

Czech University of Life Sciences Prague
Faculty of Economics and Management

Proceedings of the 15th International Conference
Efficiency and Responsibility in Education 2018



7th - 8th June 2018
Prague, Czech Republic, EU

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| EFFECT OF CORRUPTION AND POVERTY ON EFFICIENT EDUCATION IN LATIN AMERICA <i>Luis Andrade, Martin Flégl, Carlos Alberto Jiménez-Bandala</i> | 7 |
| CREATING AND EXPERIENCE WITH KNOWLEDGE ASSESSMENT MODULE IN TEACHING PROGRAMMING <i>Ladislav Beránek, Radim Remeš</i> | 14 |
| MOBILE TECHNOLOGIES AND THE WAYS OF USE IN TEACHING IT RELATED SUBJECTS <i>Mária Burianová, Milan Turčáni, Zoltán Balogh, Marián Mudrák</i> | 21 |
| PUPILS' ABILITIES TO SOLVE PROBLEMS IN MATHEMATICS AND PHYSICS AND THEIR SCHOOL PERFORMANCE <i>Jiří Cihlář, Petr Eisenmann, Eva Hejnová, Jiří Přebyl</i> | 29 |
| SARUD – A PROJECT FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF MASTER STUDIES IN RUSSIA AND KAZAKHSTAN <i>Martin Dieterich, Axel Schwerk, Olga Anciferova, Anargul Belgibayeva, Oleg Blinov, Anna Borsuk, Izabela Dymitryszyn, Tatyana Gorbacheva, Jakub Husák, Erzhená Imeskenova, Aliya Ismailova, Niyazbek Kalimov, Nina Kazydub, Galina Korotkova, Olesya Kovaleva, Michal Lošťák, Nadezhda Meleshenko, Nurgul Nurmukhanbetova, Iraida Sangadieva, Nalima Sartanova, Liubov Schmidt, Andrey Shindelov, Angelika Thomas, Zhenis Zharlygassov</i> | 36 |
| EMPLOYEE TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT: ORGANISATIONAL ASPECT <i>Martina Fejfarová, Jiří Fejfar</i> | 45 |
| ONCE BAD PROFESSOR ALWAYS BAD? AN APPLICATION OF MARKOV CHAIN <i>Martin Flégl, Robert Hlavatý, Luis Andrade</i> | 52 |
| RESPONSIBLE SELF-ASSESSMENT AS PART OF TEACHER ASSESSMENT <i>Zdenka Gadušová, Simona Ďurková</i> | 61 |
| KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT IN INDIAN HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS – PERCEPTION AND ISSUES <i>Pankaj Kumar Gupta, Arunima Sirohi</i> | 69 |
| GEN Z IN THE WORKPLACE: EXPECTATIONS, COMMUNICATION AND RELATIONSHIPS <i>Jaroslav Havlíček, Ludmila Dömeová, Robert Hlavatý</i> | 76 |
| THE CHALLENGES OF ROMA MINORITY EDUCATION IN THE CZECH REPUBLIC FROM THE HUMAN RIGHTS PERSPECTIVE <i>Alena Höfrová</i> | 83 |
| THE STUDY OF THE REASONS OF EARLY TERMINATION OF STUDY AT DISTANCE EDUCATION STUDENTS <i>Jiří Homan</i> | 96 |
| EDUCATION OF HUMAN RESOURCES FOR CONTEMPORARY TECHNICAL SOCIETY <i>Miroslav Hrubý, Kamila Hasilová</i> | 103 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF RURAL COMMUNITY SCHOOLS IN THE CZECH REPUBLIC <i>Jakub Husák, Helena Hudečková</i> | 110 |
| SPATIAL ANALYSIS OF THE TERTIARY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT IN EUROPEAN UNION <i>Michaela Chocholatá</i> | 117 |
| PERSONALITY AND STRESS COPING AT CZECH UNIVERSITY OF LIFE SCIENCES STUDENTS <i>Hana Chýlová, Ludmila Natovová</i> | 125 |
| TAX COURSES EXAMS RESULTS AT FEM CULS PRAGUE EVALUATION <i>Jakub Ječmínek, Gabriela Kukulová, Lukáš Moravec, Dana Bína Filipová</i> | 132 |
| EDUCATION-JOB MATCH: LABOR MARKET DILEMMAS FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES <i>Carlos Alberto Jiménez-Bandala, Martin Flégl, Luis Andrade</i> | 140 |
| COMPARISON OF THE LEVELS OF FINANCIAL LITERACY AMONG HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS <i>Martin Kazda, Vladimíra Petrášková, Přemysl Rosa</i> | 147 |
| PROBABILITY COMPARISON WAYS OF ACCEPTANCE STUDENTS AT UNIVERSITY <i>Jindřich Klůfa</i> | 155 |
| WHY TO BECOME A TEACHER? FACTORS OF PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS' MOTIVATION <i>Kristýna Krejčová</i> | 163 |
| RESULTS ANALYSIS OF THE EXAM IN ACCOUNTING THEORY <i>Ivana Kuchařová, Daniela Pfeiferová, Marie Prášilová</i> | 171 |
| ACT AS A®: DEALING WITH NEGATIVE EMOTIONS <i>Roman Liška, Martin Zigo</i> | 180 |
| EFFECTS OF EDUCATION AND HIGH WAGES ON AVERAGE WAGES IN THE CZECH REPUBLIC <i>Luboš Marek</i> | 189 |
| SNT PROCESS PETRI NETS THEORY APPLIED TO RECORDING OF REMOTE PRESENTATIONS <i>Ivo Martiník</i> | 195 |
| IDENTIFICATION OF CRUCIAL COMPETENCIES IN MATHEMATICAL INQUIRY <i>Janka Medová, Kristína Bulková, Soňa Čeretková</i> | 203 |
