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Abstract

Objectives: This article provides a look from the inside at present-day higher education – its current state and the latest issues and reforms in it, as seen by college professors with extensive work experience. The authors view education as an element in the society’s education – individual’ system. Methods/Statistical Analysis: The authors rely on their own professional experience to prove that at present society and authorities are not doing much in the way of creating the necessary and sufficient conditions for colleges to function effectively. Hence, the lack (and ineffectiveness) of reform in education. Colleges do not have access to resources they need in order to achieve their goals and meet the objectives set by society. Findings: Models for the reformation and development of higher education vary drastically depending on which element’s interests and needs are put at the top of the list: society, the individual, or education (e.g., institutions of higher learning) as a social institute and a particular type of relations. Most of the latest proposals on improving the quality and effectiveness of education tend to be geared towards the interests and objectives of society as a whole. It is to a lesser degree that these proposals are directed towards the interests of the individual (learner). The interests of education as a particular institute are not being considered at all. Having said that, the development of any system requires that the conditions necessary for the existence and development of each of the system’s elements be met. Application/Improvements: The authors propose a special approach to defining a set of goals and objectives in higher education, which they term a problem-objective approach. The idea is simple: overcoming the major issues most law schools tend to face during the process of an educational activity must become a proximal and current objective in legal education.
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1. Introduction

Any talk of the standards of education or its quality and effectiveness should begin with discussing the issue of objectives in education. Before we construct any of our educational models, generate any of our trajectories, and choose any of our strategies for education, we need to formulate what and why we are going to teach our students. It stands for reason that we can assess the effectiveness of education only by measuring its progress and results against the objectives we set. Likewise, we can assess both general models for education and separate methods for education only by way of analyzing them within the context of the objectives set. There are various approaches to defining objectives in education. With respect to legal education, it is a social-role approach to formulating objectives in education that has been gaining steady momentum as of late. It implies that first, we determine what social roles lawyers play in society and then we formulate objectives in educational training inclusive of these roles. The variety of social roles for lawyers provides a basis for constructing such objectives and, as a consequence, for determining the content of legal education. Here, a social role is construed as a type of professional activity. That said, we should not interpret the idea too simply: as such the social roles of lawyers do not automatically turn into objectives in legal education and, certainly, do not become the content of...
teaching at colleges. Information on the social roles of lawyers needs assessing and reworking. After this, it becomes a basis for seeking out new standards of quality in education and lawyer training at colleges.

On the whole, we find this approach to be correct. It is practically oriented and makes it possible to set strategic, intermediary, and proximal objectives in education. The lawyer as a legislator, as a participant in professional communication, as a law enforcement officer, as a human rights activist, as a public prosecutor, as a lawyer in the system of commercial courts, as a lawyer in the area of antimonopoly legislation, as a highway-traffic lawyer, as an attorney, as a lawyer in the area of private business, as a lawyer in the area of private legal practice, and so on and so forth – in a sense, all these variations on the theme of types of professional activity are social roles that are in demand and socially significant. It stands to reason that social roles shape our notions of a successful professional lawyer and set certain expectations for the system of legal education.

To generalize, we, somewhat nominally, can state that being oriented towards the formation of certain practical skills right during the process of learning and using a social role approach in the area of goal-setting are the most conspicuous trends in present-day legal education.

To generalize, we, some what nominally, can state that being oriented towards the formation of certain practical skills right during the process of learning and using a social role approach in the area of goal-setting are the most conspicuous trends in present-day legal education.

2. Results and Discussion

However, for the purposes of this study, we would like to discuss a different approach to the study of present-day legal education. We shall nominally call it a problem-objective approach. The idea is quite simple: overcoming the major issues most of today's law schools tend to face during the process of educational activity is to become a proximal and current objective in legal education. This approach makes no pretense to formulate strategic objectives in higher learning. Issues faced by colleges have a specific-historical character and are governed regionally, culturally, and demographically. They reduce the effectiveness of education “here and now” and require prompt resolution. These issues become the conditions in which educational activity is carried out. Their existence impedes reaching strategic objectives in education and renders ineffective many of the latest models and strategies for education available at the moment. That said, issues in the social college environment have a pronounced practical character; it is these that we should try to promptly alter our existing models, strategies, and methods for education to fit under. Promptly – because otherwise we get generations of “lost” graduates incapable of effective professional self-actualization; hundreds of people with law school diplomas incapable of adapting to a specific social environment and the labor market. In turn, this causes a crisis of the legal profession as a whole: a whole army of law school graduates amid a huge lack of competent law specialists and the progressing legal unprotectedness of the population and small business. Using a problem-objective approach has led us to the conclusion about the need to reconsider existing models for the professional training of lawyers as a reaction to the changing parameters of the social environment.

Studies into issues in present-day legal education are quite numerous. This prompts us to isolate an array of issues which will be the subject of examination in this work. We are going to do this by means of the research approaches we normally use. The one that fits the best in our case is related to the case-study strategy. In the broadest strokes, this strategy is viewed as the all-round study of a “case” within the context of its existence. The “case” is thoroughly investigated using a set of tools the researcher views as necessary and relevant. It is worth understanding that with this kind of research strategy it is a case, a phenomenon, or some area of social reality that is subjected to thorough investigation, but not a specifically formulated problem. As a result, we keep fine-tuning the subject of investigation throughout the study, which involves, accordingly, the selection of methods that fit each stage the best way possible. There are no boundaries for investigation inside the case we choose, which is of major significance. This type of approach is needed when the researcher is tasked to determine what it is that is going on in reality. Here, there is no need to formulate the problem upfront and check whether or not it exists. With a traditional approach of this kind, we can answer only the question as to whether this kind of problem exists in the set area of reality. The case-study strategy makes it possible to investigate not just problems the researcher may be aware of and which, normally, serve as a stimulus for conducting a study, but those that used to be absent from the researcher’s notions before.

A well-established tradition in science is to trust the results of a study if these results are obtained through the use of traditional quantitative methods and observance of the rules of representativeness. This happens when in numbers and portions we express the degree to which problems are common or distribute view points, compile
The above issues have a mass character, which means that they will be practical employees in a certain area who have a sufficient amount of experience working in their field. The authors of the present study are law school instructors with extensive experience in the field (20 and 9 years, respectively). In addition, the authors possess documented experience working at a number of colleges in Russia (providing instruction to students pursuing postgraduate and doctoral studies and those taking career enhancement courses) and undertaking practical training overseas. Further more, the authors have, over a number of years, combined their teaching activity with administrative positions at their institutions of higher learning. These factors make it possible for the authors to compare the parameters of the intra-college environment with the characteristics of the college students within different periods of time; they also speak to a systemic vision of issues in the educational process. The above lets us view ourselves as experts in the area of legal education and hope that our experience and our suggestions will be useful both in terms of helping to resolve specific problems at particular colleges and in terms of helping enhance present-day legal education as a whole.

