (Ob Obrazovanii, 1992, Article 45). Teachers could also give fee-based lessons individually after appropriate registration with the tax authorities (Article 48). Apparently, at that time, internal tutoring organised by schools or individual teachers was not considered problematic. On the contrary, it seems to have been part of a governmental attempt to democratise the former Soviet school and give it greater financial independence (see chapter 9).

Although ethical aspects of profit-making in education became the subject of extensive public debate in the last decades of the Soviet era (chapter 8), they were relatively invisible in policy discourse until the late 1990s, when the government launched a series of reforms to modernise education. It was argued that the lack of transparency and inadequate regulation of paid services corrupted all involved in the educational process (Putin, 2001). Indeed, the introduction of the USE and GIFO was justified by the need to combat corruption in public education (chapter 9).

However, Russian officials seem to have quite different perceptions of corruption and do not consider the same practice equally condemnable. Take, for example, the following quote from Boris Vinogradov, Deputy Minister of Education, who argues that corruption has been found everywhere to justify the introduction of the USE:

Причём на том этапе коррупированный сочли Марию Ивановну, At that stage, Maria Ivanovna, a regular schoolteacher who could give a student...
школьную учительницу, которая за коробку конфет может поставить школьнику любую выпускную оценку. Также обвинили репетиторов в коррупции. Хочу вам сказать, что репетиторство в России при подготовке к высшим учебным заведениям – давняя историческая традиция. … Так что борьбу с репетиторством вести под эгидой ЕГЭ – это вообще бессмысленное занятие. Было понятно, что это тоже будет провалено. (Vinogradov, 2008, p. 86)

It is interesting to note that the long history of private tutoring in Russia is mentioned here to legitimise both a certain form of corruption in education and a policy of no-interference.

A few years later, another Education Minister, Andrey Fursenko, also referred to the long tradition of private tutoring, stressing that tutoring does not equal corruption:

Во-первых, я хотел бы определиться, что я понимаю под словом «коррупция». Вот когда мы говорим о том, что процветает репетиторство... Можно к этому относиться хорошо или плохо, но, кстати сказать, в дореволюционной России репетиторство было достаточно широко развито – почитаем классическую литературу, и мы увидим, что там это сплошь и рядом упоминается. Коррупция – это когда человек, который является репетитором, одновременно и главным образом использует это для того, чтобы обеспечить получение необходимых оценок, то есть он готовит людей в тот вуз, по тем предметам, по которым потом сам и будет принимать экзамен. А если говорить о коррупции при поступлении по результатам ЕГЭ, то в этом вопросе, как говорится, коррупции быть не может, может быть подготовка, целенаправленная подготовка, коррупции тут просто по определению нет. Что касается борьбы с коррупцией как таковой, я считаю, что единый государственный экзамен и хорошо, честно проведённые предметные олимпиа-

Firstly, I would like to define what I mean by the word “corruption”. When we talk about the flourishing tutoring... You can have different opinions about it, but it might be worth mentioning that tutoring was quite widespread in pre-revolutionary Russia—just read classical literature and you’ll see that it’s mentioned everywhere. Corruption is when a person, who is a tutor, simultaneously and mainly uses it in order to secure the necessary marks, that is, he or she prepares children for that university, for those subjects, which they will assess. And if we talk about corruption in admission based on the USE results, then, as they say, there is no room for corruption there; there may be preparation, targeted preparation, but corruption is not there by definition. As for the fight against corruption as such, I think that the USE and fairly conducted subject Olympiads are key to fighting corruption because they provide a way to an objective assessment of students’ knowledge.
ды – это как раз и есть главный спо-
соб борьбы с коррупцией, потому что это способ объективной оценки зна-
ний у ребят. (Fursenko, 2009)

Naturally, different perceptions of misconduct and corruption in education lead to different solutions. Whereas some policy makers believed that greater transparency in final examinations would completely eradicate corrupt practices, others asserted that it was impossible to “build an island of communism in one single sphere, in this case education, when the whole country is cor-
rupted” (Vinogradov, 2008, p. 88).

As this brief overview suggests, internal tutoring was hardly seen as a seri-
ous problem requiring state intervention. On the contrary, aware of low sala-
ries, the state has encouraged teachers to participate in the provision of com-
mercial services within and outside public institutions. The adoption of the Anti-Corruption Act (O Protivodeistvii Korruptsii, 2008) sparked a renewed debate on ethics and corruption in all spheres, including education. In general, however, prior the 2012 Law on Education, this debate was not about tutoring in schools but, as shown in the previous chapter, about the ‘admissions mar-
ket’, that is at the point of transition from secondary to higher education.

Public Comments on the Draft Law: Challenging the Concepts of ‘Ethics’ and ‘Morals’ in Education

In the previous section I showed that in Russia, tutoring supplied by school-
teachers has long been a matter of public, but hardly policy, concern. It seems surprising, therefore, that the government’s attempt to ban the practice at the legislative level was met with resistance. Indeed, the vast majority of com-
ments on this part of the draft law (28 out of 31) suggested that the provision in question should be deleted or fundamentally revised. Below I outline the most common counter-problematisations by which the public justified internal tutoring.

Curricular Knowledge, Individualisation and Quality: Educational Justification

According to one of the most popular arguments as to why teachers should not be prohibited from tutoring their students, this practice has a number of pedagogical advantages. Firstly, it has been argued that, with expert knowledge of curriculum, teachers can quickly identify what a student needs to improve in order to meet the requirements of a particular programme. Re-
flecting on this, one commentator contends the following:
Есть множество причин, по которым платные занятия с педагогом «своего» учебного заведения предпочтительнее: 1) разница в программах различных учебных заведений и в требованиях к учащимся; 2) наличие узкоспециальных предметов; 3) территориальная удаленность от других учебных заведений.112

There are many reasons why paid classes with a teacher of the [same] education institution are preferable: 1) variations in the programmes of different educational institutions and in the requirements for students; 2) availability of highly specialised school subjects; 3) geographical distance from other education institutions.

The author of this commentary believes that tutoring provided by teachers from schools other than the student’s own may be less effective due to possible differences in curricula between the schools and in the requirements imposed by individual teachers. Moreover, in some cases it can be difficult to find teachers from other schools because of geographical distance (I return to this argument later in the chapter).

Secondly, it was argued that teachers are aware of the needs of each student, which allows them to approach them individually and make private lessons more useful than teaching in a large class. It seemed therefore necessary to lift the potential ban “because in most cases only the teacher who teaches a particular student knows exactly what that student needs in order to improve his or her performance”. One participant asked:

Если учащийся хочет и нуждается в дополнительных занятиях с педагогом – почему нет? Ведь давно известно, что у разных людей разная степень обучаемости. Если одному учащемуся понятна тема с первого объяснения, то для многих нужно более детальная проработка каждой темы.

If a student wants and needs extra tuition from a teacher, why not? After all, it has long been known that different people have different learning abilities. If one student understands a topic from the first explanation, others may need more detailed study of each topic.

Another one concurred that teachers often have to provide extra tuition, albeit free of charge, to meet the individual needs of students:

Считаю, что эту часть надо полностью отменить, так как все ученики в классе разные: одни быстро обучаются, а другим недостаточно одного урока, чтобы понять изучаемый материал, поэтому приходится учителям обучать таких учеников дополнительно, после урока, причём бесплатно.

I think that this clause should be abolished completely, because all students in any class are different: some learn quickly, while others do not have enough time to understand the material studied, so teachers have to tutor such students additionally, after school hours, and for free. Why is this the fault

112 Hereinafter public comments are given in accordance with the spelling and punctuation of the original source.

Thirdly, it was pointed out that teachers themselves are interested in the good results of their students. Consequently, the quality of their tutoring sessions should be higher compared to sessions run by external tutors. The following comment illustrates this line of reasoning:

Этот пункт препятствует повышению качества образования. Занятия со «своими» преподавателями наиболее эффективны в плане реального повышения уровня знаний учащихся. Преподаватель, занимающийся с учеником из своего учебного заведения, как никто другой заинтересован в конечном результате этих занятий, и поэтому он тщательно готовится к каждому занятию. «Чужие» преподаватели зачастую относятся к индивидуальным занятиям формально.

This clause is impeding the improvement of quality of education. Classes with [students’] “own” teachers are the most effective in terms of actually improving student learning. A teacher who tutors a student from his or her own educational organisation is more interested than anyone else in the end result of these lessons, and therefore prepares carefully for each session. “External” teachers often simply go through the motions during private lessons.

Challenging this view, some critics pointed out that if a teacher “failed to teach in the classroom, he or she wouldn’t do it for the money either”.

Others agreed on the need for extra tuition, especially for low-achievers and gifted students. They noticed, however, that extra lessons should not be paid for privately, but instead the charge for such classes should be included in teachers’ salaries.

To summarise, this line of public comment emphasizes the educational benefits of teacher-provided tutoring, which are considered to outweigh the ethical concern inherent in the bill.

The Urban-Rural Gap: Social Justification

Another counter-problematisation relates to the geographical remoteness of rural schools from other educational organisations. In particular, it was noted that the drafters did not take into consideration the peculiarities of rural areas. As one commentator put it, “Russia is not only big cities, but also villages and settlements where there is only one school”.

Reflecting on this issue, another participant pointed to the negative consequences that both teachers and students in rural areas would face if the ban were to be upheld:
Предлагаю исключить этот пункт. Желая лишить преподавателей хоть какого-нибудь дополнительного заработка, будут ущемлены права детей и их родителей, особенно проживающих в сельской местности.