| THE ROLE OF PARENTS IN EARLY CHILDHOOD MORAL DEVELOPMENT <i>Anatoly Vasílievich Merenkov, Natalya Leonidovna Antonova, Natalia Gennadievna Popova</i> | 213 |
| MATHEMATICS LESSONS IN CULTURALLY AND LINGUISTICALLY HETEROGENEOUS CLASSROOMS <i>Hana Moraová, Jarmila Novotná</i> | 221 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| USE AND ADAPTATION OF CAREER ADAPT-ABILITIES SCALE IN CZECH UNIVERSITY STUDENTS <i>Veronika Motlová, Pavlína Honsová, Klára Vítěčková</i> | 229 |
| VALUE OF KNOWLEDGE IN THE PROCESS OF LIFELONG EDUCATION <i>Kristýna Mudrychová, Martina Houšková Beránková, Milan Houška, Tereza Horáková</i> | 235 |
| FULL-TIME OR COMBINED STUDIES: DIFFERENT PERSONALITIES IN DIFFERENT STUDY MODES? <i>Ludmila Natovová, Hana Chýlová, Pavel Michálek, Pavel Natov</i> | 243 |
| CHANGES IN PROFESSIONAL VISION IN PRESERVICE TEACHERS AFTER WATCHING OWN LESSON <i>Linda Němečková, Lenka Pavlasová</i> | 250 |
| IMPACT OF ORDER OF DATA IN WORD PROBLEMS ON DIVISION OF A WHOLE INTO UNEQUAL PARTS <i>Jarmila Novotná</i> | 257 |
| THE EFFECT OF DATE AND MID-TERM TEST ON PERFORMANCE AT THE FINAL TEST <i>Miroslava Otavová, Irena Sýkorová</i> | 265 |
| ASSESSMENT OF THE PROFESSIONAL AND MANAGEMENT COMPETENCES AS PART OF PROJECT MEMORY <i>Gabriela Alina Paraschiva, Anca Draghici</i> | 272 |
| FLAWLESS MANAGERS: MYTH OR REALITY? <i>Michal Prokop, Václav Švec</i> | 281 |
| WHY STUDENTS FAIL TO FINISH UNIVERSITY (CURRENT DILEMMA: TO STUDY OR TO WORK?) <i>Alice Reissová</i> | 290 |
| BENEFITS OF VIDEOCLUBS FOR FUTURE TEACHERS TRAINING <i>Jarmila Robová, Magdaléna Novotná</i> | 299 |
| HOUSEHOLDS OF SECONDARY SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY STUDENTS: THE CASE OF THE CZECH REPUBLIC <i>Samuel Ryckenberg, Sean Hellingman, Petr Mazouch, Kristýna Vltavská</i> | 307 |
| WRITTEN TESTS VS CONCEPT CARTOONS: THE CASE OF FUTURE TEACHERS AND FRACTIONS <i>Libuše Samková</i> | 314 |
| MODEL OF STUDENTS' ONLINE PRIVACY BEHAVIOUR <i>Tomáš Sigmund</i> | 322 |
| GENDER DIFFERENCES IN MATHEMATICS ACHIEVEMENTS AND ATTITUDES <i>Irena Smetáčková</i> | 329 |
| TEACHER BURNOUT SYNDROME, COPING STRATEGIES AND SELF-EFFICACY <i>Irena Smetáčková, Ida Viktorová</i> | 336 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| ANALYSIS OF MOTIVATIONAL AND PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GENERATIONAL GROUP Z <i>Augustín Stareček, Kristína Koltnerová, Natália Vraňaková, Dagmar Cagáňová, Andrea Chlpeková</i> | 343 |
| GENERATIONAL GROUPS AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES IN THE SLOVAK INDUSTRIAL ENTERPRISES <i>Augustín Stareček, Natália Vraňaková, Dagmar Cagáňová, Andrea Chlpeková</i> | 351 |
| ANALYSIS OF FACTORS INFLUENCING THE LEVEL OF PROCRASTINATION AMONG STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF LIFE SCIENCES PRAGUE <i>Marta Stárová, Helena Čermáková, Tomáš Hlavsa, Tomáš Rain</i> | 359 |
| TEACHING OF INTERNATIONAL ACCOUNTING STANDARDS IFRS AT THE UNIVERSITY LEVEL <i>Marta Stárová, Miroslava Navrátilová, Enikő Lörinczová, Markéta Beranová</i> | 366 |
| CASE STUDIES IN ACCOUNTING COURSES FOR MANAGERS: CZECH AND SLOVAK COMPARISON <i>Irena Stejskalová, Martina Bednářová, Lenka Komárková, Marta Bartošová Vrbová</i> | 373 |
| WORK EXPERIENCE AS A PREREQUISITE FOR THE SUCCESS OF GRADUATES IN THE JOB MARKET <i>Daniela Šálková, Miroslava Navrátilová</i> | 380 |
| UTILIZATION AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF LMS MOODLE TOOLS IN SELECTED STUDY PROGRAMMES <i>Petra Šánová, Lucie Kvasničková-Stanislavská, Roman Kvasnička, Adriana Laputková</i> | 387 |
| FINANCIAL LITERACY OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS IN THE AREA OF EXTERNAL FINANCING <i>Jan Šíma, Markéta Beranová, Miroslava Navrátilová</i> | 394 |
| BACHELOR'S DEGREE GRADUATES PERCEPTIONS TOWARDS PURSUING THEIR ACADEMIC STUDIES <i>Attila Turi, Marian Mocan, Larisa Ivascu, Aida Szilagyi</i> | 402 |
| BEHAVIOUR AND DISCIPLINE IN SCHOOLS AS AN EDUCATIONAL PROBLEM FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF STUDENT TEACHERS <i>Miluše Vítečková, Miroslav Procházka, Marie Najmonová, Iva Štěchová</i> | 416 |