1. This study is a look at the system of legal education from the inside, a look by a practitioner for whom legal education reform is becoming an everyday professional activity.

2. Thus, specific objectives in legal education, proximal and current, are associated with issues faced by a law school at a specific point in time. Boosting the effectiveness of legal education implies identifying problems in its current implementation and selecting models and learning methods aimed at resolving these problems.

Present-day legal education has been facing the following problems:

- the on going infantilization of youth;
- the mismatch between the level of students’ emotional-psychological and intellectual maturity and the characteristics of the legal profession, which requires from the student – a future specialist – a certain degree of personal maturity and an adequate motivation for achieving things;
- mechanistically copying the foreign experience in the area of education and educational technology;
- formalizing and bureaucratizing the educational process and prioritizing a diversity of the external forms of the educational process over its content;
- the need to correlate the needs of the time we live in with the characteristics of the order placed by society: expecting mixed competence from a specialist in law (in addition to professional-legal competence proper, there is a need for information, organizational, and communicative competence as well);
- the decline in law students’ level of general cultural erudition.

The above issues have a mass character, which means...
we can view them as negative trends in social development in the area of higher education. For the purposes of this study, we would like to examine in greater detail some of these trends inclusive of the all-round case study principle.

3. We, obviously, are in no position to conduct the integrated analysis of the above issues at the proper level of quality within the frame of just one single research study. In this work, we would like to focus on just one specific issue – that of the infantilization of youth. In our view, it is this problem that appears to be the most burning one at the moment, as it is seen as the one that, in many respects, gives rise to and prefigures the other issues mentioned above.

On the whole, the infantilization of youth manifests in their low emotional and social maturity level, which hinders students from mastering knowledge and forming their professional competencies in alignment with the standards of higher education. For the purposes of this study, we shall nominally single out a few aspects of the issue of youth infantilization: social infantilization, intellectual infantilization, emotional-psychological infantilization, and moral-ethical infantilization.

### 2.1. Social Infantilization.
There are a couple of aspects to this phenomenon. From the standpoint of psychology, the major difference between an adult and a child lies in the ability to independently organize one’s activity beyond any external control and be responsible for oneself, one’s choice, actions, and words. Children are controlled by a community (the school or family). While, when it comes to adults, society views them as someone who is fully aware of the character of their actions, understands the consequences of making their choices, and, as a result, assumes responsibility for their behavior. Adults are less dependent on external control, are capable of acting independently and taking the initiative. They act in their own interests, and external evaluation (by a parent, an instructor, or a group) is not the main and sole motivator for activity. In terms of learning, adults consciously study for “them selves”, being fully aware of why they need that and what practical results they are trying to achieve. By contrast, children study under external control and are driven by the external evaluation of their activity (including the grades they get) as the chief motivator. As a child, you may be motivated to study because you want to “please my aunt”, “please my uncle”, because “I don’t want to be scolded”, because “that’s the way it should be”, or because “children are supposed to go to school”, etc.

In this sense, there is a sad trend among first-year students we have been witnessing over the last few years: in terms of their level of psychological maturity, their ability to engage in conscious activity beyond external control, and their ability to be fully aware of and assume responsibility for their actions, junior students are almost at the level of a sixth-grader, i.e. a 12-13-year-old (if we go by pedagogy text books and draw a comparison with school-students from the last two decades of the last century). This condition, in turn, brings into college education some problems that are typical for the period of going to high school and hinders the student and the instructor from moving on to a whole new level of mastering professionally significant knowledge.

In addition, social infantilization manifests in students’ lack of personal responsibility, their inability to be fully aware of and assume responsibility for their actions and deeds. Students tend to wait for instructions on the part of adults, some kind of stimulus from without. They are not capable of independently organizing their learning and are inclined to ignore any instructional recommendations unless following the latter is insisted upon by the instructor or enforced by some kind of coercion (in the form of external control of this type of activity, like lowering one’s grades or debarring one from completing the final academic assessment). Due to this kind of attitude towards study being highly wide spread, colleges are forced to meticulously regulate learning activity and impose tight control over it. This, in turn, formalizes and quite ineptly bureaucratizes the learning process, depriving it of its creative and individual components. Formalized learning activity does increasingly little in terms of facilitating the development of a sense of responsibility in students. Failures at school are not considered by them as a serious problem. Besides, poorly performing students are inclined to put their poor grades at school not down to their own fault but to the impact of various external factors: the subject being too tough, the instructor being too biased, the material being explained in a poor way, or the requirements set by the instructor and the college being too demanding.

### 2.2. Intellectual Infantilization.
Intellectual infantilization manifests, above all, in today’s students having poorly developed theoretical...
thinking skills, in their inability to perform certain logical operations, which hinders their mastering the system of generalizations, which make up the core content of knowledge.

Back in the middle of the last century, a phenomenon known as the formalism of knowledge was explored in pedagogy. It was viewed as a flaw in school education. However, we feel this phenomenon is characteristic of today’s college students as well. From the standpoint of modern pedagogy, the primary objective in learning is the acquisition of non-formal knowledge, i.e. knowledge that is innately important for students, closely associated with their personality, and makes it possible to see the link between science and actual reality. It is based on such, non-formal, knowledge that the person's practical abilities develop and their professional skills form in the future. Non-formal knowledge is transformed into convictions, into a way to apprehend reality.

The psychological nature of the formalism of knowledge became the subject of a study whose findings were presented by an article entitled "A Psychological Analysis of Formalism in Assimilating School Knowledge" published in 1945. The formalism of knowledge is about knowledge being detached from the person's former notions, from phenomena of the real world. Formalism in learning has the following manifestations: memorizing something without understanding it; separating the concept from the object; being unable to fully master the content.