И предлагаю исключить этот пункт. Желая лишить преподавателей хоть какого-нибудь дополнительного заработка, будут ущемлены права детей и их родителей, особенно проживающих в сельской местности.

In similar manner, another one asked:

В сельских школах зачастую 1–2 специалиста-предметника; если им запретить заниматься репетиторством, кто сможет разносторонне подготовить ребенка?

Rural schools often have 1-2 subject specialists; if they were banned from tutoring, who would be able to provide all-round education to children?

As such, was said to reflect the ideals of urban schooling. In the meantime, unlike their peers from large metropolitan areas, students from small villages and settlements, and, especially, from remote areas have no choice than to hire their own teachers as tutors if necessary. This means that, despite democratic intentions, the ban would deprive students from rural areas of the opportunity to hire a tutor, which would only increase inequality.

As such, was said to reflect the ideals of urban schooling. In the meantime, unlike their peers from large metropolitan areas, students from small villages and settlements, and, especially, from remote areas have no choice than to hire their own teachers as tutors if necessary. This means that, despite democratic intentions, the ban would deprive students from rural areas of the opportunity to hire a tutor, which would only increase inequality.

What is at stake here is the “spatial (in)justice” (Soja, 2010) arising from differences in access to education between urban and rural areas. This problematisation is particularly important because it calls into question the arguments for the introduction of the USE put forward by the government a decade earlier (chapter 9). At the time, it was stated that, with no access to either private tutors or preparatory courses, applicants from rural areas were disadvantaged and less likely to enter the country’s best universities. However, as public commentary suggests, banning teachers from providing tutoring to their students, while possibly preventing ethical dilemmas, would simultaneously deepen the urban-rural gap.

A Question of Rights: Legal and Moral Justification

It would of course be wrong to say that there were no voices supporting the ban. As one commentator expressed it, “allowing a teacher to provide a paid service to his or her student is the same as allowing a traffic policeman to provide paid services to explain traffic rules to an offender”.

Nevertheless, most participants argued that the way in which the government attempts to address the moral dilemma is itself unethical and contrary to other laws and legislations. One commentator noted, for example, that the ban is based on the assumption “that all teachers are inherently corrupt and try to get as much money as possible from each student”. This assumption, they
emphasized, contradicted the presumption of innocence guaranteed by the Constitution of the Russian Federation.

Others appealed, often implicitly, to the *Family Code*, which provides for the right of parents to choose the form of education for their children (see *Semeinyi Kodeks Rossiiskoi Federatsii*, 1995, Article 62:2). Consider, for instance, the commentary below, which states that the ban would violate this right:

Эта часть ущемляет права учащихся и их родителей. Ведь родители вправе сами выбирать, с каким преподавателем занятия будут наиболее удобны и эффективны для их ребёнка. Естественно, что большинство родителей обращается за помощью в своё учебное заведение. И это не означает, что занятия будут с преподавателем, работающим в классе, где учится данный ученик. Принятие данного пункта лишь создаёт родителям дополнительные сложности: они будут вынуждены искать преподавателя в других учебных заведениях. Нельзя ограничивать родителей в выборе преподавателя для индивидуальных занятий с их ребёнком.

This clause infringes on the rights of students and their parents. After all, parents have the right to choose which teacher is most suitable and effective for their child. Naturally, most parents seek help from their school. This does not mean that extra lessons will be with the teacher working in the class with the student in question. The adoption of this clause only creates additional difficulties for the parents: they will have to look for a teacher in other schools. Parents should not be restricted in their choice of teachers for their child’s individual lessons.

The same commentator pointed out that the wording of the bill is rather vague and does not take into account less-controversial situations when a teacher tutors a student from the same school but in a different class, in a different year, etc. Also, as suggested by another comment, the ban could be applied to paid extra-curricular activities conducted by teachers of the same educational organisation, which is not the purpose of the regulation.

Opposing Government Intervention: “It doesn’t Make Sense…”

It is clear from the public discussion that there was a strong belief that private tutoring is inevitable. According to this logic, a ban would only create additional barriers for those concerned, without addressing what is believed to be the root of the problem. Hence, it would have the opposite effect: increasing rather than eliminating corruption. To quote one panellist: “Enough with the prohibitions! After all, teachers will not stop this otherwise perfectly legitimate activity, they will only fear being reported”. Another one stated that “adopting this clause would only make life harder for parents: they would be forced to look for teachers in other schools”. Echoing this sentiment, yet
another participant said: “It doesn’t make any sense to regulate such activities as private tutoring. It will continue to exist until quality education is achieved”.

Others argued that tutoring would flourish as long as it provided teachers with the extra income needed to supplement their salaries:

It is unfair to ban such activities. Teachers should be given the opportunity to make a living from one place of work by signing a contract to provide paid services, rather than having many part-time jobs.

In this and other similar comments, the ethical problematisation of teacher-supplied private tutoring is challenged by economic considerations that morally justify the practice and make the prohibition seem unfair and ineffective.

Alternative Solutions

One of the purposes of participatory law-making is to get input from the public and make the process more transparent and democratic. As mentioned earlier, most panellists suggested deleting the relevant clause because its adoption would be unreasonable from educational, moral, legal, and economic perspectives.

The improvement suggestions put forward in the discussion can be boiled down to three points. First, the public pointed to the need to clarify when and where teachers may be allowed to provide paid educational services: for example, by adding ‘during working hours’ or by specifying whether such services can be provided on the premises of an educational organisation. According to another proposal, the provision of paid educational services should be allowed upon conclusion of a special agreement—a contract between a teacher or an educational organisation and parents. Third, if the ban cannot be avoided, salaries must be urgently and drastically increased so that teachers do not have to seek extra income.

Put another way, the first two proposals focus on what needs to be done to allow teachers to tutor their own students. These proposals are based on the assertion that “private tutoring should stay”, as one commentator put it. They also reflect the belief that ethical dilemmas can be resolved by legal means, provided the latter are worded with greater precision. The third suggestion, by contrast, is directed at the alleged roots of the problem. To use the terminology of Lee et al (2010), this exemplifies a causal treatment approach to private tutoring. From this perspective, the roots of the problem lie in economic hardship; hence, a significant improvement in the material situation of teachers is seen as the only effective solution. This line of reasoning is characterised by
a clear distrust of the ability of regulative frameworks to tackle complex ethical and educational problems, as they tend to address the symptoms, rather than the causes, of what is thought to be a disease.

Allowed or Not Allowed? Fostering Self-Governing Subjects

Crowdsourcing as a policy-making tool has the potential to transform citizens from consumers of policy texts (cf. Ball et al, 2011) to co-producers of policy problems and solutions. However, the extent to which the participants in the law-making process can exercise their power depends on whether their involvement is a purely symbolic gesture, necessary to add legitimacy to the decisions made, or whether they can challenge, disrupt, or modify the proposed understandings of problems and their solutions.

It is impossible for an outside observer to determine which, if any, of the justifications and counter-problematisations resonated the most. Although the number of comments on the ban was relatively low, the adopted version of the law was revised:

Педагогический работник организации, осуществляющей образовательную деятельность, в том числе в качестве индивидуального предпринимателя, не вправе оказывать платные образовательные услуги обучающимся в данной организации, если это приводит к конфликту интересов педагогического работника [emphasis added]. (Ob Obrazovani v Rossiiskoi Federatsii, 2012, Article 48:2)

In this wording, the prohibition is no longer absolute. On the contrary, the law allows teachers to tutor students from the same educational organisation, except in situations that might lead to a ‘conflict of interest’. The explanatory part of the law specifies that such a situation may arise when a teacher’s interest in material gain adversely affects his or her main job (Article 2:33). The establishment of a conflict of interest is based on the decision of a special commission for settling disputes between participants in educational relations. Article 45 of the Law grants students and parents the right to appeal to this commission if they believe that their right to education has been violated by a teacher.

In other words, different conceptions of ethics, equality and justice in education have been revised and melded into a new vision of teacher-supplied
tutoring as a potentially corrupt practice. It goes without saying that the adopted wording opens up room for uncertainty, as it is entirely premised on interpretations and subjective judgements as to what a conflict of interest means and how it is to be resolved. By that, the law creates a policy space within which the parties involved are expected to be able to determine on a case-by-case basis what is counts as appropriate behaviour and may or may not be allowed. This indicates that the participants in the educational process are thought of as capable of self-governance and of making ethical decisions.

It is also worth noting that the target, or, more precisely, the subject of regulation, has been expanded to include not only teachers but also students and parents, who have become responsible for identifying and resolving ethically controversial situations.

Chapter Conclusions

Private tutoring has long been of ethical concern to researchers and policy makers as well as others involved in the educational process. However, as Bray (2003) noted, perceptions of what behaviour is ethical are often based on personal judgment. This means that “what one individual may describe as the corruption of the education system, another may perceive as entirely appropriate pattern” (Bray, 2003, p. 17; see also Kobakhidze, 2014). It is this diversity of ways of thinking and reasoning about what is ethical versus problematic in education that has been the focus of the analysis presented above.