SARUD – A PROJECT FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF MASTER STUDIES IN RUSSIA AND KAZAKHSTAN

¹Martin Dieterich, ^{2✉}Axel Schwerk, ³Olga Anciferova, ⁴Anargul Belgibayeva, ⁵Oleg Blinov, ¹Anna Borsuk, ⁶Izabela Dymitryszyn, ⁷Tatyana Gorbacheva, ⁸Jakub Husák, ⁹Erzhena Imeskenova, ¹⁰Aliya Ismailova, ¹¹Niyazbek Kalimov, ⁷Nina Kazydub, ¹²Galina Korotkova, ¹³Olesya Kovaleva, ⁸Michal Lošťák, ¹⁴Nadezhda Meleshenko, ¹⁵Nurgul Nurmukhanbetova, ¹⁶Iraida Sangadieva, ¹⁷Nalima Sartanova, ¹⁸Liubov Schmidt, ¹⁸Andrey Shindelov, ¹⁹Angelika Thomas, ²⁰Zhenis Zharlygassov

¹Institute of Landscape and Plant Ecology, Faculty of Agricultural Sciences, University of Hohenheim, Germany

²Laboratory of Evaluation and Assessment of Natural Resources, Faculty of Horticulture, Biotechnology and Landscape Architecture, Warsaw University of Life Sciences – SGGW, Nowoursynowska Street 166, Warsaw, 02-787, Poland, 0048 22 59 32224, aschwerk@yahoo.de

³Institute of Economics and Management of Federal State Educational Institution of Higher Education, Michurinsk State Agrarian University, Russia

⁴Department of economics and accounting, Agrarian-economic institute, sh.Ualikhanov Kokshetau state university, Kazakhstan

⁵Department of Economics, Accountancy and Financial Control, Omsk State Agrarian University named after P.A. Stolypin, Russia

⁶Laboratory of Evaluation and Assessment of Natural Resources, Faculty of Horticulture, Biotechnology and Landscape Architecture, Warsaw University of Life Sciences – SGGW, Poland

⁷Department of Agronomics, Plant Breeding and Seed Research, Agrotechnological Faculty, Omsk State Agrarian University named after P.A. Stolypin, Russia