In exploring the formalism of knowledge, a couple of conclusions were drawn which were recognized by modern pedagogy and psychology. Firstly, the formalism of knowledge and its manifestations are linked with the level of thinking skills in students. In groups of school students with different levels of thinking skills, research registered various flaws in assimilating knowledge and various manifestations of the formalism of knowledge. Secondly, it was proven that the complete assimilation of school knowledge implies mastering the system of generalizations, which make up the core content of knowledge. The research was conducted through the example of learning physics at school. In relation to physics, the study's practical recommendations were as follows: the objective in learning physics at school ought to lie not in the practical significance of material studied but in bringing to light the laws of nature and phenomena occurring in the world around us; it is knowledge as such that ought to constitute the purpose of learning.

For the purposes of this study, we prefer to be concerned less with the inferences relating to the manifestations of the formalism of learning than some of the other aspects of the study by Yes, it is a sad fact that, as of late, the formalism of knowledge has been manifested with college students on a truly mass scale, which is becoming a very serious issue in today's society. In this regard, we have specifically taken an interest in those of the findings of the above study which appear to have a direct bearing on our core issue of youth infantilization. The thing is that the possibility of quality non-formal knowledge forming is directly linked with the student's level of intellectual development, their ability to perform certain thinking operations. Our observations indicate that a sizable portion of college students are performing today at the intellectual level of a secondary school student. These tend to evince the same thinking characteristics as those of secondary school students and poor theoretical thinking skills on the whole, which renders virtually impossible the proper assimilation of knowledge under the college curriculum. We are going to examine this aspect of the issue of infantilization in greater detail, which takes us back to the study by.

For the purposes of the study, the participating secondary school students were divided into 4 subgroups by level of thinking skills.

1. Students (a portion of the group) who command just a set of sensory generalizations directly amalgamated with the object and action and have an especially hard time in terms of the theoretical aspect of thinking.

In terms of the formalism of knowledge, this group has the following characteristics. If these students did not have to face the external necessity of assimilating theoretical material that is hard for them to pick up on, they really would not even try to master it and would just keep on digesting phenomena and facts to the best of their current understanding of things. But we know that students are supposed to master most of the academic material prescribed by their school curriculum; this is something that is required of the student by the instructor and the curriculum and is what any student is expected to be doing at school; however, they tend to just memorize the material without really comprehending it well enough. Most of the students with this kind of formal knowledge are those with a pronouncedly narrow academic mind set. They are convinced that they "must study", want to be "good students", manage to achieve a certain standing in their class, get good grades, receive praise from the
teacher, etc., but they do not comprehend the gist of what they are learning, failing to delve deeper into the laws they are studying. The above type of knowledge formalism is, from a psychological point of view, a consequence of a portion of students not being completely “ready” to genuinely master theoretical material.

2. Students (the majority) with well-developed theoretical thinking skills who can make the concept a special object of cognition. They are capable of making a distinction between what is abstract and what is real.

With this group, we come across a type of formalism that is totally different from what we have described above. The student not only knows most of the rules and laws, not only remembers them, but comprehends their theoretical content – albeit they remain alien to the student's consciousness and personality. To the student, formal knowledge acts here as “separate knowledge” which is along side their former notions and perceptions and is not correlated with phenomena in the real world, which means the student perceives it as devoid of its real cognitive sense. This type of formalism is manifested in the abstractness and schematism of knowledge, in one's inability to use acquired knowledge to explain phenomena in the real world. “This type of formalism, as the majority of the study's findings indicate, still remains prevalent in our schools,” writes “It is inherent to many students and is something that is normally overcome quite slowly during the process of learning”.

3. Students (the minority) who appear to comprehend their school material and strive to apply it – but, at the same time, they are inclined to single out just one side of the phenomenon and try to groundlessly expand it to an all-encompassing principle.

This, higher, level of assimilation is another level where we came across formalism, a level where the students both comprehend the learning material and do their best to apply their knowledge in resolving theoretical and practical objectives. So what is behind this type of formalism? An analysis of the assimilation process indicates that a certain portion of students (quite a small one) tend to try, right in class, to grasp new knowledge based directly on their life's experience. They are not satisfied with the co-existence of two types of knowledge – their own knowledge and school knowledge, as is the case with the other, much lower, assimilation level. They tend to try to amalgamate all of their notions and perceptions into a single system of knowledge. What we have here is just the opposite of what is characteristic of the students from assimilation levels 1 and 2: there even most of the verifiably correct general ideas (e.g., Archimedes’ principle) are reduced in significance to the level of a private explanation, whilst here a particular moving cause is given the significance of a law. The genuine assimilation of the fundamentals of sciences is impossible if generalizations, which possess a sensory, visual character, remain unperceived, amalgamated with the object and the action; but it is also impossible in the event that generalizations, having separated from the reality reflected in them, end up absolutized in the child's consciousness. Full and conscious assimilation requires not just being able to see the general in the singular but also being able to see the singular and specific in the general. In our case, the students have yet to learn to take into account the entire specific diversity of conditions for applying scientific ideas and concepts – for which reason, in trying to use their knowledge in grasping real life facts, they tend to sink into dogmatism.

4. Students (a small portion of the group, few individuals) who are not intellectually prepared to perceive and comprehend theoretical ideas.

In had this to say about this student group: “In formulating their answers, they reason from “common sense”, explaining phenomena and facts just to the best of their understanding of things, making absolutely no use of relevant laws in the process. These students have no formalism in their answers. They simply do not know any physical laws and rules and tend to assimilate from the entire learning curriculum just those ideas and facts that are within the range of their comprehension. They tend to have a better command of examples than actual laws and are totally incapable of articulating precise formulations. Normally, these students tend to just “cram” for exams trying to eke out at least a C... They tend to forget the material pretty fast, and learning fails to produce any tangible changes in the way they think or their attitude towards reality”.

Note that this group of students exhibits no formalism of knowledge. For formalism to be there, one needs to have a known level of knowledge assimilation. Formalism implies not just superficial fragmentary knowledge but a special knowledge structure that forms in students with a faulty, narrow academic mindset.

Let us keep in mind we are talking here about secondary school students. This study singles out several typical groups, by level of thinking skills, for said age category. These groups are featured in proportions typical of said
age category as of the middle of the last century. Based on
the above, we can establish which intellectual operations
the students were capable of and which gave them hard
time. Most of the secondary school students had well-
developed theoretical thinking skills and were capable of
abstract thinking. The rest were capable of generalizations
based on sensory experience (generalization being a
significant intellectual operation needed for constructing
concept lists). Only an insignificant portion of the students
were characterized by having a low level of thinking
skills and being unprepared to perceive and comprehend
theoretical ideas.