In this chapter, I have examined public reactions to the government’s attempt to prohibit teachers from entering into a monetary relationship with their students through private tutoring. The analysis shows that public comment on the draft law challenged the established ethical problematisation and brought to the forefront issues neglected by the government and which are hardly addressed in previous scholarly works. In short, in the public discussion, the proposed prohibition of internal tutoring was portrayed as ineffective and undesirable. It was pointed out that banning internal tutoring may solve the problem of corruption but, at the same time, cause other forms of inequality and lead to new moral dilemmas and conflicts. In other words, while potentially equalising, such a ban would run counter to other ethical, educational, and societal values.

More specifically, it was claimed that the practice of teachers providing paid services to their students is justified from an educational perspective, as teachers’ knowledge of each student’s individual needs and of the requirements of a particular programme can have a positive impact on the quality of their teaching. The commentators also stressed that teachers have a vested interest in improving student performance, as it directly affects their professional reputation and salaries in the long run. Thus, teachers are believed to be more responsive to students’ needs and aspirations than external tutors.
sum, this line of reasoning emphasizes that ethical problematisation fails to take into account the pedagogical benefits of the practice.

Secondly, in opposing the ban, the public argued that it was constructed according to metropolitan perceptions of schooling and disregarded the existing differences between urban and rural areas when it comes to educational opportunities. In essence, this problematisation of spatial injustice draws attention to the potential conflict between the ethics and the question of equality. To support their criticism, the panellists suggested that ban was likely to widen the urban-rural gap and thus could not be justified in terms of the common good.

Thirdly, it was maintained that suspecting all teachers involved in fee-based educational activities of being corrupt violated the presumption of innocence. At the same time, the ban would infringe on the legally guaranteed rights of parents to choose the form of education for their children. Appealing to the constitution and the rhetoric of rights, the participants challenged the legal and moral grounds of the proposed solution to the ethically problematic issue.

In line with predominantly negative attitudes towards the commercialisation of education articulated in the general public debate in post-Soviet Russia (Minina, 2018), some participants opposed paid services in public institutions altogether. Nevertheless, in the adopted version of the law, an absolute prohibition is replaced by a conditional one. This implies that teachers, students, and parents are expected to act as ethical self-governing participants in the educational process. The ambiguity of the regulation helps to preserve the status quo and relieves the government of having to intervene and address the complex moral, pedagogical, economic, and other potential dilemmas that monetary relations in school may entail.
11. Rethinking the Relations between the Public and the Private in Education

This dissertation aimed to provide a genealogy of the relations between the public and the private in education. For that, I have examined the ways in which private tutoring has been problematised in Russia over the past three centuries and discussed how these problematisations reflect and shape dominant visions of education. Being interested in exploring the mutual transformations of public education and private tutoring over time, I sought to avoid binary thinking and to explore them as intertwined and interdependent rather than separate and hierarchical. Drawing on a combination of curriculum theory and Foucault’s concepts of governmentality and problematisation, I have endeavoured to make visible different modes of thinking about desirable and problematic education in order to understand why tutoring practices are seen as legitimate or problematic in different contexts.

In tracing different trajectories of Russian educational thought as manifested in policies and public debates, this study has identified several perennial questions in relation to which private tutoring has been problematised and regulated and which have had a bearing on the formation of education. In this final chapter, I summarise the main findings and discuss them in light of the most recent developments in Russia.

In what follows, I first outline the general picture of how private tutoring has come to be seen as an economic rather than educational concern. Second, I summarise the recurring problematisations and their modifications in response to shifting visions of education in different historical and political contexts. Particular attention is paid to questions of governance and ideological conformity and how the official curriculum has served as a technique of ideological governance for various educational practices, both formal and informal. Thereafter, I elaborate on how the identified problematisations reshaped the nature of both private tutoring and public education. The final section discusses how the developed theoretical and methodological approach allows for new insights the history, nature, and politics of public and private relations in education.
‘Shadow Education’ versus ‘Shadow Economy’: De-Educationalisation of Private Tutoring

In Russia, private tutoring became a policy problem in the age of the Enlightenment, when public education was just taking its shape. To understand the nature of this problem, it is important to bear in mind that in Imperial Russia, education, or, more specifically, schooling, was part of the compulsory service (служба) to the state. Accordingly, resistance to schooling and a consistent preference for private education could be interpreted as a resistance to the monarch and the country. It was in that context that the centuries-old tradition of acquiring knowledge through tutoring and apprenticeship awakened reflection and critical thought.

Unable to replace it altogether, the imperial government sought to bring private education in line with the core values of the autocratic state and prevent the spread of ideas that could collide with the interests of the state. It also encouraged the development of supplementary tutoring in schools and rewarded it accordingly, that is, as part of service to the state.

Over time, however, the view of education as a service to the state gave way to an understanding of it as a service (услуга) provided by the state or by non-state actors. The embryo of this thinking can be found in the policies of the last two decades of the Soviet period, notably in the Law on Individual Enterprise (Об Индивидуальной Трудовой Деятельности Граждан СССР, 1987), which positioned private tutoring as a service required to meet the needs of society. The institutionalisation of commercial services in and out of schools in the early 1990s, made it possible to apply the notion of “educational service” (услуга)—as a fee-based service—to a wide range of activities, including private tutoring (репетиторство). Nowadays, education is included in the list of “state services” (госуслуги), that is, services provided by the state, on the eponymous government website (https://www.gosuslugi.ru).

It is against the background of this fundamental shift—from “service-oriented education” to “education as a service provided by the state”—that one can understand why, starting from the late Soviet period, private tutoring in Russia has been considered a matter not so much of shadow education but of the shadow economy. In other words, while many social problems are increasingly “educationalised” (Smeyers & Depaepe, 2008), in this case the opposite process can be observed; that is, private supplementary tutoring is increasingly seen as an economic problem and is treated accordingly, that is, through constant revision of the relevant articles of the Tax Code. This rationality takes

---

113 For an analysis of the use and public perception of the notion ‘educational service’ in post-Soviet Russia, see Minina (2018).
114 Judging from the transcripts of the State Duma meetings, during the 2010s, there was much discussion about whether private tutors should pay taxes. Until 2020, their activities fell into the category of the self-employed, which exempted them from paying taxes, provided they notify tax authorities and do not use hired labor.
private tutoring out of the realm of education policy, rendering it essentially a market concern.

Recurring Problematisations and Their Modifications

The history of the questions to which curriculum poses itself as an answer is inevitably a history of norms, values, and knowledge to be promoted and defended. As shown in the empirical chapters, these norms, values, and knowledge have varied in line with nationalist, communist and neoliberal visions of education. In general, however, private tutoring was rarely singled out as a separate issue in authoritative discourse. Rather, it was imbricated in a multitude of other educational, economic, ideological, political, and ethical concerns. In tsarist Russia, for example, it was discussed and treated as part of the general problem of private and home education; in the USSR, as part of shadow, or secondary, economy; in the post-Soviet period—as part of non-state education, supplementary education, paid educational services, individual entrepreneurship, and corruption. Add to that the variety of terms historically used to refer to private tutoring in Russian (see chapter 7) and it becomes clear why it is hardly even mentioned in policy. This is not to say that it was not problematised and neglected by the government.

Some questions, such as tutor competence, individual privilege, inequality, ethics, governance, and ideological conformity, have constantly been the focus of critical reflection. Yet, their legitimacy and rationale have undergone significant changes over time. Other questions, such as ethics and equality, are of more recent origin and are more characteristic of public rather than authoritative discourse. Below I discuss why these questions have arisen and how they have been ‘answered’ over the last three centuries.

Tutor Competence

One of the oldest policy concerns identified in this dissertation is related to tutors’ competence. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the government continuously questioned the ability of tutors to provide necessary knowledge. However, the conceptualisation of competence changed over time. Whereas in the eighteenth century it was ‘measured’ by the level of tutors’ education and their ability to train effective servicemen, in the nineteenth century it was equated with their ability to transmit national values and foster citizens loyal to the Russian Empire. Accordingly, in addition to academic degrees, tutors’ competence came to be defined by their faith, citizenship, knowledge of the Russian language, culture and traditions, and loyalty to the country.

With the advent of mass education in the Soviet Union the question of competence receded from the policy level. However, concerns about the
professional and moral qualities of private tutors remained paramount in public discourse. Many critics pointed to the low pedagogical value of tutors’ work, suggesting it was reduced to rote learning and coaching for tests. Unlike in imperial times, when the prevailing conceptualisation of the moral elements of competence had been imbued with nationalist sentiments, in the 1970s and, especially, in the 1980s, more attention was paid to the perceived clash between teaching and entrepreneurialism. Even though education outside state institutions became acceptable in the context of growing consumerism, materialism, and individualism, making private profits by selling goods and services was still seen as a manifestation of anti-Soviet values. Consequently, the notion of a good and reliable tutor was more closely linked to their ability to put educational ambitions ahead of economic ones.

The enactment of the Law on Individual Enterprise (Ob Individual’noi Tradovoi Deyatel’nosti Grazhdan SSSR, 1987) in 1987 can be seen as an ‘answer’ to the latter conceptualisation of the question. The law marked a departure from socialist policy, allowing individuals to enter into monetary relations and make a profit in various spheres of life, including education. In justifying this shift, reform advocates argued that the law would allow “qualified instructors and specialists who possess extensive experience and knowledge” (Verkhovnyi Soviet SSSR, 1986, p. 325) to earn extra money while serving the public interest. This meant that the question of tutor competence and the moral dimension of profit-making was no longer a policy concern.