⁸Department of Humanities, Faculty of Economics and Management, Czech University of Life Sciences Prague, Czech Republic

⁹Chair of landscape design and ecology, faculty of agronomy, Buryat State Academy of Agriculture named after V. R. Philippov, Russia

¹⁰Department of Accounting and Audit, Faculty Economic, JSC „S. Seifullin Kazakh Agrotechnical University“, Kazakhstan

¹¹Agrarian and Biological Faculty, Akhmet Baytursynov Kostanay State University, Kazakhstan

¹²Center of research and development of social and economic sciences and the international scientific projects of Federal State Educational Institution of Higher Education, Michurinsk State Agrarian University, Russia

¹³Faculty of Public Administration, Novosibirsk State Agrarian University, Russia

¹⁴Department of Economy, Faculty Economic, JSC „S. Seifullin Kazakh Agrotechnical University“, Kazakhstan

¹⁵Department of chemistry and biotechnology, Faculty of natural sciences, sh.Ualikhanov Kokshetau state university, Kazakhstan

¹⁶Chair of economics and regional management, faculty of economics, Buryat State Academy of Agriculture named after V. R. Philippov, Russia

¹⁷Department of Finance and Banking, Faculty of Economics, Akhmet Baytursynov Kostanay State University, Kazakhstan

¹⁸Department of International Affairs, Novosibirsk State Agrarian University, Russia

¹⁹Institute of Applied Agricultural Research, Nuertingen-Geislingen University, Germany

²⁰Akhmet Baytursynov Kostanay State University, Kazakhstan

ABSTRACT

The development and implementation of Masters programs on Sustainable Agriculture and RUrural Development (SARUD) in Russia and Kazakhstan is analysed based on the components of the devised programs and the profiles of the enrolled students. The contents of the study programs show differences which are in line with the respective aggregative majors (economics, agronomy, public administration) under which they are implemented. With respect to age and gender ratio of the students, regional aspects seem to be more important than the aggregative majors. Generally, the study programs match to a high degree the situation analyses carried out prior to program development. In order to assess the quality of the study programs student surveys will be a useful tool. The results of our study underline the importance of inter- and transdisciplinary approaches in education.

KEYWORDS

Agriculture, Kazakhstan, Masters program development, Russia, sustainable rural development

INTRODUCTION

Most rural areas in the Russian Federation and Kazakhstan are characterized by dramatic changes in the agriculture and food sector, due to privatization, modernization and increasing differences between large-scale agro-holdings and small-holder farms. The effects of the current changes on labour market, quality of life and depopulation in rural areas, exploitation of natural resources, soil degradation, biodiversity and landscape differ from region to region. The central black soil regions close to the Moscow markets have more opportunities for economic diversification and subsequently invest in the development of various economic sectors including tourism and recreation, while the potential for diversification in Western Siberia is more limited. The common denominator for rural development is the great importance of agriculture and natural resources providing for ecosystem services and opportunities towards diversification (Lindner and Vorbrugg, 2012).

State regulations, research and education are already responding to the challenges imposed by the changes outlined, e.g. in Russia through the Policy Concept of Sustainable Rural Development and the RUDECO Vocational Training project (Dieterich and Merzlov, 2013; Russian Government, 2015). In Kazakhstan, issues of sustainable agriculture and rural development are regulated by a Law “On State Regulation of the Development of the Agro-Industrial Complex and Rural Territories” adopted in 2005. According to this regulation, when defining conceptual approaches directed towards drafting of projects, scientific research work and priority directions with respect to development of agricultural science for the period 2018-2020, the priority is attributed to “Sustainable development of agro-industrial complex and safety of agriculture products”. However, in Russia and Kazakhstan there is a considerable lack of sustainable rural development strategies and integrated approaches for the regional or local levels. This includes knowledge about up-to-date methods and approaches (e.g. stakeholder involvement) and skilled people to assess and further develop agro-ecosystems services. Beyond agricultural products, such services include environmental and social output. To fill this gap, higher education institutions together with public and private services need to re-define job qualifications and education for (future) decision makers and professionals in agriculture and related areas incorporating principles of sustainable rural development.

The idea of sustainable development evolved from the Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm in 1972 and was further developed during the following decades (Adams, 2006: 1). It became popularized in the broader political arena through the 1987 report of the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED, 1987) and subsequently by the United

Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) held 1992 in Rio de Janeiro, where the Agenda 21 document was produced. Whereas, the traditional concept of sustainability originally coined in forestry has a strong supply-ecological connotation, the mainstream 1987 WCED definition focuses on the demand side and therefore the socio-economic system. Accordingly, over the last decades most research on sustainable development had a strong and often only focus on the economic dimension (Wichaisri and Sopadang, 2018). This has caused the sustainability concept to become rather arbitrary.

