ANNOTATION

***«Identification of student agency in the ecosystem of university self-government»***
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*Research questions.* –1) What are the basic manifestations for student agency in the modern university? 2) What are the actual contexts for forming ecosystem logics of development of student self-government in modern university? 3) What is the reasonable design of the research process for agency manifestations and stakeholder status of a student? 4) What are the main factors for involving students into self-government?

*Theoretical framework of the research. Concepts of agency in human activity.* (Archer, 2007, 2013; Bandura, 1989; Emirbayer, 1998). – Concepts of student agency, their stakeholder status in modern university (Дроботенко, Альтергот, 2013; Ефимов, 2020, 2021,2022; Розовски, 2015; Carey, 2013; Lizzio, Wilson, 2009; Matthews, Dwyer, Hine, 2018; Mainardes, E.W., Alves, H., Raposo M., 2012; Lukasova R., Kucharova D.,2015). -*–Concepts of the essence of forming of educational ecosystems* (Global Education Futures, 2018, 2020, Прикот, 2021, 2022; Экосистема развития инноваций…, 2020). – Hypothesis of "the strength of weak bonds" (Granovetter, 1973). – Methodology of organizational development based on the concepts of "circular organizations" and "five catapulting ideas" (Р. Акофф, 1985, 2007). - Terms of modern phenomenology as contextual framework for research design. (Гуссерль,2012; Квале, 2003; Улановский 2007, 2012).

*Research design* –

For design layout we based upon the assumption that student agency is most clearly shown in their participation in student self-government, while its [self-government] stability and efficiency are determined with their phenomenological ecosystem features. Thus, phenomenological description became our general research method which is based on direct observation of the research object. We used the following procedures: involving observation, talks in focus groups, extensive narrative and guided interviews, project sessions. Respondents were academic managers of educational programs in a number of Russian universities, university managers and functionaries, leaders of university activities.

However, considering unstable veracity of high-quality phenomenological researches, collection of traditional quantity data on relative aspects with google-forms became one of design layouts for the research. Collected data were processed with the tools of correlation and factor analysis and interpreted with mutual verification at correlating with the data collected by phenomenological descriptions. Researchers held three surveys among students of 9 Russian universities representing basic categories of Russian higher education – federal, national, research, basic, regional. 1185 students of various specialties and years took part in the survey.

*Results of the research.*

*The first meaningful result* is clarification for the notions of student agency, their stakeholder status in modern university. The trends detected within the research reveal increase of students influence on making managerial decisions which make important effect on transforming basic processes in university.

*The second meaningful result* is fixing evidences that the process of activation student agency is becoming international. For that, researchers studied the contents of missions and strategic programs in 21 Russian and 21 American universities, relative in status (national), number of students (20-30 thousand) and rating placements. No serious difference between Russian and American universities was found.

*The third meaningful result* is private and general factor hypotheses which claimed that teachers’ and managers’ opinions as well as the contents and the format of corresponding rules and regulations, e.g. outer factors for the student community, are factors which determine students involvement into self-government as the main activity for their agency manifestation, were not claimed. Basic triggers for involvement and activation of student agency are the factors which lie within the community. This evidences the decisive role of the processes of self-regulations, which determine ecosystem logics for self-development of the phenomenon explored.
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