A similar argument was used a couple of decades later when the government tried to ban in-service teachers from tutoring their own students. Commenting on the current draft Law on Education (Proekt Federal’nogo Zakona “Ob Obrazovanii v Rossiiskoi Federatsii”, 2011), the panellists pointed out that since teachers have curricular expertise, they were best equipped to provide remedial tutoring and compensate for possible curricular differences.

Inherited Privilege versus Institutional Merit

Another recurring question, whose dynamics and changing meanings I have traced, is the question of privilege. As I discussed in chapter 5, in order to lure the nobility away from private teachers and tutors into public schools, the imperial government deemed necessary to establish a clear link between educational attainment and social rank. The original idea was to temper the pursuit of ranks without ‘true’ merit, defined as a combination of talent, intellectual ability, and academic achievement.

The civil service examinations, introduced in the early 1800s, were intended to promote public education and in-depth studies of academic subjects as a counterbalance to private tutoring and superficial knowledge. Ultimately, this played a crucial role in shaping the nature of public education: the established link between the level of education and social ranks introduced a new hierarchy of distinctions (in the Bourdieuan sense of the term), which was to be
based on meritocratic rather than hereditary privileges. The quantified indicators of merit (i.e., school grades, awards, diplomas, and certificates), endowed with multiple tasks, became a striking feature of the whole system: they were used as a tool for ranking students, which determined both their physical place in the classroom and their symbolic place on the educational and, ultimately, social ladders. To put it in Foucault’s (1991a) terms, they functioned as a technique of disciplinary power.

The promise of individual advantage and rank promotion through education proved so compelling that it helped to overcome societal resistance to schooling. It also contributed to the nationalisation of home education and some forms of private tutoring in the nineteenth century (chapter 6). On the other hand, the increased use of tests and examinations gave rise to new forms of preparatory and supplementary tutoring and turned many private institutions into cram schools whose main purpose was to prepare children for admission to prestigious grammar schools (Stoyunin, 1865/1892). Overall, these changes meant that both public and private schools began to promote the acquisition of individual privileges, notably in the form of opportunities for promotion in rank, rather than for the common good and the acquisition of knowledge.

What started out as a remedy for the pursuit of ranks in early modern Russia, prompted the strive for institutional merit that has persisted in both Soviet and post-Soviet Russia. However, the system of meritocratic ranking has not led to any significant changes in the social order. As shown in chapter 7, in the nineteenth-century policy discourse, the notion of merit was intricately intertwined with that of aristocracy. Such a merging of merit and hereditary privilege allowed the government to preserve access to prestigious schools for the wealthiest families and to present this as a fair way to reward distinction.

As mentioned above, “the tyranny of merit” (Sandel, 2020) changed the nature of private tutoring. From the nineteenth century onwards, tutors were employed not so much for the harmonious, all-around development of children, but for preparing them for admission to gymnasia, for passing daily tests and annual examinations and, ultimately, for maturity examination and university admission. In the wake of “diploma obsession” (diplomomaniya) in the post-war Soviet Union, they were hired to bridge the growing gap between secondary and higher education and to prepare children for entry into specialised schools that could secure a competitive advantage. Similarly, in contemporary Russia, parents pay for tutoring and preparatory courses to ensure that their children get into prestigious schools and highly ranked universities (RANEPA, 2020; VCIOM, 2019). They do this not only for the sake of knowledge—it can naturally be obtained elsewhere—but also for the presumed merits the entry into these institutions entails.
Equality and Social Justice

The question of equal access to education has also been at the centre of attention during all three historical periods. As early as the eighteenth century, the public was concerned that only rich families could afford highly educated private tutors, while the rest had to settle for the services of shady enterprisers preoccupied only with making a profit. Overall, though, education policy was dominated by a non-egalitarian understanding of justice; that is, rather than reducing persisting disparities in access to education, the imperial government sought to maintain them by providing different educational opportunities for different social classes. This was justified by the notion of inborn differences in educability between social groups. In other words, the government was not concerned about equality in education, whether public or private.

In Soviet Russia, the question of justice, in the egalitarian sense of the term, came to the fore in the public debate on the commercialisation of education and the growing discrepancies between the ideology of equal opportunity and egalitarianism in practice. It was argued that private tutoring exacerbated inequalities by giving students from wealthy families, mostly from urban centres, a privileged opportunity to prepare for entrance examinations. However, even the public system promoted privilege and the growth of an elite. The creation of schools offering special tuition in mathematics and foreign languages is a case in point. On the one hand, these schools were supposed to reduce inequality, replacing private initiative in the training of gifted children. On the other hand, by providing more than an average standard for certain social groups, these schools created unequal opportunities for access to quality education and higher education and as such had little to do with the communist ideology of the Soviet school. Thus, in practice there still was a close relationship between a person’s social background and his or her chances of getting into a prestigious school or university.

In the early 2000s, inequality, especially between urban and rural students, became one of the leitmotifs of the policy rhetoric justifying the introduction of the USE. In particular, the standardised school-leaving and university entrance examination was supposed to eliminate the demand for tutors from specific higher education institutions. The exam was thus intended to equalise the chances of admission to higher education for all graduates regardless of their place of residence and material conditions, thereby eliminating inequalities between the privileged and disadvantaged groups. However, as social surveys and research studies show, tutoring still remains an important link between secondary and higher education in Russia\textsuperscript{115}. Moreover, this very argument was used by the public when discussing the new law on education in the early 2010s. It was stated that banning teachers from tutoring their own students

\textsuperscript{115} For references, see chapters 1 and 2.
would deprive rural students of virtually all opportunities to receive additional lessons and thus deepen the urban-rural gap.

It is worth noticing that in both the Soviet and post-Soviet periods, the question of inequality, including between urban and rural schools, was constructed in such a way that it focused on disadvantaged students. However, it did not question the privileged position of those who had access to and could afford private tutoring, preparatory courses, or paid electives. Nor did it address the structural causes of these inequalities.

Ethics and Corruption

In Imperial and Soviet Russia, the ethical aspects of private tutoring were only discussed by the public, whereas in authoritative discourse they were scarcely noticed. In the post-Soviet period, by contrast, the corruption associated with some forms of private tutoring constituted one of the main arguments used to justify policy change. Drawing on unambiguously polarised metaphors of light and shadow, truth and lies, the government presented market-oriented reforms as a necessary step in rooting out corruption and nurturing entrepreneurial and ethical citizens (chapter 9).

In the early 2010s, ethical concerns were once again put on the political agenda. This time the spotlight was placed on tutoring supplied by in-service teachers to their own students. Although the practice has long roots, up until this point it was either encouraged (in imperial and early post-Soviet Russia) or completely absent from policy discussions (in the Soviet period). However, in the twenty-first century, following the introduction of the Anti-Corruption Act (О Protivodeistvii Korruptsiyi, 2008), this practice was apparently re-assessed and submitted to public discussion in connection with the drafting of the new Law on Education. However, the adopted version of the law does not prohibit teachers from providing paid educational services to their students if this does not lead to a conflict of interest (Об Образовании в Российской Федерации, 2012). The ambiguity of this wording relativises the ethical dilemma, indicating that it is recognized only as a potential problem that can be prevented or solved without imposing additional rules and regulations (chapter 10).

There is a slight but significant modification in the problematisation of this issue between the two points in history. Whereas the modernisation reforms of the early 2000s were aimed at legalising the flow of shadow money and redirecting private investment into the public system, in the latter case the aim was not to bring internal tutoring out of the shadows, but to prevent teachers from abusing their professional position. In other words, in the former case the problem was not so much ethical as economic, whereas in the latter case the economic dimension of a similar practice seems to be of less concern. However, none of these policy initiatives forbids or unambiguously regulates what are deemed as ethically dubious tutoring practices, which indicates that,
as such, they appear to decision-makers to be less evil than the possible consequences of prohibiting them.

Governance and Ideological Conformity

Based on my analysis of policy documents, it can be argued that the question that has received the most attention is that of governance and ideological conformity. This problem runs deeper than others described in this dissertation and therefore, paradoxically, is not immediately apparent. Overall, my analysis suggests that the mimicking character of private supplementary tutoring is not its natural feature. Rather, in the case of Russia, it is the effect of constant problematisation and the corresponding regulation of its conformity with what are regarded as sacred national values.

As early as the eighteenth century, the government expressed concern about the lack of homogeneity between public and private education. The policies adopted for private education were permeated by fear that, left without state control and supervision, private teachers and tutors could convey values potentially harmful to the existing political and social order. To block this path, the government demanded “perfect alignment” of all forms of education in terms of content and teaching methods. At the beginning of the nineteenth century these ambitions culminated in the partial nationalisation and institutionalisation of private and home education as legitimate alternatives to schooling.

The widespread nationalisation of education in the Soviet Union took the issues of government and ideological conformity off the agenda. However, the growth of private enterprise during perestroika brought these questions back to the forefront. This is illustrated by the Law on Individual Enterprise (Ob Individual’noi Trudovoi Deyatel’nosti Grazhdan SSSR, 1987), which allowed tutors to give instruction only in the subjects included in the curricula of public institutions.