By the logic of education, the number of students with
a lack of theoretical forms of thinking decreases going
forward, i.e. by the end of school. Thus, among high school
graduates there should be no individuals whose arsenal is
limited to just sensory generalizations and, all the more
so, no one incapable of perceiving and comprehending
theoretical ideas. These thinking traits are characteristic
of children from younger age groups and are indicative of
a low level of thinking skills.

What are we witnessing with most of today’s
institutions of higher learning? It is worth remembering
that most of today’s junior students are guys and girls
ages 18–19, who have completed a full course of study
at a comprehensive school. We are forced to admit that
the characteristics of levels of thinking skills identified
for secondary school students in the middle of the last
century can also be applied in respect of most of today’s
college students. Most importantly, strangely as it may
seem, among present-day first-year students there are a
number of individuals who are intellectually unprepared
to take in theoretical ideas (Group 4 in the study by). Most
of them have the characteristics of students from Group
1 based on the classification by these are individuals
who command just a set of sensory generalizations
which are amalgamated directly with the object and the
action; they do not command well-developed theoretical
forms of thinking. In working with this pool of students,
what stands out above all is their inability to take in and
formulate concept lists.

As an example, we often come across a lack of
understanding when it comes to learning to classify the
various state-legal phenomena. Phrases like “states are
divided into monarchies” have become a common thing
in the classroom. Most of the students see no logical error
in the above statement. This one is about the criteria for
demarcating the forms of government into republican and
monarchical. The standard answer may look something
like: “In a republic, they elect the authority, whereas in
a monarchy all power is concentrated in the hands of a
monarch”.

It would be OK for students to say: “States are
divided into republics and federations” – and they would
see no logical error in this. The issue of classification
criteria remains unresolvable for half of the audience. In
our last class, I wrote a phrase on the black board and
asked the audience to find the mistakes in it. The phrase is:
“Shoes are divided into red, green, leather, heeled, suede,
women’s, and chiffon”. Only three (!) students out of the 18
present suggested that here we have several classifications
that are mixed up based on different attributes. Those who
did find mistakes in the phrase called the classification
incomplete, adding that shoes can also be black, brown,
etc.

When working with one of the other groups, after
becoming aware of their having hard time studying
another classification, I came up with the following
problem: identify the odd word out in a list of words.
The list consisted of the following words: dachshund,
Pekingese, Rottweiler, dog, poodle, and bichon. I had not
provided any clarifications to help the group with the
task. The best idea the students suggested was that we
complement the concept list with more entries (herding
dog, Great Dane, cat…).

These examples indicate that the majority of students
are exhibiting a level of thinking skills that is too low
to analyze such complex abstractions as “law”, “state”,
“legal system”, “political power”, “legal norm hypothesis”,
“capacity” and “legal capacity”, etc. Being incapable of
classifying things makes it impossible for students to use
typology as a method of scientific analysis. And without
using typology we cannot derive and formulate the major
patterns in the development of society and state-legal
phenomena.

Cramming without understanding the material
sufficiently well enough may lead to a situation where
some – who have suddenly lost track of their thoughts –
start saying utterly nonsensical things, totally unaware
of the blunders they are making. Examples of such
blunders may include the following statements: “all law
is laws formally enshrined in laws”, “law employs state
compulsion”, and “law is different from the norms of
primitive society in the apparatus of government and
compulsion”. These statements are extracts from written
assignments and oral answers by real first-year students
If we compare typical logical errors made by first-year students and those made by school students (grades 6 and 7) with thinking formalism, we can see that they are very similar to each other. The majority of today’s students are demonstrating levels of thinking skills that used to be considered normal for a secondary school student. Students with low levels of abstract thinking skills tend to perceive legal disciplines quite superficially and fragmentarily. Consequently, at the level of mechanical learning, legal terminology, which implies the highest levels of abstraction, tends to remain unassimilated by students.

We can see the intellectual infantilization of today’s students in that they are evincing the levels of thinking skills and degrees of knowledge formalism which are typical of school students. This condition objectively reduces the ability of students to take in a significant portion of professionally crucial information and, clearly, is an insufficient basis for the formation of the major professional skills.

Thus, youth infantilization manifests in today’s students exhibiting poor levels of theoretical thinking skills.

Another manifestation of the intellectual infantilization of youth (second after poor theoretical thinking skills) is the decrease in the degree of students’ cognitive activity and curiosity as a whole. The overwhelming majority of junior students are oriented towards a simplified model of schooling: familiarizing yourself with a minimum of material on the topic and reproducing it “close to the original text” with a view to getting a mark. Only few are interested in looking for some extra material and undertaking deeper study into the subject. As we understand, this kind of student mindset is in conflict with the very idea of higher education. According to the aforementioned study by there are two aspects of formalism in the process of learning: the “formalism of knowledge” and the “formalism of knowledge assimilation”. The “formalism of knowledge” as an outcome of learning implies dead knowledge devoid, for students, of any cognitive sense and existing in their consciousness “parallel” with reality and their every day experience. The “formalism of knowledge assimilation” stands for the lack of genuinely cognitive attitude towards knowledge, which leads to the assimilation process halting halfway through and ending up incomplete over all.

2.3. Emotional-Psychological Infantilization.
We shall nominally single out a few of its manifestations: flaws in the personality structure and flaws in motivation.

A) Firstly, infantilization manifests in one’s poorly developed psychological structure, meaning that today’s first-year students have yet to develop certain personality elements needed for an adult person to succeed in life. Among these are such concepts in personality psychology as one’s self-concept and Adult ego-state.

One’s self-concept is a system of beliefs about oneself, the part of personality that one is aware of. One is, to a greater or lesser degree, aware of these beliefs, which are known to be relatively sustainable. A well-formed self-concept is an indicator of one’s maturity level. Children normally lack a well-formed self-concept, do not self-reflect, and have disjointed and fragmentary beliefs about themselves. Psychology has an extensive set of ways to structure and classify self-concept. The concept has been widely drawn upon as part of theories by prominent scholars like Abraham Maslow, Carl Rogers, Charles Cooley, George Mead, Erik Erikson, and William James. Of great interest is the hierarchical structure of self-concept proposed by Robert Burns, which incorporates the following modalities: 1) the real self (how you really see yourself); 2) the ideal self (how you would like to think of yourself); 3) the looking-glass self (how you think others see you). Each of these modalities incorporates certain aspects, like the physical self, social self, mental self, and emotional self.