In order to tackle the above mentioned tasks, the international project “Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development (SARUD)” was initiated in 2016 (Sangadieva et al., 2016). The project consortium consists of 28 partners and is coordinated by the University of Hohenheim (Stuttgart, Germany). The major aim of this project is to implement professional Masters programs on sustainable agriculture and rural development in Russia and Kazakhstan tailored to the demand of regions for professionals of public services, local and regional governments and private service providers, so that (future) professionals are educated and trained to adopt theoretical development concepts for specific local conditions, access (international) experiences and apply up-to date methods for the assessment of agro-ecosystems and for natural resource and agriculture land use planning and management. The Masters programs devised in the SARUD context have been implemented at the following universities under the respective aggregative majors: Omsk State Agrarian University named after P.A. Stolypin (OSAU: agronomy major, economics major), Michurinsk State Agrarian University (MSAU: economics major), Buryat State Academy of Agriculture (BSAA: economics major), Novosibirsk State Agrarian University (NSAU: administration major), S. Seifullin Kazakh Agro Technical University (KASU: economics major), A. Baitursynov Kostanay State University (KSU: economics major), and Sh. Ualikhanov Kokshetau State University (KokSU: economics major). Masters programs were launched in the academic year 2017/2018 at all universities.

The first phase of the SARUD project consisted of a situation analysis to identify and describe the needs for the knowledge, skills and competencies of the graduates with a master degree in sustainable rural development in Russia and Kazakhstan and specifically in the geographical regions and territories where universities involved in the project operate. Based on the data from this situation analysis the most needed issues for rural areas of Russia and Kazakhstan related to education were determined (Table 1).

The aim of this paper is to analyse and evaluate the process of the implementation of the master degree programs on sustainable agriculture and rural development in Russia and Kazakhstan. We assess how these programs have been developed in the two countries, what characterizes students enrolled in the Masters programs, and what differences and similarities exist between the two countries and the different programs implemented at the different HEIs with respect to content and student profiles.

The Masters programs were designed to properly integrate agronomy, ecology, economics and socio-cultural issues reflecting the basic pillars of sustainable rural development (interdisciplinarity component). In addition, the programs target the integration of theory and practice (transdisciplinarity). In order to assess the integration of the basic components into the different Masters programs and to classify and compare the backgrounds of students registering for the according programs we reviewed (1) the focus on theoretical and practical aspects, (2) the possibilities for students to take part in shaping the program and (3) the allocation of learning contents to key topics. Concerning student backgrounds the focus was on (1) demographic aspects and (2) the initial qualification when entering the Masters program.

Based on the results we discuss, to what degree the implementation of the Masters programs fits to the situation analysis performed.

Relevant education issues in Russian rural areas

- the graduates should be able to identify the main trajectories of sustainable socio-economic development of rural territories in the context of a transition to market based approaches;
- the graduates should determine main pathways towards sustainable rural territories resulting in socio-economic development in agriculture without harming nature and protecting continued function of ecosystem services;
- the graduates should know how to develop the non-agrarian sector in rural settlements.

Relevant education issues in Kazakh rural areas

- the graduates should know how to prepare and implement development projects in order to achieve sustainable development of rural areas;
- the graduates must be skilled in economic issues (e.g. financial management) when dealing with processing of agricultural production and agricultural commodity sale;
- the graduates should also be able to work in livestock or crop production (the need to have knowledge about the agricultural production sector).

Table 1: Education issues relevant for rural areas of Russia and Kazakhstan identified in the situation analysis.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Data regarding the Masters programs were provided by the Russian and Kazakh universities in the form of in-depth study guided by aide memoire (Swain, 2013) forming the questions resulting in the situation analysis. Other needed data were collected by analysing the respective Masters programs and module syllabi. With respect to students enrolled in the study programs, data on age and sex as well as the background qualification were collected from descriptive statistics provided by the participating HEIs.

In order to assess the focus of the study programs on theoretical and practical aspects we compared the total number of ECTS credits and their distribution to the theoretical part (lectures), the practical exercises and the exam related workload. The theoretical segment of the Masters programs was analysed in more detail by comparing the total number of modules (as module is to be understood a single course of the respective program) necessary to be accomplished by the students. In order to assess possibilities for the students to take part in shaping the learning contents, we also compared the share of compulsory and elective modules.