In contrast, the Law on Education (Ob Obrazovanii, 1992), adopted shortly after the dissolution of the Soviet Union, entitled schools to offer paid educational services in subjects not included in the curriculum. The period of soft governance did not last long: at the turn of the millennium Putin’s government launched a series of reforms, including the introduction of the USE, which according to some observers, can be seen as a case of “authoritarian modernisation” (Gel’man & Starodubtsev, 2016). Although there are indications that the USE has increased rather than decreased the demand for private tutoring, it does not seem to be considered a problem. This is not to say that the question of curricular and ideological conformity has disappeared. Rather, as I argued in chapter 9, this indicates that private tutoring is no longer seen as a competitor but rather as a mere complement to school. The compliance of supplementary educational activities is believed to be ensured by the meritocratic
principle of upward social mobility, which forces students to perform better within a standardised system.

Clearly, in a society where “uniformity of thought” (Betskoi, 1764, p. 5; see chapter 5) prevails over other values, curriculum-based tutoring is and has historically been given less political thought. While it certainly poses some challenges (mostly economic, such as hidden money flows and taxpaying), supplementary tutoring promotes values similar to those codified in the formal curriculum and does not call into question established ‘truths’ about what is worth knowing and achieving. On the contrary, by operating within the ideological limits set by the standardised curriculum, it reinforces its legitimacy and ensures that the centrally prescribed goals are met.

What have worried, and, obviously, continues to worry, the authoritarian government are educational practices that ignore or go beyond the formal curriculum. In this case, the question of curricular and ideological conformity takes on a special urgency. This could be seen in the first half of the nineteenth century, which was marked by a noticeable intensification of the government’s struggle against private education, seen as a means of spreading “improper” Western ideas (chapter 6). This trend is also visible in today’s Russia.

In this regard, the latest amendment to the Law on Education promulgated in 2021 is indicative. Among other things, the law forbids educational activities (prosvetitel’skaya deyatel’nost’) that go beyond the formal curriculum, conveying what could be regarded as “inaccurate information about the historical, national, religious, and cultural tradition” (O Vnesenii Izmenenii v Federal’nyi Zakon “Ob Obrazovanii v Rossiiskoi Federatsii” (v Chasti Vvedeniya Prosvetitel’skoi Deyatel’nosti), 2020). The provision covers a wide range of unauthorised activities which can be classified as educational and which the government may deem harmful and “inciting actions contrary to the Constitution of the Russian Federation”. Potentially, it could extend to private tutoring if it does not transmit an official view on historical, religious, cultural, or social issues. According to the authors of the bill, the law is essential to prevent “negative foreign influence on the educational process” (Komitet Gosudarstvennoi Dumy po Obrazovaniyu i Nauke, 2020). This remark is strikingly reminiscent of the nationalist rhetoric of the early nineteenth century, when most reforms concerning home and private education were justified by the need to protect the country and “true” Russian values of Orthodoxy, authority, and nationality from liberal foreign ideas.

Arguably, this shift in problematisation—from concerns for building a transparent market of educational services in the early 2000s to a greater emphasis on (re-)building the nation in the 2020s—signals a new stage in the relationship between public and private in Russian education. This neoconservative rationality is likely to have an impact on how other issues, such as tutor competence and teaching content, are (re-)considered and regulated.
Transforming the Nature of Public Education

As noted in the introduction, in scholarly discourse, the notion of ‘publicness’ in education is often equated with democracy. Consequently, public education is seen as a solution to many of society’s problems, while private tutoring—as an obstacle to be eradicated. However, as this dissertation has shown, the origins of public education have little to do with democratic and emancipatory aspirations. Rather, the idea of public schools as well as major educational reforms were underpinned by pragmatic, paternalistic, nationalistic, and economic needs. Nor is there a simple link between the expansion of the public system and the democratisation of political power. As argued in the previous section, even in the context of mass education, characteristic of today’s Russia, the government may seek to prevent democratic ideas and institutions in the name of political stability. It is worth emphasizing that similar dynamics can be observed not only in Russia, but also in other historical and contemporary contexts, both liberal and authoritarian (see e.g., Green, 2013).

When it comes to private and non-formal education, with the exception of the first half of the nineteenth century, they were seen and treated mainly as a ‘symptom’, while the main concerns were found elsewhere. It is therefore not surprising that private tutoring was often addressed indirectly, through reforms in public education. Below, I summarise the role that the problematisations of private tutoring played in shaping public education in Russia.

I have already mentioned the rise of meritocracy as one of the consequences of the government’s struggle against a public preference for private education. Having established in the early nineteenth century a permanent link between educational attainment and social status, the government created a new system of ranks and divisions in schools. This system fed into social stratification and encouraged competition, individualism, and personal advantage—all the things usually associated with private tutoring.

Furthermore, in Imperial Russia the government’s campaign against private education led to a revision of school curricula. Seeking a “perfect alignment” of all forms of education, the Ministry of Education required private educators to follow the formal curriculum, and, at the same time, it adjusted public schools to the interests of the gentry. As a result, the range of subjects in elite schools was expanded to include music, art, dancing, fencing, riding etc. These subjects had previously been a natural part of the nobles’ home and private education (chapters 5 and 6).

Similarly, as described in chapter 8, Soviet authorities were looking for ways to reduce the demand for private tutoring and replace it with public alternatives. To this end, they established preparatory courses, introduced electives in regular schools and set up specialised schools with in-depth study of certain subjects. In contrast to regular ones, such schools promoted individualism and excellence and offered privilege and high symbolic capital for their students. Although this policy change was relatively insignificant in
quantitative terms (after all, only a small proportion of students attended these schools), it had considerable ideological implications. The retreat from the principle of uniformity marked a decisive break with the communist vision of education. In justifying that, officials and academics alike claimed that partly differentiated curricula would better meet the needs of a particular social group—this time of academically gifted talented students and of intelligentsia—preventing them from being poached by private initiatives. Put another way, in combating the growing tutoring industry, the Soviet school had to adopt some of the traits commonly associated with just that industry, namely individualisation, exam drills, and the promotion of quantified material and symbolic benefits.

In the same spirit, the modernisation reforms of the 2000s, discussed in chapter 9, were presented by their authors as a means of fighting corrupt tutoring practices. However, as opponents pointed out, a standard-based curriculum, along with the extensive use of quasi-market mechanisms, is likely to change the very nature of education. It involves the restructuring of public institutions along market lines, forcing schools to act like business ventures that must make a profit, and reducing teaching to cramming, rote learning and preparation for high-stakes tests. Ironically, these are the qualities for which private tutoring is usually criticized.

### Shifting Shadows

The increased academic interest in private tutoring over the last few decades has largely been driven by a problem-solving approach. Using medical vocabulary, many scholars have offered recommendations for ‘diagnosing’, ‘curing’, or preventing the spread of the ‘disease’ around the world. Contrary to these tendencies, in this study I have suggested new ways of researching private or informal educational practices, which may enrich and deepen our understanding of the relations between the public and the private in education. From the start I have argued that a conceptualisation of private tutoring as a ‘shadow’ of the mainstream system is based on simplistic and often misleading assumptions about both public education and private tutoring. It reinforces the public-private dichotomy, overlooking the complex, two-ways interaction between the two.

Assuming that a more nuanced, non-binary understanding of public and private can generate new insights into the history of education and contribute new perspectives to the study of politics and policy making in education, I sought to avoid the established narratives that tend to romanticise public education and present private alternatives as a given policy problem. Driven by an interest in exploring public and private forms of education as mutually constitutive, I have taken a genealogical approach and drawn attention to the process of policy formation. In particular, I have extended the application of
curriculum theory and examined tutoring as a contextualised educational practice whose meaning and significance may be completely different in one particular historical and cultural environment than in another. In this way, I highlighted the role of curriculum in normalising certain worldviews and establishing particular boundaries between the legitimate and the problematic, the permitted and the forbidden, the formal and the informal, the public and the private.

By inquiring empirically in the ways in which private tutoring was problematised in authoritative and public discourses over time, I have identified and discussed several perennial questions on the basis of which different policies regarding tutoring were adopted or, conversely, public education was reformed. It is important to point out that most of these questions are not unique to Russia and, therefore, cannot be attributed exclusively to authoritarian governmentality. Arguably, issues such as access to education, teacher competence, certification, curriculum differentiation, standardisation and unification, assessment, quality, equality, and ethics form fundamental matters of concern for educational thought over time and space. However, the ways in which these issues are conceived and addressed vary in accord with changing mentalities of government and shifting perceptions of the desirable education, the citizen, and the imagined future.

Furthermore, as shown in this dissertation, the boundaries between private and public forms of education are fluid. Ironically, the more the state system mutated to make undesirable forms of education less attractive, the more traits of private tutoring it absorbed, enabling at the same time new forms of tutoring to emerge and flourish. Moreover, as the commentaries from the nineteenth, twentieth and twenty-first centuries repeatedly showed, no matter how education policies change, tutoring is likely to exist as long as people’s well-being hinges on institutional merit that distributes individuals according to a symbolic table of ranks. Naturally, changes in the structure, content, pedagogy, or assessment procedures in the mainstream system provoke changes in tutoring practices. However, while certainly related to the formal curriculum, these changes are not limited to mimicry and imitation.