An important indicator of personal maturity is having the real self in the system of beliefs about oneself, i.e. having adequate knowledge as to what personal qualities, faculties, traits of character, physical characteristics, etc., one possesses. It is this aspect of self-concept that is not developed in an infantile person. With children, it will be typical and normal that they have no well-formed real beliefs about themselves at the present time – and, as a result, that their real self is replaced by the ideal self (what one should be like based on moral requirements), the fantastical self (what one could be like if one had the opportunity and the right conditions for it), and the dynamic self (what one intends to be like in the future).

Unfortunately, our research indicates that this kind of self-perception is characteristic of today’s junior students as well. The real self being absent in the personality
structure hinders the formation of the rest of the elements and aspects of self-concept. As a result, young people tend to have a rather vague idea of the objectives and prospects for their learning, fail to plan out their education and professional career, and have a rather distorted idea of how others see them. These students are unable to gauge themselves in different social roles and, as a consequence, tend to be incapable of social adaptation and professional self-actualization. Most youth's social image of self is distorted and uniformed. These students tend to unjustifiably extend positive assessments of themselves in particular social roles to the other social roles of theirs. For instance, we can picture a young man who is good looking, with a nice sense of humor, really good at the latest computer games, up to speed on the most popular music, is loved and praised by his parents, and has a circle of friends he like to socialize with. As a result, the guy develops a positive self-concept and begins to extend positive characterizations of himself to the other areas of his life as well—with no objective grounds for doing so. These students are inclined to over estimate their potential and prospects and tend to put off any serious work they may need to do on themselves “until later”. Being infantile manifests in this case in that you have no understanding of the way you are seen by others outside your micro-group, what qualities you display through your daily behavior, and how you cope with your social roles. The real self of this type of people is devoid of notions of their objectively being at present, despite all the positive characteristics, a poorly performing student, an ill-bred youth, an illiterate person, someone irresponsible, unreliable, incompetent and incapable of following their profession, incapable of logical thinking, etc. This kind of selective self-perception impedes youth's personal and professional development and hinders them from perceiving information crucial to their social and professional growth.

The concept of ego-state was introduced into scientific circulation by, who created the theory of transactional analysis as a way of explaining human behavior. Typically, according to transactional analysis, there are three ego-states that people can (or choose to) be in: the Parent, Adult, and Child state. The Parent ego-state is comprised of the behaviors, thoughts, and feelings copied from our parents. The Adult ego-state deals with our ability to think and determine action for ourselves based upon the ‘here and now’. And in the Child ego-state we behave, feel, and think similarly to how we did as a child. This state represents archaic relics, still-active ego states which were fixated in early childhood. Each of the three ego-states is crucial to man in its own right. The Parent in us expresses the social “you need to” and “you have to”; it is about the ability and need to fulfill all kinds of rules and obey restrictions; it is associated with being nurturing, critical, and controlling. In the Parent ego-state, we either imitate the behavior of one of our parents or try to fit in with their demands.

The Child is our “I want”; it is the source of intuition, creation, joy, and spontaneity; conversely, it may also be associated with fears, dependency, being given to whims, being defiant, or whining. Functionally, the Child ego-state is comprised of 2 aspects: the Free (Natural) Child and the Adapted Child. The Adapted Child is associated with behavior meant to conform to the expectations of parents, while the Free Child is spontaneous: playful, naughty, free-wheeling, rebellious, self-indulgent, curious, or creative.

The Adult is our “I can”; here we can think of such characteristics as being self-sufficient and self-confident; it is the ability to make decisions and resolve problems and the ability to interact with others on a parity basis. The Adult state is necessary for survival. It processes information and computes the probabilities which are essential for dealing effectively with the outside world. Here is how describes this ego-state: “It also experiences its own kinds of setbacks and gratifications. Crossing a busy highway, for example, requires the processing of a complex series of velocity data; action is suspended until the computations indicate a high degree of probability for reaching the other side safely. The gratifications offered by successful computations of this type afford some of the joys of skiing, flying, sailing, and other mobile sports”.

The Adult regulates the activities of the Parent and the Child, and mediates between them. The Adult ego-state is the hardest to be formed. The emotional-psychological infantilization in the student milieu manifests in this state not being formed or simply missing in the overwhelming majority of students. Most of the “adult” issues, like professional training and professional activity, end up being discussed with someone who is still a child, and done so at children's level. Poor self-organization, lack of responsibility for one's academic performance, knowledge and learning formalism, superficial understanding of the material, being oriented towards the formal grade, and lack of interest in real knowledge – all these are manifestations of an underdeveloped Adult ego-state in today's students.

Thus, our observations lead us to assert that a great
many of today’s students are characterized by certain mental structures being undeveloped in them as opposed to their actual chronological age. This not only makes it harder for students to acquire a higher education but renders impossible the achievement of certain objectives in higher learning.

B) Secondly, infantilization affects student motivation. Student motivation for learning is generally quite low, which, in large part, is due to the unjustified massification of higher learning we are witnessing today. Democracy has done a bad service to the educational system: despite wider access to higher learning, it is gradually losing its elite standing. For society to develop harmoniously, it does not really need mass higher education. What is more, the percentage of people with a higher education in society does not need to be too high, as this contradicts the very idea of higher education. There is an unjustified substitution of concepts going on in today’s world: professional education does not necessarily have to be higher education. To ensure the effective development of our society at the stage of scientific and technological progress, we need a well-developed and accessible system of professional education. A part of this system of professional education is higher education. With this type of structure of the educational system, each of its segments performs its designated functions, while there are specific requirements in place as to admission to a particular form of education. The unjustified massification of higher education leads, quite naturally, to its simplification and makes us adjust things to the average pool of students. It is no wonder that in such conditions education ceases to be consistent with its social objectives and can no longer be seen as fulfilling its functions. The result of embracing the distorted “a college diploma is a must” mindset is that most of the individuals entering college nowadays are young people with no interest or inclination in higher learning, no high and adequate motivation, and no academic or professional achievements. As a consequence, the diploma of higher learning is gradually losing its prestige and authority: it no longer guarantees getting a prestigious job, no longer gives you good knowledge, and no longer attests to the high level of its holder’s general and professional culture.

Massification has devalued higher education as a social value. Most of those coming into college today view study as a kind of activity that is hard and, most importantly, uninteresting. Furthermore, it tends to be seen as a formal stage, imposed by society, in the shift to practical professional activity. The benefits of professional learning and its inherent value fail to be considered.

For the purposes of this study, we would like to lay a special emphasis on another defect in motivation. But let us first recall some of the famous postulates in pedagogical psychology.

