
© VERA V. GAVRILYUK

gavriliuk@list.ru

UDC 31

**CONCEPTUALIZATION OF PRACTICE OF STUDENT'S
YOUTH EDUCATION IN THE XXIST CENTURY***

SUMMARY. In this article the theoretical and regulatory basis of the upbringing process in institutions of higher education is given, and features of the mass pedagogical mentality for the problems of education are analyzed. The paper is based on representative empirical material which reflects the results of monitoring Tyumen institutions of higher education.

KEY WORDS. Student's youth, education, subjects of educational activity, mass pedagogical conscience.

The process of social transformation of Russian society creates new social and cultural practices, in which the subjectivity of youth shows itself in an unexpected light. Nowadays the older generation, independently of the social status of its representatives, gingerly calls the younger generation "different". The complexity of this new generation and its obvious heterogeneity gives the humanities the task of conceptualizing the means of observing it. The necessity of a sociological survey of up-bringing is conditioned by the insufficient elaboration of its fundamental questions in Russian sociology. That being said, a fair quantity of works covering questions of upbringing, especially youth upbringing, show the urgency of the problem. The categorical field of upbringing theory in Russian scientific literature varies due to the complexity of the phenomenon [1]. There are several paradigms: upbringing can be viewed as a social institution (M.Z. Ilchikov, B.A. Smirnov), a social process (V.V. Dubitsky), or a process of socialization control (A.V. Mudrik, V.A. Slastenin, V.G. Harcheva). The interdependence of the notions of "upbringing" and "socialization" is closely researched (by Y.G. Volkov, O.N. Kozlova, V.N. Lavrinenko, V.N. Nechipurenko, A.V. Popov, K.B. Rubchevsky, S.I. Samygin, I.T. Frolov, G.A. Harchev), while "upbringing" is defined as a mechanism of socialization (M.Z. Ilchikov, B.A. Smirnov) or as a means of socialization (Zh.T. Toschenko). Thus upbringing is surveyed as a social institution, as a peculiar kind of activity and a type of relations, and it is analyzed from the point of view of social functions. Given this plurality of approaches, the problem seems to be in choosing only one theory for the substantiation of practical pedagogical activity,

* The present article was prepared within a grant of the Russian Humanitarian Scientific Fund (No. 12-03-00191a) Gavrilyuk V.V. Professional capacity of young teachers from provincial universities (Tyumen Oil and Gas University 2012-2013).

but it is not exactly so. Existing disagreements on matters of principle are predetermined by the radical changes in the very social practice of higher education in the 21st century and by the change of social roles of students. Amidst reorientation and radical change in the social structure of the society, the problem of the place, role, and function of the most educated young people seems meaningless, though, as we think, it is impossible to view young people in separation from their place, role and functions in the social structure of the society. This especially applies to young students, as the most “advanced” part of the society always defines its image.

Modern student youth has a strong drive for self-actualization, an individual attitude towards social processes, a wide range of ideologies and cultural orientations. Among teachers there is still a strong belief that students should represent the best part of Russian youth, which will in the near future become the main power of social, political, economical, and cultural development of Russia. Teachers are convinced that a high-school graduate should be a polymath with unconventional ways of thinking, a professional with broad-based knowledge, a high level of social activism, a person that is ready for occupational work in a spiritual, moral and professional way. A high-school graduate should know his/her place on the labour market and be ready to easily change his specialization within the professional framework given by the university. He/she should be psychologically ready to build interpersonal relations, respect opinions of other people, be tolerant and able to find a way out of conflicts in the workplace and in everyday life. The most important ability he/she has is a highly developed sense of responsibility to society, the family, the group and himself/herself. This social image is the ideal model of professional and pedagogical cooperation in higher education. Whether it is close to social reality and what is the measure of teachers’ confidence in their students are tasks for a serious sociological survey.