This symbiotic relationship between public education and private tutoring transcends the binary oppositions of public and private, individual and society, and the moral coordinates of ‘good’ and ‘evil’. Thus, it cannot be reduced to any single function, be it supplementation, extension, enrichment, or anything else. Rather, the relation between the two changes like shifting shadows, reflecting, and ultimately shaping, our beliefs about what education is and ought to be.
Swedish summary

Introduktion


Mot denna bakgrund är det inte förvånande att dagens forskning om skuggutbildning präglas av ett problemlösningsperspektiv. Det framträder bland annat i policystudier som fokuserat på vad som skulle kunna kallas "lösningarnas historia" (Foucault, 2000, s. 256). Denna typ av studier kartlägger olika policystrategier och erbjuder rekommendationer med syfte att "diagnostisera", "bota" eller förhindra en alltför stor spridning av privata och kompletterande undervisningspraktiker. Gemensamt för dessa är att de förutsätter att den globala spridningen av privatundervisning är en konsekvens av en nyliberal agenda och ser det som ett problem som bör hanteras av policy.

Den här avhandlingen har en annan ansats och erbjuder vad som skulle kunna beskrivas som en "problematiseringarnas historia" med ett övergripande syfte att utveckla en genealogi av relationer mellan det offentliga och det privata inom utbildning. Studiens forskningsfrågor riktar uppmärksamheten mot hur offentlig utbildning och privatundervisning formar och förändrar varandra, och varför olika former av privatundervisning ses som legitima eller problematiska i olika historiska och kulturella sammanhang.

Genealogi betraktas här genom linsen av problematisering och bygger på empiriska exempel från den ryska kontexten. Detta innebär att jag undersöker
hur privatundervisning har probleematiserats och hanterats i Ryssland över tid och genom att diskutera hur dessa probleematiseringar återspeglar och formar dominerande visioner om utbildning.


Teoretisk inramning och empiriskt material

Relationen mellan det offentliga och det privata inom utbildning studeras här genom ett genealogiskt tillvägagångssätt och med utgångspunkt i läroplansteori och Foucaults begrepp *governmentality* (styrningsmentalitet) och *problematisering*.


Genom att sammankoppla läroplansteori och Foucaults teoribildning utforskar avhandlingen hur olika utbildningspraktiker tar form och förändras i relation till varandra och den formella läroplanen. Samtidigt hjälper dessa teoretiska utgångspunkter att synliggöra hur en viss förståelse av problemet, som policy säger sig vilja lösa, formas, rättfärdigas och modifieras i specifika historiska och politiska sammanhang. Detta har i sin tur konsekvenser för hur gränserna mellan olika utbildningspraktiker dras och huruvida de framstår som legitima eller problematiska.

Analysen är begränsad till diskursiv nivå och bygger på en kombination av officiella policydokument (totalt 218) och informella källor (över 460), inklusive memoarer, brev, tidningsartiklar och annonser, vilka på ett eller annat sätt lyfter privatundervisning som fenomen och företeelse. När det gäller policydokumenten bör det noteras att endast ungefär hälften av dem (123) direkt reglerar eller explicit nämner privatundervisning. De övriga dokumenten är i första hand avsedda att reglera den officiella utbildningen, men som analysen av deras formering visar, kan de ses som ett indirekt sätt att bekämpa eller förebygga önskade utbildningspraktiker, varav privatundervisning utgör en inte oansenlig del.

Konklusion av studiens resultat


Avhandlingens empiriska kapitel visar att normer, värden och kunskaper i relation till vilka privatundervisningen problematiseras i Ryssland har varierat i linje med nationalistiska, kommunistiska och nyliberala visioner om utbildning. Vissa frågor, som till exempel privatlärarnas kompetens, elevers individuella privilegier, frågor om jämlikhet och ojämlikhet, etik, styrning och ideologisk konformitet, har hela tiden stått i fokus för kritisk reflektion. Problematiseringen av etiska aspekter av vissa former av privatundervisning är däremot karakteristisk för vissa diskurser och historiska sammanhang.
Nedan redovisas kort de centrala frågor som varit dominerande i relation till studiens kunskapsobjekt och den roll som problematiseringen av privatundervisning spelade för utformningen av det allmänna utbildningsväsendet i Ryssland.

Privatlärares kompetens


Nedärvda privilegier kontra utbildningsmeriter

I början av 1800-talet aktualiserades behovet av att upprätta en tydligare koppling mellan individers utbildningsnivå och deras sociala rang. Den ursprungliga tanken var att locka bort adelns barn från privat lärare och i stället få dem att ansluta till den officiella skolan. Det fanns även en ambition att mildra
sociala ojämlikheter och skapa ett system baserat på “äkta” meriter, definierade som en kombination av talang, intellektuell förmåga och akademiska prestationer (kapitel 5).

Särskilda examinationer för tillträde till statliga befattningar (civil service examinations), vilka infördes i början av 1800-talet infördes, avsåg att främja allmänbildningen och utbildningsstandarden hos tjänstemän. Med tiden kom kopplingen mellan utbildning och social rang att spela en avgörande roll för utformningen av den offentliga utbildningen; den introducerade en ny hierarki av distinktioner (i Bourdieus mening av termen), som skulle basera sig på utbildningsmässiga meriter snarare än ärliga privilegier. Skolbetyg, utmärkelser, diplom och intyg fick nu en dubbel funktion; de kom att användas som ett sätt att rangordna eleverna och bestämde såväl deras fysiska plats i klassrummet som deras symboliska plats inom den sociala hierarkin (kapitel 7).


Systemet med social rangordning baserat på utbildningsmeriter snarare än nedärvda privilegier har dock inte lett till några betydande förändringar i den sociala ordningen. Däremot förändrade “meriternas tyranni” (Sandel, 2020) privatundervisningens karaktär. Från och med 1800-talet och framåt anställde lärare inte för att främja barnens mer holistiska utveckling utan för att förbereda dem för att komma in på gymnasier, för att klara olika prov samt för att ha framgång vid avläggandet av mognadsexamen som skulle möjliggöra att komma in på olika universitet (kapitel 7). Denna tendens fortsatte under Sovjettiden. Även om allt egenföretagande i princip var förbjuden, anlitades privata lärare i efterkrigstidens Sovjetunionen för att överbrygga en upplevd växande klyfta mellan sekundär och högre utbildning samt för att förbereda barnen för inträde i skolor med fördjupad undervisning i främmande språk eller matematik (kapitel 8). I dagens Ryssland betalar föräldrar för privatundervisning för att se till att deras barn kommer in på prestigefyllda skolor och högt rankade universitet (RANEPA, 2020; VCIOM, 2019). De gör det inte bara för kunskapens skull utan också för de meriter som inträdet i dessa institutioner innebär.

**Jämlikhet och social rättvisa**

Frågan om lika tillgång till utbildning har stått i centrum för uppmärksamheten under alla tre historiska perioder. Redan på 1700-talet oroade sig allmänheten över att endast rika familjer hade råd med kompetenta privatlärare, medan

I Sovjetryssland kom frågan om rättvisa, i egalitär mening, i förgrunden av den offentliga debatten. Det hävdades att privatundervisning ökade ojämlikheten eftersom den gav elever från rika familjer, främst från de större städerna, fler möjligheter till att förbereda sig för olika inträdesprov. Men även det offentliga systemet främjade individuella privilegier och möjliggjorde en ny elits framväxt genom skapandet av skolor med avancerad undervisning i matematik och främmande språk. Å ena sidan hävdade man att dessa skolor skulle ersätta privata utbildningsalternativ som särskilt begävade elever sökte sig till. Samtidigt erbjud dessa skolor en högre standard än genomsnittet, vilket skapade ojämlika möjligheter till kvalitetsutbildning och hade som så föga att göra med den sovjetiska skolans officiella komunistiska ideologi. I praktiken fanns det fortfarande ett nära samband mellan en persons sociala bakgrund och hans eller hennes chanser att komma in på en prestigefylld skola eller universitet (kapitel 8).


Det är värt att notera att under både den sovjetiska och den postsovjetiska perioden diskuterades frågan om ojämlikhet, inklusive den mellan skolor i städer och på landsbygden, på ett sådant sätt att den fokuserade på missgynnade elever utan att ifrågasatta den privilegerade positionen av dem som hade tillgång till och råd med privatundervisning och förberedande kurser. Diskussionen tog inte heller upp de strukturella orsakerna till dessa orättvisor.
Etik och korruption

I det kejserliga och sovjetiska Ryssland uppkom frågan om korruption i samband med privatundervisning endast i den offentliga diskursen, medan den knappt uppmärksammas av policymakare. Däremot tog den en central plats i policydiskursen under den postsovjetiska perioden och användes som ett av de viktigaste argumenten för de kommande utbildningsreformerna. Förutom att lösa flera utbildningsproblem, skulle införandet av USE, GIFO (en form av voucher för högre utbildning) och en 12-årig skola utrota korruption och eliminera behovet av privatundervisning och högskoleförberedande kurser (kapitel 9).

Frågan om etiskt tveksamma former av privatundervisning diskuterades mer intensivt i början av 2010-talet i samband med införandet av den nya lagen om utbildning. Enligt förslaget skulle lärare förbjudas att undervisa sina egna elever mot betalning. Den antagna versionen av lagen tillåter dock denna praxis så länge det inte leder till en intressekonflikt (Ob Obrazovanii v Rossiiskoi Federatsii, 2012).

Det finns en liten men betydande förändring i problematiseringen av denna fråga mellan de historiska tidpunkterna. Medan moderniseringsreformerna i början av 2000-talet syftade till att legalisera flödet av “skuggpengar” (det vill säga pengar inom privatundervisningens domäner) och omdirigera privata investeringar till det offentliga systemet (kapitel 9), var målet i det senare fallet inte att få bukt med intern privatundervisning, utan att förebygga oetiska praktiker i skolan. Med andra ord var problemet i det första fallet inte så mycket etiskt som ekonomiskt, medan den ekonomiska dimensionen i det senare fallet tycks vara av mindre betydelse. Å andra sidan, kan den antagna lagens tvetydiga formulering tolkas som att den etiskt tveksamma praktiken endast erkänns som ett potentiellt problem som dock kan förebyggas eller lösas utan att det för den sakens skull behöver införas ytterligare regler och bestämmelser (kapitel 10).