The learning contents of each module were allocated to the four basic topics “economy”, “ecology”, “society” and “agronomy”. We calculated the percentage share of the total learning contents of the study programs dealing with these basic topics to assess the balance and completeness of the study programs. This was done by multiplying percentage shares for the topics in the different modules with the didactic hours of the respective module. The module values were summed up for each basic category by adding the values for the compulsory modules, and values for the required number of elective modules. The total was then divided by the respective number of modules for each study program. Since the percentage shares of the basic topics to be covered in lectures often differed between elective modules, students might reach higher or lower values for each basic topic depending on their choice of electives. Therefore, for each of the key topics the minimum and maximum possible values were calculated.

We compared the total number of students and the share of male and female students between the Masters programs (major agronomy, major economics, major administration). We also compared the age distribution of the students entering the different Masters programs. Due to the low numbers of students enrolled in the Masters programs in Kazakhstan, the data on students from the three Kazakh Universities were pooled. Differences in proportions of male and female students were tested using the Chi-square test. Because of the low number of samples statistical significance was estimated using a Monte-Carlo-estimation (Mehta and Patel, n.d.) (10000 samples, confidence

limit 99 %). Differences in the age of the students between the Masters programs at the different universities were tested using the Median test. The statistical analyses were carried out using IBM SPSS Statistics, version 23.

The initial background qualification was determined for each student based on their bachelor degree and/or current employment. We calculated the share of students with a background according to the chosen master program as well as the share of other backgrounds for each study program in Russia (economics, agronomy, administration) and the study program under the economics major at the Kazakh universities.

RESULTS

The total number of ECTS credits is 120 for the Russian Masters programs and 122 for the according program in Kazakhstan. However the allocation of the ECTS credits to the theoretical study program, the practical part of the study and the exam part differs (Table 2). While in Russia the study programs under the agronomy and economics majors have a very similar distribution of the ECTS credits, a far higher number of credits is assigned to the theoretical part for the Masters program under the major administration. The Masters program under the major economics in Kazakhstan has a higher amount of credits for the exam part. The amount of credits for this part is also elevated for the master under the administration major in Russia. Consequentially, this program has by far the lowest number of credits associated with the practical part.

The total number of modules to be completed by students differs between the Masters programs. The range is between 25 modules for the Russian master under the agronomy major and 16 modules for the Kazakh master under the economics major. In Kazakhstan only 7 modules are compulsory, 9 modules are elective. In Russia, the number of compulsory modules ranges from 14 to 17 and the number of elective modules ranges from 5 to 8 (Table 2).

| Characteristic | | Russia – Admin. | Russia – Agronom. | Russia – Econom. | Kazakhstan – Econom. |
|----------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| ECTS | theoretical part | 84 | 66 | 63 | 63 |
| | practical part | 27 | 48 | 51 | 43 |
| | exam | 9 | 6 | 6 | 16 |
| Modules | compulsory | 17 | 16 | 14 | 7 |
| | elective | 8 (16) | 5 (10) | 5 (10)* | 9 (17) |
| % Economy | min. | 29.28 | 24.02 | 30.79 | 19.76 |
| | max. | 29.28 | 30.38 | 36.27 | 35.24 |
| % Ecology | min. | 24.25 | 20.38 | 18.65 | 16.90 |
| | max. | 24.25 | 25.38 | 19.84 | 31.67 |
| % Society | min. | 22.56 | 20.83 | 26.59 | 14.52 |
| | max. | 22.56 | 24.92 | 33.02 | 28.81 |
| % Agronomy | min. | 23.10 | 22.95 | 15.87 | 23.10 |
| | max. | 23.10 | 31.14 | 18.97 | 30.00 |

*Study program „Russia – Economy“ offers one optional module. This module was not taken into account when calculating the minimum and maximum values for the learning contents.

Table 2: Characterization of the Masters programs with respect to numbers and distribution of ECTS credits, number and distribution of modules (total number of elective modules offered in brackets), and minimum and maximum share of contents relating to the basic topics economy, ecology, society and agronomy within the lecture part.

With respect to the percentage share of the learning contents of the study programs on the different key topics the study program in Kazakhstan showed the biggest differences between the topics.

Generally, highest maximum values were in good agreement with the respective aggregative majors (Table 2).

The total number of students and the proportions between male and female students differed between the programs (Figure 1). The highest number of students was recorded in Omsk with 18 students in the program under the agronomy major, and 15 students in the program under the economics major. The study programs in Kazakhstan were chosen by 8 students at all three universities combined. The proportions between male and female students were significantly different between the study programs (Chi-square test, Monte-Carlo-estimated statistical significance $p < 0.01$). The proportion of males was particularly high in the study programs at Omsk, whereas at BSAA (economics) only female students inscribed for the study program.