The Yerkes–Dodson law, formulated a few decades ago, holds that the quality of performance depends on the intensity of motivation. In other words, performance increases with physiological or mental arousal. But that is only up to a point. If certain results have been achieved and levels of arousal continue rising, performance starts decreasing. Thus, a motive can possess:

1. Quantitative characteristics (based on the “strong – weak” principle).
2. Qualitative characteristics (internal and external motives). This is about the interrelationship between the motive and the content of activity. If the activity is significant to one as such (e.g., it satisfies one’s cognitive need for learning), it is internal motivation. Whilst, if one’s drive towards the activity is associated with social prestige, a high salary, etc., those are external motives.

The qualitative characteristics of motives are of great importance. Note that the aforementioned Yerkes–Dodson law does not hold for cognitive motivation. Let us imagine a person who is eager to study: the more he/she learns, the stronger his/her thirst for knowledge.

However, it will not suffice to just divide motives into internal and external. External motives, in turn, can be positive (motives of success, achievement) and negative (motives of avoidance, defense). External positive motives are more effective than external negative ones, even if they are equal in terms of power (a quantitative indicator).

Here is how the defect of motivation works. The average first-year student is motivated exclusively by getting a grade, which is an external indicator. Indeed, they tend to be oriented towards just getting a good score and “passing” the subject. They lack a conscious motivation for professional achievement; it simply has yet to develop as a new mental formation. We cannot really expect a secondary school student to have a well-developed motivation for performance, all the more so in the form of independent formulation of criteria for one’s performance... Such things as the sustainability and fullness of one’s knowledge and well-developedness of one’s practical skills, the ability to perform a class assignment in a quality way (writing something) and to
put forward original ways to solve a professional problem, etc., tend to be totally overlooked by the present-day student. They are just not perceived as possible criteria for planning out and evaluating one's performance and, certainly, fail to become motivators for learning. The student is oriented towards getting a grade. That is all. It does not matter how you get the grade and whether or not there is real knowledge and skills behind it.

The present-day student is characterized by what they call a “narrow academic mindset” in pedagogical psychology. This means “studying for the sake of studying”, with no real goal to master all of the knowledge. The narrow academic mindset is reflected in the student being primarily oriented towards formal grades and external indicators.

In a practical sense, this brings about the problem of learning being detached from its end objectives and practical professional activity. This kind of attitude formalizes the learning process and emasculates its cognitive content. Many forms of academic activity in college tend to become pointless and end up being a mere imitation of themselves.

2.4. Moral-ethical infantilization.
The infantilization of law students makes impossible the formation of the ethical structure of the lawyer personality. The ethical structure of personality is construed in professional psychology as a set of one’s moral mindsets and ethical qualities. The major signs of a well-developed moral structure of personality are the ability to make a moral choice and the ability to act under the influence of inner convictions (exclusive of external pressure).

Moral convictions and standards are abstractions. Only a person with a certain level of intellectual development, capable of abstract thinking and with a high level of overall erudition, is capable of perceiving them. These baseline mindsets help one perceive the ideas of humanization, moral standards of justice, and requirements of professional ethics. Being infantile manifests in one’s fragmentary knowledge, inability to discern historical and social patterns, inability to forecast things, and inclination towards simplified ways to solve problems and force-based ways to enforce compliance. With such a grim picture, we can hardly speak of fostering high standards of professional ethics in law students and, most importantly, their conscious willingness to embrace them.

In addition, the moral aspects of activity engaged in by courts, attorneys, and investigating officers can be discussed only with people with a well-developed moral structure of personality and well-formed and personally mediated moral values and ideals. In other words, a good law student ought to be a person with fundamentally well-developed moral principles. Resolving the moral issues of society through professional activity is an even higher level of abstraction which involves making a complex moral choice on the part of and a higher level of moral development of the decision maker. Moral maturity manifests in the ability to make a reasoned moral choice and behave guided by one’s own moral convictions regardless of public opinion or the threat of punishment. Being morally infantile manifests in that the person is only capable of formally complying with the norms of social morality, and in doing so is guided not by respect for people and society and a personal belief in the social need for this type of behavior, but by fear of the negative consequences of not abiding by such norms.

It is this low, primitive level of moral development that a great many of junior students are at today. They have yet to realize the need for and the social significance of moral regulation and, as a consequence, tend to lack the ability to make a conscious choice of morally justified forms of behavior under the influence of their own convictions. In other words, it is still early to talk to these individuals about things like professional ethics and the moral aspects of justice. And, considering that globally law is a socially accepted form of justice and an ethically saturated category, an immoral or morally indifferent lawyer can be a disaster for society.

4. Obviously, the above list cannot cover all of today's issues in higher education. But it can give us an idea of where our society is heading and provide some clues as to where we may need to reconsider our existing approach to organizing higher education. We can nominally term the general line of development of today’s legal education a socially-oriented approach to determining the major targets and content of education. More specifically, in the “society – education – individual” system we give priority to society, social needs, orders placed by society, and sought-after social roles for specialists. The major objective in education under this approach is to transform the individual into a specialist in alignment with the demands of society. The approach is logical and is quite well-justified. However, today there are certain conditions and circumstances that make a socially-oriented approach virtually impossible to implement. Indeed, there is plenty
of research into the effectiveness of legal education that attests to its ineffectiveness and social dissatisfaction with its quality. In our view, given the objective realities of our today’s system of professional education, there is a need to reconsider the existing approach. We may expect all improvements, models, and strategies proposed as part of a socially-oriented approach to just crash into a set of subjective factors which will render these improvements, models, and strategies impossible to apply or distort their true purpose. Today’s issues in EDUCATION (not issues in society through the system of education, as is the case most of the time) can and should be resolved using a person-oriented approach. This implies that in the “society – education – individual” the focus needs to be shifted onto the individual, i.e. the average student with all his/her inherent characteristics. From this viewpoint, the role and potential of education as a link between the individual and society are bound to change. So are its content and society’s expectations of it.