Styrning och ideologisk konformitet

Under de tre perioder som studerats i denna avhandling har frågan om styrning och ideologisk konformitet fått mest uppmärksamhet. Denna fråga är djupare än andra som beskrivs ovan och är därför inte uppenbar.

Redan på 1700-talet uttrycktes oro över att privatlärare, av vilka de flesta var utlänningar, skulle förmedla värdningar som ansågs vara skadliga för den rådande politiska och sociala ordningen. För att hindra det krävde regeringen en “perfekt överensstämmelse” mellan alla former av utbildning och undervisning när det gäller innehåll och undervisningsmetoder. I början av 1800-talet kulminerade dessa ambitioner i ett partiellt förstatligande av vissa former av privat- och hemundervisning (kapitel 6).

Efter den omfattande nationaliseringen av utbildningen i Sovjetunionen togs frågorna om styrning och ideologisk konformitet tillfälligt ned i
policydiskursen, för att återigen aktualiseras under perestrojkan. Detta framgår av den ovannämnda lagen om individuellt företagande (Ob Individual’noi Trudovoi Deyatel’nosti Grazhdan SSSR, 1987), vilken tillåt privata lärare att ge undervisning, dock endast i de ämnen som ingick i de officiella institutionernas läroplaner (kapitel 8).

Den första lagen om utbildning i ryska federationen (Ob Obrazovaniii, 1992), som antogs år 1992, gav skolorna rätt att erbjuda betalda utbildnings tjänster i ämnen som inte ingår i läroplanen. Men redan vid millennieskiftet inleddde Putins regering en rad standardiseringar, inklusive införandet av USE, som enligt vissa kan ses som ett uttryck för ”auktoritär moderniserings” (Gel’man & Starodubtsev, 2016). Även om flera sociologiska undersökningar visar att USE snarare har ökat än minskat efterfrågan på privatundervisning, verkar detta inte ses som ett problem (kapitel 9).

I ett samhälle där ”enhettligt tänkande” (Betskoi, 1764, s. 5) är överordnad andra värderingar är det inte förvånande att läroplansbaserad privatundervisning (jfr. läxhjälp) får lite politisk uppmärksamhet. Även om det förvisso innebär vissa utmaningar (främst ekonomiska, såsom dolda penningflöden), främjar denna typ av privatundervisning normer och värden som liknar dem som kodifierats i den formella läroplanen. Genom att verka inom samma ideologiska gränser, ifrågasätter den inte den formella läroplanens legitimitet och de etablerade ”sanningarna” om vad som är värt att veta och uppnå; tvärtom, hjälper den eleverna att prestera bättre inom ramen för en standardiserad läroplan.


Transformering av det allmänna utbildningsväsendet


Som beskrivits ovan, för att etablera en permanent koppling mellan utbildningsnivå och social status skapade regeringen i början av 1800-talet ett nytt system för att rangordna elever i skolan. Detta system uppmuntrade konkurrens, individualism och personliga fördelar, det vill säga det som vanligtvis förknippas med privatundervisning. Regeringens kampanj mot privatundervisning ledde dessutom till en översyn av skolornas läroplaner. I strävan efter en strömlinjeförmåning mellan alla former av utbildning krävde utbildningsministeriet att privata lärare skulle följa den formella läroplanen, samtidigt som man anpassade statliga skolor till adelns intressen. Som ett resultat utvidgades ämnesutbudet i elitstolarna till att omfatta musik, konst, dans, fäktning, ridning. Dessa ämnen hade tidigare varit en naturlig del av adelns hem- och privatundervisning (kapitel 5 och 6).

På liknande sätt, för att minska efterfrågan på privatundervisning under Sovjettiden, inrättades förberedande kurser och specialiserade skolor med för djupade studier i vissa ämnen. Dessa skolor främjade individualism och excellens och gav sina elever konkurrensprivileger med ett högt symboliskt värde. Med andra ord, i kampen mot den växande privatundervisningen var den sovjetiska skolan tvungen att anta några av de drag som vanligtvis för knippas med privatundervisning, nämligen individualisering, coaching inför prov och främjande av personliga materiella och symboliska fördelar.

Skiftande skuggor

I de inledande kapitlen konstateras att det akademiska intresset för skuggutbildning under de senaste decennierna till stor del har drivits av ett problemlösende synsätt. I motsats till dessa tendenser har jag från början antytt att en förståelse av privatundervisning som en “skugga” eller som en “imitation” bygger på förenklade och ofta missvisande antaganden om både offentlig utbildning och privatundervisning. En sådan uppfattning förstärker dikotomin privat-offentligt och förbiser den komplexa, ömsesidiga interaktionen mellan olika utbildningsformer, vilket medför betydande begränsningar för hur de utforskas och förstås.

Genom att undersöka hur privatundervisning problematiserades i olika historiska och politiska kontexter i Ryssland, har jag lyft fram några eviga frågor som låg till grund för hur olika policystrategier utvecklades. Dessa frågor rör sig om så vitt skilda fenomen och företeelser som tillgång till utbildning, lärarkompetens, certifiering, differentiering, unifiering och standardisering av läroplaner, utbildningsinnehåll, bedömningspraktiker, kvalitet, jämlikhet och etik. Dessa frågor är på inget sätt unika för Ryssland utan utgör de mest grundläggande utbildningspolitiska frågorna över tid och rum.

Som jag har visat i denna avhandling är gränserna mellan privata och offentliga former av utbildning flytande och förändras i takt med historiskt och kulturellt etablerade uppfattningar om den önskade samhället och den tänkta framtid som man tror att utbildningen kan bidra till att uppnå. Detta har naturligtvis konsekvenser för privatundervisningens utformning, syfte och innehåll, vilka dock inte är begränsade till reproduktion, imitation eller komplettering. Paradoxalt nog, ju mer det statliga systemet förändrades för att göra oönskade former av utbildning mindre attraktiva, desto fler drag av privatundervisning absorberade det, vilket också gjorde det möjligt för nya former av privatundervisning att uppstå och utvecklas.

Detta symbiotiska förhållande mellan skolan och privatundervisning överskriver alltså de binära motsättningarna mellan privat och offentligt, individ och samhälle, och de moraliska koordinaterna av “gott” och “ont”. Snarare förändras förhållandet mellan dem som skiftande skuggor, vilket återspeglar och i slutändan formar våra uppfattningar om vad utbildning är och bör vara.
Bibliography

Empirical Sources


Chkhikvishvili, D. (1979, March 6). Bagazh ili ballast?: Prodolzhayem obsuzhdat’ problemy popolneniya vysshey shkoly [Baggage or ballast? We continue to discuss the problem of higher education enrolment]. Pravda, 3.


Durinin, A. (1922, October 17). Pora podumat’ o chetkoi linii v prosveshchenii [Time to think about a clear line in education]. Pravda, 1.


K osennim ispytaniyam v shkole nado khorosho podgotovit’sya [You need to be well prepared for the autumn examinations in school]. (1939, July 16). Pionerskaya Pravda, 1.


MNP. (1875d). O merakh protiv umnozheniya pansionov i chastnykh uchebnykh za-
vedenii. Ot 4 noyabrya 1833 [On measures against the proliferation of boarding
schools and private education establishments. November 4, 1833]. In Sbornik
postanovlenii po ministerstvu narodnogo prosveshcheniya [Collected proceed-
ings of the Ministry of National Enlightenment]: Vol. 2. Tsarstvovanie impera-

MNP. (1875e). O predvaritel’nom obrazovanii Moskovskogo Blagorodnogo Instituta.
Ot 22 fevralya 1833 [On the preliminary foundation of the Moscow Noble Insti-
tute. February 22, 1833]. In Sbornik postanovlenii po ministerstvu narodnogo
prosveteleniya [Collected proceedings of the Ministry of National Enlighten-

MNP. (1875f). O tochnom povsemestnom nabliudenii pravil o prieme v uchebnye
zavedeniya lyudey razlichnykh sostoyanii. Ot 9 maya 1837 [On the strict super-
vision of the rules for the admission of people of different states to educational
institutions. May 9, 1837]. In Sbornik postanovlenii po ministerstvu narodnogo
prosescheniya [Collected proceedings of the Ministry of National Enlightenment]:
Vol. 2. Tsarstvovanie imperatora Nikolaya I. 1825–1855 [god]. Otdelenie

MNP. (1875g). O vospreshchenii prinimat’ v dolzhnosti po domashnemu vospitaniyu
inostrantsev, nepoluchivshikh attestatov ot Russkikh Universitetov. Ot 25 maya
1834 [On prohibiting the admission to positions in home education of foreigners
who have not obtained certificates from Russian Universities. March 25, 1834].
In Sbornik postanovlenii po ministerstvu narodnogo prosvescheniya [Collected
proceedings of the Ministry of National Enlightenment]: Vol. 2. Tsarstvovanie

MNP. (1875h). Ob ispytanii domashnikh inostrannykh uchitelye. Ot 19 janvarya 1812
[On the examination of foreign home teachers. January 19, 1812]. In Sbornik
postanovlenii po ministerstvu narodnogo prosvescheniya [Collected proceed-
ings of the Ministry of National Enlightenment]: Vol. 1. Tsarstvovanie impera-
heva.