Figure 1: Number and sex of students of the respective study programs. White part of the bars – males, black part of the bars – females (Chi-square test, statistical significance based on Monte-Carlo-estimation, $p < 0.01$).

Significant differences were also revealed with respect to the age of the students (Median test, $p < 0.05$) (Figure 2). On average the oldest students were recorded in Omsk with median values above 25 years, whereas in all other programs the median value were 22 years. Compared to the age ranges recorded for the Masters programs at other participating universities, narrow ranges in student age were observed for Kazakh universities and those of the economics major at MSAU. The allocation of the initial background qualifications of the students to the different Masters programs (Table 3) indicates that quite often students had a background that differed from the aggregative major. A fit $> 50\%$ was reached for three study programs only: Economics in Kazakhstan (75.0 %), agronomy at OSAU (72.2 %) and administration at NSAU (55.6 %). Low or very low values of fit were recorded for economics at BSAA (14.3 %) and OSAU (26.7 %).

DISCUSSION

Awareness of the need for targeted education towards sustainable development is not limited to Russia and Kazakhstan. As early as in 1991, Cornell University (Ithaca, NY) had established a graduate minor in conservation and sustainable development (Shelhas and Lassoie, 2001). Wang (2010) emphasizes the need for advanced ecotourism education in China in order to improve sustainable development. Mulá et al. (2017) mention increasing activities regarding education for sustainable development in higher education worldwide. Education is of high priority among the sustainable development goals adopted by UN member states (Vlidirova and Le Blanc, 2017). Our study not only stresses the need for developing study programs with a focus on sustainable

rural development, but also revealed differences with respect to both the implemented study programs and the enrolled master students.

The studied parameters of the Masters programs exhibit differences between the respective aggregate majors as well as the countries. The allocation of ECTS and the relationship between compulsory and elective modules is mainly predetermined by the rules of the respective country or university. This highlights the importance of institutions in shaping the educational process. Similarly, the degree of practical content is determined by the major under which a Masters program is launched. Administration requires considerable knowledge in procedures and the legal framework governing activities. Therefore and not surprisingly the practical part of the Masters program under the major administration is comparatively low. Especially interesting is the allocation of the learning contents to the key topics in the Masters programs. The fact that learning contents independent of the selected majors cover basic topics rather well can be considered as a strong indication for appropriately balanced and well-developed study programs.




Figure 2: Age distribution of students in the respective Masters programs shown as box-whisker plots. Median values indicated by a bar, the boxes show inter-quartile distances. Whiskers indicate range of data without outliers (distance from the edge of the box between 1.5 and 3 times of box length, shown as circles), and extreme values (distance from the edge of the box more than 3 times of the box length, shown as asterisks).

| Background | NSAU – Admin. | OSAU – Agronom. | BSAA – Econom. | OSAU – Econom. | MSAU – Econom. | Kazakhstan – Econom. |
|----------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Administration | 5 (55.6 %) | - | 1 (14.3 %) | 2 (13.3 %) | 1 (10.0 %) | - |
| Agronomy | 1 (11.1 %) | 13 (72.2 %) | 4 (57.1 %) | 3 (20.0 %) | 1 (10.0%) | 1 (12.5 %) |
| Economics | 2 (22.2 %) | - | 1 (14.3 %) | 4 (26.7 %) | 4 (40.0 %) | 6 (75.0 %) |
| Other | 1 (11.1 %) | 5 (31.8 %) | 1 (14.3 %) | 6 (40.0 %) | 4 (40.0 %) | 1 (12.5 %) |

Table 3: Allocation of students with the respective initial background qualification within the Masters programs (Accordance in initial background qualification of students with study program's major printed bold).

With respect to the students age, sex and professional/educational background the results express only limited dependences on the aggregative majors and countries of implementation. We highlight the fact that to some degree regional aspects seem to override the aggregative majors, to which the study programs have been assigned. Students at Omsk differentiated from study programs in other regions of Russia or in Kazakhstan in terms of percentage of male and female students as well as the age of students. However, this situation might be a valid only in the current year and may not describe a regular pattern.

It is difficult to discuss the results with respect to the background of the students, because – on one side – a high number of students with the background of the respective aggregative major may express a good match between profile and topics addressed. On the other hand, students switching fields might express that the respective study program provides them with well elaborated topics in order to enlarge their knowledge base towards additional expertise on sustainable development. In order to gain more detailed information about such aspects and to assess the quality of the study programs future student surveys to accompany program implementation will be useful. For example, Savelyeva and Douglas (2017: 218) conducting questionnaires and collecting reflective narratives discovered an ‘increase in the self-perceived knowledge and behavioral aspects of sustainability consciousness of Hong Kong students, who were enrolled in the General Education course’.