The findings of today’s comparative-legal research indicate that the current crisis in education is a global reality – it is not a specific-historical characteristic of particular regions. Educational reform appears to be a topical issue not only in Russia. The overwhelming majority of research studies into issues in and the effectiveness of today’s higher education have examined are characterized by one flaw: the absolutization of a socially-oriented approach. In other words, higher education is viewed and evaluated exclusively through the prism of social needs and in terms of the degree to which it fulfills, fails to fulfill, a specific order placed by society. The system of education is perceived exclusively as a means of achieving certain socially significant results. We are by no means saying that it is totally wrong. And we are not trying to declare a socially-oriented approach wrong. On the contrary, both in terms of ensuring social development and in terms of the significance of the profession and its role in society, the use of a socially-oriented approach is right and justified. Education is one of the social functions and one of the areas of social reality; in relation to society as a whole, it, indeed, has an applied, servicing nature and is not a goal in and of itself. Education is of great value when it comes to personal and social development. And, indeed, the overall effectiveness of education has to be gauged through the parameters of it achieving and failing to achieve certain socially significant objectives. All this is true. We just want to add that in present-day conditions a socially-oriented approach to organizing the educational system ought to be complemented with a person-oriented one. Even more so, to overcome crisis trends in today’s legal (or any other form of higher) education, we need to shift for a moment to a person-oriented approach, for, otherwise, recovery from the crisis may take longer and a social-oriented approach may remain unimplemented for a long time. Under a person-oriented approach, education is a means too, but here it is rather a means of ensuring the link between the individual and society, a means of personal development.

Society, as we know, is an entity that is comprised of a number of subsystems, such as the educational, legal, political, economic, religious, cultural, and other subsystems. Education as a social institute interacts with other institutes, like the family, professional societies, the church, the state, etc. Besides, education, in turn, can be viewed as a system (of a lower level) that consists of a number of subsystems, like the systems of pre-school, primary, secondary, higher, and post-graduate education and systems of professional development. The system of higher education cannot resolve all of the problems brought about in the other subsystems and other social institutes. It is possible to have higher education as an idea, a system of learning, and a social institute under certain conditions. But in today’s society these conditions are not being met.

Education can be reformed inclusive of social needs. But, aside from that, education should also be reformed inclusive of its own internal needs as an independent subsystem within society. If we look at it from this angle, it becomes obvious that education has its own logic and laws and there are conditions under which it can exist, as well as a whole lot of factors which will govern the boundaries and areas of its development in society. The “society – education – individual” system can also be evaluated from an additional, third, perspective: by placing education in the center as a social institute with its own laws and needs. This gives us our third approach to organizing education, which we shall nominally term asystem-oriented approach. Under the first two approaches (socially-oriented and person-oriented), education is viewed as a means, a tool. The last approach makes us look at education and its needs as a goal and at society and the individual as a means, in a sense. Society and the individual ought to create certain conditions for education to be able exist and develop, and provide it with the necessary resources.

The existence and effective operation of any system
requires that all of its elements be well-formed and function effectively. In reforming any system, we must take account of the specificity, characteristics, and needs of all the elements in the system. These axiomatic postulates have not been taken into account in implementing the numerous educational reforms over the last few years. Educational reform tends to focus on a socially-oriented approach the most. This approach can help identify what kind of order society is willing to place with it and what society’s expectations of today’s education and today’s college graduates are. However, in order to achieve strategic objectives for higher education, which can be formulated by a socially-oriented approach to education, we need certain baseline data. As these baseline data we shall use the qualitative condition of the rest of the system’s elements – in our case, it is the qualitative condition of the system of higher education and that of the student. The existing qualitative condition of the system of higher education and that of the students does not let us achieve the objectives proposed by a socially-oriented approach to education, no matter how benevolent, imperative, and socially significant these objectives may be. The further reformation of the “society – education – individual” system requires shifting the focus to the issues and objectives which are set forth by the other elements in the system: education (in our case – higher education) and the individual (the law student).

A problem-objective approach proposed by this study helps identify the needs and patterns of education as a social institute and a social subsystem. We have already examined the issue of youth infantilization in some detail. On one hand, infantilization is an important characteristic of today’s students, and, on the other, it is a factor that affects higher education. When youth infantilization is significant, education is clearly unable to achieve the objectives and goals set for it by a socially-oriented approach. Nor is it capable of meeting in full the objective of the socialization of students and creation of conditions for their personal development and professional and personal self-actualization. We can discern an imbalance in the “society – education – individual” system. In our view, to be able to harmonize this system in present-day conditions, we need to act in two directions. Firstly, education must give the person something, be able to shift the focus onto the individual and react to the qualitative characteristics and needs of the present-day student. Secondly, society must give something to education as a subsystem of society. Let us take a closer look.

The “education - individual” dimension. A person-oriented approach in education suggests being oriented, first of all, towards the characteristics of the present-day student and, second of all, towards the student's needs and interests. A while ago we spoke about the intellectual infantilization of today’s college entrants, their inability to perform certain intellectual operations needed to fully master professional legal knowledge. This state of affairs is the objective reality of the system of higher education. In order to maintain balance within the “society – education – individual” system, the system of higher education must somehow react to what is going on. It stands to reason that today’s colleges must come up with ways to compensate for certain gaps the school education of their students, or else studying core law subjects will turn into a mere travesty of the educational process. Many law schools (not just in Russia) are still using a model of legal education that is tailored to the needs of legal systems from the last century. Those quite compact (as opposed to today’s volumes of information) and sustainable systems of normative regulation used to conveniently lend themselves to review study. In those conditions, legal education had at its core brief reviews of all (or almost all) available branches of law and law disciplines, and knowledge of the content of legal regulation in the various areas of law (i.e., knowing most of the codes, laws, and case-law “by heart”) was a sign of a quality education. In present-day conditions that is both impossible and pointless. Consequently, gigabytes of legal information crammed into their brain is not what today’s students need – what they need is a set of skills and qualities that will help them obtain any situationally necessary information and acquire a competitive edge in the labor market. In addition, students need well-developed memory and attention, theoretical thinking, communication, and self-presentation skills. This is what today’s youth are lacking and that is what today’s colleges can help them with. Knowledge of a certain law will become irrelevant once that law is revoked, whilst the ability to search for and find the right law, interpret and use it the right way will never become obsolete.

Among the major needs and interests of today’s students are professional and personal self-actualization and being socially successful. In this regard, colleges ought to not only provide students with knowledge related to the profession but teach them how to apply it
in real life, teach them how to fit into a social situation, fit into a team, overcome professional stress, and withstand professional deformations\textsuperscript{11}.

To generalize the above, we would like to propose a two-tier model for legal professionalism which is expected to form during the process of legal education. Lawyer professionalism as a new mental formation is comprised of two levels: 1) primitive professionalism, i.e. knowledge and skills in the area of law; 2) derived, or social, professionalism, i.e. certain universal skills and personal qualities that will help one build a career, find one’s own niche in society, and achieve self-actualization. Derived professionalism includes communication skills, well-developed empathy skills, the ability to handle stress, the ability to self-learn, well-developed organizing skills, the ability to make decisions, creativity, the ability to utilize the latest sources of information, etc.

