как осознание индивидом (социальной группой) своей принадлежности к определенному сообществу, принятие ценностей, норм, идеалов, которыми руководствуется данная нация, как результат овладения индивидом совокупности знаний об историческом пути, который прошла нация.

Идентичность белорусского народа формировалась на протяжении многих веков. Основными факторами, которые повлияли на ее становление, являются территория, история и культура. Территория современной Беларуси всегда оказывалась «пограничной», между двух цивилизаций: западной и восточной. Пограничное, межцивилизационное геополитическое положение белорусских земель, пересечение, взаимодействие и взаимовлияние культур Запада и Востока в отечественной истории привили общественному сознанию стремления к поиску компромиссов, терпимости и толерантности. В настоящее время национальная идентичность белорусов зависит от тенденции сохранения и возрождения национальной духовной и материальной культуры. Для сохранения культурной идентичности необходимо постепенное и целенаправленное развитие гражданско-политической национальной идентичности. Именно поэтому учреждения образования становятся важными институтами в процессе формирования белорусской идентичности, поскольку через них передается культурное и историческое наследие, закладываются национальные ценности у молодежи [5]. Одной из важных задач развития является вовлечение традиционной культуры в общественную жизнь и образование. Такой подход не только позволит сохранить культурное наследие, но и поможет воспитать у обучающихся национальное самосознание и патриотизм. Проблема формирования национально-культурной идентичности в условиях активного процесса глобализации не теряет своей актуальности.

Литература

1. Национальное самосознание и философия Беларуси : учеб.-метод. пособие / Г. И. Малыхина [и др.] ; под ред. Г. И. Малыхиной и В. И. Миськевича. – Минск : БГУИР, 2012. – 170 с.
2. Эриксон, Э. Х. Идентичность и цикл жизни / Э. Эриксон ; пер. с англ. Т. Зверевич. – СПб. : Питер, 2023. – 207 с.
3. Хантингтон, С. Кто мы?: Вызовы американской национальной идентичности / С. Хантингтон ; пер. с англ. А. Башкирова. – М. : Изд-во АСТ : ООО «Транзиткнига», 2004. – 635 с.
4. Русских, Л. В. Идентичность: культурная, этническая, национальная / Л. В. Русских // Вестник Южно-Уральского государственного университета. Серия: Социально-гуманитарные науки. – 2013. – URL: https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/identichnost-kulturnaya-etnicheskaya-natsionalnaya (дата обращения: 22.04.2026).
5. Сокольчик, В. Н. Национально-культурная идентичность как основа межкультурного диалога в условиях глобализации / В. Н. Сокольчик // Диалог цивилизаций в условиях глобальной экологической нестабильности : материалы Междунар. науч. конф. молодых ученых. – Минск : БГУ, 2013. – С. 122–124.

UDC 378(510)+378(4)

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE CHINESE AND EUROPEAN EDUCATION SYSTEMS

Cui Zheng

Sukhoi State Technical University of Gomel, the Republic of Belarus

Scientific supervisor V. N. Yakhno

The divergence between these two systems is not reducible to superficial differences in policy design. Rather, it emanates from foundational disparities in civilizational heritage, conceptions of knowledge and the relationship between the state and the scholarly community. European uni-

versities trace their lineage to medieval guilds and evolved through the Humboldtian synthesis of teaching and research, whereas Chinese higher education descends from the imperial examination system and its enduring entanglement with state governance.

Keywords: educational system, structure and management in the field of education, Chinese and European education systems.

СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ КИТАЙСКОЙ И ЕВРОПЕЙСКОЙ СИСТЕМ ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ

Цуй Чжен

Учреждение образования «Гомельский государственный технический университет имени П. О. Сухого», Республика Беларусь

Научный руководитель В. Н. Яхно

Различия между китайской и европейской системами образованиями не сводятся к поверхностным различиям в разработке политики управления. Различия проистекают из фундаментальных особенностей в цивилизационном наследии, представлениях о знаниях и взаимоотношениях между государством и научным сообществом. Европейские университеты ведут свое происхождение от средневековых гильдий и эволюционировали через гумбольдтовский синтез преподавания и исследований, тогда как китайское высшее образование происходит от имперской экзаменационной системы и ее постоянной связи с государственным управлением.

Ключевые слова: образовательная система, структура и управление в сфере образования, китайская и европейская системы образования.

Europe and China, representing paradigmatic exemplars of Western and Eastern civilizational systems respectively, have engendered markedly divergent models of higher education development. A systematic comparative historical analysis of these two systems holds significance for civilizational dialogue, theoretical advancement and pragmatic institutional recalibration.

The Chinese higher education system's three-dimensional structure is rooted in the millennia-long historical traditions of Chinese civilization. Its core genes were established with the Sui-Tang imperial examination system. This examination system, established during the Sui and Tang dynasties, constituted the core institution of China's classical higher education system. Unlike the guild origins of European universities, the examination system was a state-led talent selection mechanism that deeply bound the education system to state governance. Governance logic during this period formed a core tradition of unity of governance and education. The state was consistently the dominant actor and controller of the education system, directly determining educational goals and evaluative standards through the examinations and constructing a nationwide administrative network through the system of state schools. Education was always a core instrument of state governance, forming a tradition of state-led service to governance. Even academies, which possessed a degree of popular character, never developed institutional autonomy independent of imperial authority and remained under state co-optation and discipline. Institutional structure during this period took shape as a system with imperial examinations at the core, state schools as the mainstay and academies as supplements. The examination system directly determined teaching content, cultivation models and developmental direction, realizing an integrated closed loop of education, examination and official selection. This structure simultaneously concretized the unity of governance and edu-

cation logic and institutionalized the practical statecraft knowledge view. The three dimensions formed a highly stable internal isomorphism that persisted for thirteen hundred years, establishing the path-dependent foundation for the Chinese higher education system [1].