MNP. (1875i). Obshchii ustav Imperatorskikh Rossiiskikh universitetov. Ot 26 iyulya
1835 [General Statute of the Imperial Russian Universities. July 26, 1835]. In
Sbornik postanovlenii po ministerstvu narodnogo prosvescheniya [Collected
proceedings of the Ministry of National Enlightenment]: Vol. 2. Tsarstvovanie

MNP. (1875j). Polozhenie o domashnikh nastavnikakh i uchitelyakh. July 1, 1834
[Statute on home tutors and teachers]. In Sbornik postanovlenii po ministerstvu
narodnogo prosvescheniya [Collected proceedings of the Ministry of National
heva.

MNP. (1875k). S predstavleniem otcheta Tainogo Sovetnika Uvarova po obozreniyu
im Moskovskago universiteta i Gimnazii. Ot 4 dekabrya 1932 [A report by Privy
Councilor Uvarov on his inspection of the Moscow University and the Gymna-
sium. December 4, 1932]. In Sbornik postanovlenii po ministerstvu narodnogo
prosescheniya [Collected proceedings of the Ministry of National


Molodtsova, V. (2001b, April 18). Dvenadtsatiletka nam po rostu [A 12-year-school is the right height for us]. Rossiiskaya Gazeta, 5.


Pionerskaya Pravda. (1934, August 4). Budu poseshchat’ repetitorskuyu gruppu [I will be attending a tutoring group]. Pionerskaya Pravda, 1.


PSZ. (1830d). O yavke nedoroslyam v Sanktpeterburg k Gerol’dmeysteru, a v Guberniyakh k Gubernatoram dlya osvidetel’stvovaniya ikh v naukakh; o naznachenii im srokov k obucheniyu i ob opredelenii ikh na mesta, po dostizhenii 20-letnego vozrasta. No 7171, ot 9 fevralya 1737 [On the attendance of unschooled
adolescents in St Petersburg to the herald master, and in the provinces to the governors to certify them in sciences; for setting terms of study for them and assigning them to places when they reach the age of 20. No 7171, February 9, 1737]. In Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiiskoi Imperii. Sobranie pervoe (1649–1825) [The complete collection of laws of the Russian Empire. Collection 1 (1649–1825)] (Vol. 10, pp. 43–45). Tipografia II otdeleniya sobsvennoi ego imperatorskogo velichestva kanzelarii.


PSZ. (1830f). Tabel’ o rangakh vsekh chinov, voinskikh, statskikh i pridvornykh, kotorye v kotorom klasse chiny; i kotorye v odnom klasse, to imeyut po starshinstvu vremeni vstupleniya v chin mezhdu soboyu, odnako zh Voinskie vyshe prochikh, khotyby i staree kto v tom klasse pozhalovan byl. No 3890, ot 24 yanvarya 1727 [The table of ranks of all the military, civil and court ranks, which ranks are in which class; and those in the same class have seniority of rank between them, but those in military rank are higher than the others, even if they are older than those in that class. No 3890, January 24, 1722]. In Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiiskoi Imperii. Sobranie pervoe (1649–1825) [The complete collection of laws of the Russian Empire. Collection 1 (1649–1825)] (Vol. 6, pp. 486–491). Tipografia II otdeleniya sobsvennoi ego imperatorskogo velichestva kanzelarii.


Repetitorskie gruppy [Tutoring groups]. (1940, August 11). Pravda, 4.


Savin, G. N. (1941, August 9). I uchit’’sya, i rabotat’ dlya fronta [Studying and working for the front]. Pionerskaya Pravda, 1.


“Skol’ko deneg nuzhno na reformu, podschtat’ nel’zya” [It is hard to estimate how much funding the reform would require]. (2001, April 26). Kommersant, 8.


Voronov, A. S. (1849). Istoriko-statisticheskoie obozrenie uchebnykh zavedenii S. Peterburgskogo uchebnogo okruga s 1715 po 1828 god vkluchitel’no [Historical and statistical survey of the educational establishments of the St. Petersburg Educational District from 1715 to 1828]. Tipografiya Yakova Treya.

Voronov, A. S. (1858). Fedor Ivanovich Yankovich de Mirievo, ili Narodnye uchilischcha v Rossii pri imperatritse Yekaterine II-y [Fyodor Ivanovich Yankovich de Mirievo, or People’s schools in Russia under empress Catherine II]. Tipografiya Eduarda Pratsa.


Vzyatki v vuzakh berut i naturoi [Bribes are taken in kind at universities]. (2000, June 28). Sovetskaya Chuvashiya.


Yemel’yanov, A. (1968, November 11). Put’ iz sela v vusshuyu shkolu—Nauchnyu osnovu [The road from the countryside to higher education: The rules for admission to higher education must be given a scientific basis!]. Pravda, 3.


References

Aleshintsev, I. (1908). Soslovnyi vopros i politika v istorii nasihkh gymnazi v XIX veke: (Istoricheskii ocherk) [The question of estate and politics in the history of our gymnasium in the 19th century. (A historical essay)]. Isd. zhurnal “Russkaya shkola.”

236
Aleshintsev, I. (1912). *Istoriya gimnazicheskogo obrazovaniya v Rossii (XVIII i XIX veck)* [The history of gymnasium education in Russia (18th and 19th centuries)]. Izdanie O. Bogdanovoi.


238
Bolshov, V. B. (2018). Repetitorstvo kak faktor sotsial’nogo neravenstva v obra-
zoval’noi srede [Tutoring as a factor of social inequality in the educational en-
Bray, M. (2003). Adverse effects of private supplementary tutoring: Dimensions, im-
plications and government responses. International Institute for Educational Planning.
cies for what private tutoring? UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP).
Bray, M. (2010). Researching shadow education: Methodological challenges and di-
Bray, M. (2013a). Benefits and tensions of shadow education: Comparative perspec-
Bray, M. (2013b). Shadow education: Comparative perspectives on the expansion and im-
Bray, M. (2017). Schooling and its supplements: Changing global patterns and impli-
cations for comparative education. Comparative Education Review, 61(3), 469–
491. https://doi.org/10.1086/692709
privatised public education: Fee-charging supplementary tutoring provided by
Bray, M., Kobakhidze, M. N., Zhang, W., & Liu, J. (2018). The hidden curriculum in
a hidden marketplace: Relationships and values in Cambodia’s shadow education
Bray, M., & Kwo, O. (2013). Behind the façade of fee-free education: Shadow educa-
Bray, M., & Kwo, O. (2014). Regulating private tutoring for public good: Policy op-
tions for supplementary education in Asia. The University of Hong Kong: Faculty of Education.
Bray, M., & Kwok, P. (2003). Demand for private supplementary tutoring: Concep-
tual considerations, and socio-economic patterns in Hong Kong. Economics of Education Review, 22(6), 611–620.
Bray, M., Liu, J., Zhang, W., & Kobakhidze, M. N. (2019). (Mis)trust and (abuse of)
authority in Cambodian education: Parallel lessons in the shadow. In M. Schüpbach & N. Lilla (Eds.), Extended education from an International compara-
tive point of view: WERA-IRN Extended Education Conference Volume (pp. 7–21). Springer Fachmedien. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-27172-5_2


Davis, J. (2013). Educational legitimation and parental aspiration: Private tutoring in Perth, Western Australia. The University of Western Australia.


RANEPA. (2020). Uchastie roditeley shkol’nikov v obrazovatel’nom protsessse [Parental involvement in the educational process] (1(10); Monitoring Effektivnosti
international conference on extracurricular and out-of-school time educational research (pp. 11–26). Budrich.


VCIOM. (2019). *EGE kak sposob postupit’ v vz: Udobstva i slozhnosti* [The USE as a way to get into higher education: The benefits and the pitfalls]. https://wciom.ru/index.php?id=236&uid=9700%3Cspan%20id=


Yurchak, A. (2013). *Everything was forever, until it was no more: The last Soviet generation*. Princeton University Press.


253
10. Agnes Nobel 1979: Boken i skolan. En analys med särskild inriktning på bibliotekets funktion i grundskolan.
44. Abelardo Castro Hidalgo 1992: Det traditionella och det ”andra” universitetet. En början till samspel?
54. Birgitta Almqvist 1994: Approaching the Culture of Toys in Swedish Child Care. A Literature Survey and a Toy Inventory.


74. Michael A. A. Ilfort 1998: Distance Education and the Training of Primary School Teachers in Tanzania.


132. Magnus Granberg 2013: Kognitivt stöd för lärande i arbetet. En teoretisk modell baserad på en fallstudie av ett svenskt militärt utlandsförband i Kosovo.

133. Stina Hallén 2013: Lärarutbildning i skolans tjänst? En policyanalys av statliga argument för förändring.


137. Anna Lindqvist Bergander 2015: Att göra literacy online och offline. Digitala medier i barns kamrakultur.

138. Maja Elmgren, Maria Folke-Fichetliau, Stina Hallén, Henrik Ramon och Wieland Wermke (Red.) 2016: Att ta utbildningens komplexitet på allvar. En vänskrift till Eva Forsberg.


140. Sofia Lundmark 2016: Designing for Online Youth Counselling. Empowerment through Design and Participation.