For both Russia and Kazakhstan the situation analysis revealed a need for education towards sustainable development with a special focus on economic issues. These aspects are fulfilled by all the Masters programs in both countries. In Russia, a special need was expressed for training the students with respect to development of the non-agrarian sector in rural settlements. Apart from the study program under the major agronomy, which has to have a strong focus on this key topic, the Masters programs in Russia had a comparatively low focus on agronomy. This might be treated as an indicator that non-agrarian aspects indeed play a more dominant role in these programs. In Kazakhstan, however, a special need was identified for training in livestock or crop production, an aspect which is indeed well addressed by the Kazakh study program.

CONCLUSIONS

Masters programs dealing with sustainable agriculture and rural development were successfully implemented at Russian and Kazakh universities. Study programmes match well the situation analysis carried out prior to the implementation. With respect to student age and gender, regional aspects seem to override the aggregative majors. In order to assess the quality of the study programs future student surveys will be a useful tool. The programmes developed under an international cooperation, demonstrate the importance of transboundary exchange of knowledge in education, because the experience of EU universities was transposed into Russian and Kazakh universities in such a way they are able to match the needs of their rural areas.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This article was supported by the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Agency (EACEA), European Commission, under Grant ”Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development (SARUD)”, number 561969-EPP-1-2015-1-DE-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP. The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein. The article is communication no. 496 of the Laboratory of Evaluation and Assessment of Natural Resources, Warsaw University of Life Sciences – SGGW.

REFERENCES

- Adams, W.M. (2006) *The future of sustainability. Re-thinking environment and development in the twenty-first century*, IUCN: Report of the IUCN Renowned Thinkers Meeting [Online]. Available: https://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/iucn_future_of_sustainability.pdf, [25 Jan 2018].
- Dieterich, M. and Merzlov, A. (eds.) (2013) *Sustainable rural development*. Moscow: Ellis Lak Press.
- Lindner, P. and Vorbrugg, A. (2012) 'Die Wiederkehr der Landfrage. Großinvestitionen und die Neuordnung der Landwirtschaft in Russland', *Osteuropa*, vol. 62, no. 6/8, pp. 325-342.
- Mulà, I., Tilbury, D., Ryan, A., Mader, M., Dlouhá, J., Mader, C., Benayas, J., Dlouhý, J. and Alba, D. (2017) 'Catalysing change in higher education for sustainable development: A review of professional development initiatives for university educators', *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, vol. 18, no. 5, pp. 798-820. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-03-2017-0043>
- Russian Government (2015) 'Decree on the approval of the Strategy for Sustainable Development of Rural Territories of the Russian Federation for the period up to 2030', Moscow: Russian Government.
- Sangadieva, I., Imeskenova, E., Ishigenov, I., Shadonova, T., Ochirova, E. and Tsybikov, B. (2016) 'Human resources as a factor for sustainable rural development', *Proceedings of the Scientific and practical conference dedicated to the Day of Russian Science and the 85th anniversary of "The Buryat State Agricultural Academy named after V.R. Philippov"*, Ulan Ude, pp. 263-265.
- Savelyeva, T. and Douglas, W. (2017) 'Global consciousness and pillars of sustainable development. A study on self-perceptions of the first-year university students', *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 218-241. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-04-2016-0063>
- Mehta, C.R. and Patel, N.R. (2018) Exact tests [Online]. Available: http://www.sussex.ac.uk/its/pdfs/PASW_Exact_Tests.pdf, [25 Apr 2018].
- Shelhas, J. and Lassoie, J.P. (2001) 'Learning conservation and sustainable development: an interdisciplinary approach', *Journal of Natural Resources and Life Sciences Education*, vol. 30, pp. 111-119.
- Swain, N. (2013) *Green Barons, Force-of-Circumstance Entrepreneurs, Impotent Mayors (Rural Change in the Early Years of Post-Socialist Capitalist Democracy)*, Budapest: Central European University Press.
- Vladimirova, K. and Le Blanc, D. (2016) 'Exploring links between education and sustainable development goals through the lens of UN flagship reports', *Sustainable Development*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 254-271. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/sd.1626>
- Wang, X. (2010) 'Critical aspects of sustainable development in tourism: advanced ecotourism education', *Journal of Sustainable Development*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 261-263. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/jsd.v3n2p261>
- Wichaisri, S. and Sopadang, A. (2018) 'Trends and future directions in sustainable development', *Sustainable Development*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.1687>
- World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) (1987) *Our Common Future*, New York: Oxford University Press.