The modern transformation period witnessed institutional rupture and paradigm transplantation driven by the introduction of Western learning. The three-dimensional structure experienced temporary adjustments, yet the traditional genes did not undergo fundamental alteration. The influx of Western learning during the late Qing propelled dramatic educational reforms. Technical academies established during the Self-Strengthening Movement introduced Western practical knowledge. The abolition of the imperial examination system in 1905 marked the institutional rupture of the classical education system. Governance logic during this period was shaped by the principle of Chinese learning for essence, Western learning for practical use. The state consistently dominated the process of educational reform; new-style schools were always instruments serving the state's self-strengthening strategy. Even during the Republican period, when Cai Yuanpei drew upon the Humboldtian model to introduce principles of university autonomy at Peking University, the core position of state power was never shaken. Amidst continuous war and upheaval, this governance logic failed to form a stable institutional tradition. Knowledge view during this period broke the monopoly of Confucian classics and introduced Western natural and social science knowledge systems. Practical statecraft was imbued with new meaning, shifting from serving dynastic governance to serving national salvation and modernization. The pragmatic orientation of knowledge was further strengthened, while the Western knowledge view emphasizing rational speculation and pure science never truly took root. Institutional structure during this period saw the promulgation of modern school systems and the establishment of degree systems and university governance structures modelled on Japanese, German and American examples. While institutional forms were modernized, the core function of serving national strategy remained intact. Western university institutions were transplanted but formed a unique hybrid configuration with China's bureaucratic system [2]. The internal logic of the traditional three-dimensional structure did not fundamentally change.

Since 1949, China's higher education system has undergone Soviet model transplantation, indigenization following reform and opening-up and the Double First-Class initiative, further consolidating the core kernel of strategic embedded governance. Governance logic under the early People's Republic involved comprehensive transplantation of the Soviet model through higher education reorganization, dismantling the Republican-era university system and fully integrating higher education institutions into the national planned economy. Universities became subordinate units of government departments, forming a highly centralized governance model. Reforms after 1978 expanded university autonomy to some extent, yet the state-led governance logic remained unchanged. Through these instruments, the state deeply embeds itself throughout university governance processes, acting not merely as resource provider but as strategic planner, performance evaluator and directional guide. Knowledge view in contemporary China adheres to the fundamental task of cultivating virtue and nurturing talent, inherits the tradition of practical statecraft and emphasizes higher education's core mission of serving socialist modernization [3].

Europe's governance tradition of coordinated autonomy is rooted in the autonomous traditions of Western urban civilization, the spirit of contract and a society-centric power structure. From the ancient Greek polis, Western civilization developed a tradition of pluralistic power balancing. The medieval dualism of papal and royal authority further reinforced this tradition. Within this configuration, universities as independent guild corporations could secure autonomous space amidst pluralistic contestation. From the moment the University of Bologna received its charter, the university established corporate legal

status, forming a tradition of contract-based autonomy. This society-centric power structure enabled universities, even amidst the rise of nation-states and intensified state control, to maintain extensive academic autonomy. Germany's academic autonomy under state protection, France's state-led coordinated autonomy and Britain's market-oriented academic autonomy, while differing in degree and mode of state intervention, share a common core premise: the university is an independent legal person, and academic affairs should be autonomously decided by the academic community [4].

China's governance tradition of strategic embedded governance is rooted in the grand unification political tradition, the isomorphic social structure of family and state and a state-centric power structure. Since the Qin dynasty's establishment of centralized imperial rule, China formed a unitary centralized governance system. The state has consistently been the core actor in social governance; no institutional autonomous space independent of state power has existed. Education, as a core instrument of state governance, has always been under state dominance.

The European (including the Belarusian educational system) and Chinese higher education systems represent institutional crystallizations of distinct civilizational traditions. However, they can successfully interact and complement each other. While safeguarding university autonomy, Europe could strengthen strategic planning at supranational and national levels, enhance project-based guidance for cross-institutional collaboration and appropriately incorporate strategic orientation indicators within quality assurance systems. For China, institutional experience from European university autonomy should be assimilated. While upholding state strategic guidance, China could further expand university autonomy in disciplinary establishment, enrolment and personnel matters, clarify boundaries between administrative and academic power and gradually reduce the direct linkage between evaluation results and resource allocation.

The European and Chinese systems are not competing models on a single developmental continuum but parallel instantiations of distinct civilizational logics. Their dialogue and mutual learning concern not only the high-quality development of their respective higher education systems but also the knowledge innovation and governance wisdom humanity requires when confronting shared challenges.

References

1. Mok K. H., Han X. Higher education governance and policy in China. Policy and Society, 2017, no. 36 (1), p. 34–48.
2. Wang S. State-led or university-led? Higher Education Policy, 2021, no. 34 (2), p. 323–344.
3. Stensaker B. Quality assurance and the battle for legitimacy. Higher Education Quarterly, 2019, no. 72 (1), p. 3–17.
4. Wang Y. Liu Q., Chen R. Comparative study on the internal governance models of Chinese and European universities. Asia Europe Journal, 2022, no. 20, p. 115–135.

UDC 001.89.321

SCIENTIFIC POLICY OF MODERN STATES: GENERAL AND SPECIFIC

Xue Peng

Sukhoi State Technical University of Gomel, the Republic of Belarus

Scientific supervisor V. N. Yakhno

In the era of knowledge economy and technological revolution, science and technology have become the core driving force for the development of human society, and scientific policy, as a key