In our view, the role of higher legal education in today’s world is to help form a special type of personality – that of a professional. A professional is a performer of some type of activity who is oriented towards personal and professional development, someone who possesses the ability to independently shape and maintain his/her professionalism, after completing a course of study, as part of his/her professional activity.

These are some of the inferences we can draw in applying a person-oriented approach to education.

\textit{The “society – education” dimension.} We can have a sustainable and socially effective system of higher education in place only if the right conditions are provided for that to happen. And the job of society is to provide such conditions. Indeed, no matter how significant a person-oriented approach in education may be, there are certain objective restrictions in applying it. Higher education can adjust to the average college entrant up to a certain critical point by altering its requirements, teaching systems, and curricula. It can, up to certain limits, take on the functions of a comprehensive school and try to foster in students skills, abilities, and personal qualities which are needed to master professionally crucial knowledge and which today’s college entrants tend to lack. This will work, but only up to a certain point. At some critical point, any further adjustment of the system of higher education to the level of students may simply result in the destruction of higher education as an idea and a social institute. At a certain level of simplification, a college may be transformed into a second school or a tradesmen’s school. Amid the current crisis in the “society – education – individual” system, we are dangerously close to this critical point. One of the ways out of this situation is to impose tougher requirements on college entrants and try to help higher education reclaim its elite standing. This is a serious step that requires a significant degree of social responsibility. But sooner or later it will have to be taken if we wish to keep higher education as a social institute. Restoring the elite standing of education presupposes renouncing the practice of massifying and – in some part – commercializing it. There is a mismatch between the quality and elite standing of higher education and the situation where colleges have to fight for their survival and depend on the number of students enrolled in them.

Another important point to make is that we ought to stop expecting the system of higher education to resolve all of the problems brought about in the other subsystems of society. For the infantilization of youth is, in large measure, a reflection of the current crisis in school education. Today’s high schools are unable to provide colleges with pools of students who in their majority are prepared for the standards of higher learning. On the other hand, the unjustified massification of higher education is a consequence of the current crisis in the system of secondary-level vocational education. Ideally, we should have various kinds of academic institutes developing across the educational space, such as, for instance, further vocational education (career enhancement) institutions, occupational retraining institutions, special colleges, and other types of secondary-level vocational training institutions. The harmonization of the educational space means that society expects the system of higher education to no longer perform functions that are not characteristic of it, like trying to “crossbreed the hedgehog with the grass-snake” in many of its reforms. A way that is a lot more efficient and civilized is a well-thought-out educational policy that takes account of the integrated (not shifting and fragmentary) development of the systems of pre-school, secondary/high school, secondary-level vocational, higher, postgraduate, and further education.

Another obvious way to harmonize the educational space is through the legislative imposition of clear-cut qualification requirements and education qualifications for various occupations in the legal area and areas adjacent to it. The Russian Federation, for instance, has yet to arrive at a legislatively established correlation between your level of education and your position at work or professional status. The legislator ought to determine which positions and areas to apply a bachelor of laws and which a master of
laws education to, as well as what additional educational requirements (specialization, career enhancement, etc.) are to be met in order for you to be granted access to a particular position. This kind of legal regulation will make it possible for the system of higher education to sort things out regarding its requirements on students and for standards of learning. It stands to reason that students who are poor at certain types of academic and practical activity could, nevertheless, succeed in mastering other areas where other skills and abilities may be needed.

5. It is quite possible that the above negative trends in the area of legal education and proposed approaches to organizing education could be applied not only to Russian reality. For instance, right after graduating from high school youth get access to legal education in Poland, Germany, and France (albeit due to differences in the organization of secondary school education, the age of first-year students may vary between 18 and 20 years). Consequently, we can have similarities in the characteristics of junior students in countries that employ a similar approach. Let us face it: “mosaic” thinking, poorly developed theoretical thinking skills, the burgeoning virtual environment, and the tendency to substitute the sign component of communication for its speech counterpart – all these are common global trends. In any case, these characteristics identified by sociologists are those of societies in the industrial and postindustrial stages of development.

There are also a set of factors that point in favor the universalness of the above issues in legal education.

The global educational space brings together national educational systems of various types and levels. It is customary to single out certain types of regions based on mutual affinity and interaction between their educational systems.

The first type is comprised of regions which act as generators of integration processes. The best example of this type of a region is Western Europe. It was the idea of unity that stood behind the call for educational reform in the countries of Western Europe in the 1990s.

Among some of the other nations that could fit into the first type of regions are the US and Canada, but their integration efforts in the area of education are normally implemented in a somewhat different way.

The Asia-Pacific Region is a viewed as a new generator of integration processes. It is comprised of South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore, and Hong Kong, as well as Malaysia, Thailand, the Philippines, and Indonesia. All of these countries are characterized by pursuing a strategy of imposing tougher requirements for the quality of learning and workforce training.

The second type includes regions that tend to react positively to integration processes. These, above all, are Latin American countries.

Latin America has been always been, and still is, affected by integration impulses on the part of the US and Europe.

The third type includes regions that are inert in respect of the integration of educational processes. This group comprises most of the African countries south of the Sahara (except South Africa), a few states in South and Southeast, and some of the islands in the Pacific and the Atlantic.

The late 20th century witnesses a disruption in the consistency of educational and integration processes in a number of regions as a result of certain economic, political, and social changes. These regions include most of the Arab countries, Eastern Europe, and countries of the former USSR.

3. Conclusion

Today's trends in the development of the educational space – more specifically, the integration of educational systems and the actively developing system of academic mobility – are facilitating the extension of some of the features of particular national educational systems to the others. As a result, issues in legal education identified above through the example of the Russian Federation can most definitely be extended to other places as well. The countries of the former USSR and Eastern Europe used to have similar educational systems in the 20th century. During the period of the millennium, these regions had experienced largely similar social upheavals associated with the dismantling and transformation of the existing state. This situation leads us to assume that these regions may have similar issues in the present-day system of education.

By giving this brief characterization of the educational space, we wanted to illustrate that the issues in the system of education which we have identified through the example of Russian academic institutions can be viewed in present-day conditions as quite common trends in the development of educational systems. Integration processes taking place across the educational space are
forcing us to depart from “parochial”, regional approaches to the study of issues in education. The experience of any region or group could be of great benefit to the various segments of the educational space.
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