The traditions of the Russian mentality and the practice of Russian education differ from others by keeping a high level of influence on the student by the teacher in the broadest sense. That is why traditions of Russian higher education still remain the stable transmission channel for values, principles and cultural patterns, and all the transformations taken by teachers reflect in the process of new generations’ socialization. That is why the wholeness or incoherency of the professional pedagogical mentality and professional and ethic standards of the society require a special attention of scientist. The current situation in Russian education, especially in institutions of higher education and especially concerning the Bologna process and the transition to the two-level system creates a lot of myths and contradictions in the mass practice. As such, in higher education we can see radical destruction of the educational paradigm, the essence of which is the rejection of a culture-oriented approach to education. The main criteria of success of higher education is the formation of the professional competence of a graduate, which does not imply the formation of a highly qualified specialist with a civic stand, moral compass or a high level of personal development; but this principle is not just dictated by establishing papers, it also works in practice. Public views on these changes are so ambiguous that Zh.T. Toschenko considers these views as a phenomenon of «centaur-fancy» in the modern educational space of Russia [2; 419-439].

The new federal Program of education development intensifies upbringing function of education, which implies priorities such as the formation of civic consciousness, hard-working, moral qualities, respect of human rights and freedoms, love to one's country, family and nature.

By order of the Ministry of Education a new term «The upbringing activity of the educational institution» was introduced in the list of terms of state accreditation and criterial figures. According to this document, there are three terms to be rated: presence of conditions for extra-curricular activities; level of upbringing activities; formation of stimuli for personal development, in other words, presence of upbringing activity and conditions and mechanisms of its operation [3].

During recent decades in higher education the processes of education and upbringing were divided, and it affected, in negative way, achieving of the final goal of higher education, which is to prepare professionally competent and socially and morally developed specialists. The idea of youth upbringing as the main function of education in the system of higher education is not that obvious for the ordinary pedagogical practice. The teacher in the higher education institution was always one of the main actors of the upbringing process, and the influence of the teacher can be compared to or even be more important than that of public associations and student organizations. The crisis in Russia had a very destructive effect on this element of education. Low salaries and double jobholding resulted in transforming a teacher into a person who just recites educational material.

In the modern concept of upbringing, the educational process is considered to be the main factor of influence on the students and the professional duty of any teacher. Professors and teachers of institutions of higher education should create optimal psychological and pedagogical conditions for the organization of the upbringing process: to introduce upbringing into the educational process; to use the traditions of the chair to form the sense of corporativity; to organize the educational process in a more flexible way, to give students more opportunities to study on their own (concerning educational activities as well as scientific and research ones); to form and develop students' desire for education; to focus extra-curricular work with students on their self-sufficiency in the organization and holding of different events; to take measures to raise the reputation of good study, to use the positive influence of active, target-oriented and successful students on their groupmates; to involve students in scientific, technical, cultural, sports and other extra-curricular activity of the institution of higher education. These are the conditions and requirements of the realization of educational policy in higher education. It means that one of the most urgent tasks today is to found the training of teachers on the indissociability of education and upbringing and on the denial of immoderate professionalizing to the disadvantage of social and moral orientation of personal development. This problem is general for the modern Russian system of education as a whole, but it is especially serious in higher education institutions, particularly taking into consideration the escalation of deviant and delinquent youth behavior. Social diseases are also a result of misunderstanding the liberal approach to upbringing. The changes in the sociological and cultural reality of Russian society have resulted in weakening the upbringing functions of traditional factors of task-oriented socialization. Education today cannot cope with the spontaneous influence of supra-educational space. All these things show significant critical changes in the upbringing system. After twenty

years of reforms, it seems clear that despite numerous programs in the sphere of youth policy, state actions have come to little effect.

The present stage of development of sociological and humanitarian knowledge in the sphere of upbringing study is characterized by a relatively high level of elaboration of many problems, but nevertheless, now there are no integral modern sociological concepts having essential significance for higher education institutions' practice. Upbringing can be viewed, firstly, as a sociological and cultural process of socialization control, aimed at reaching agreement and solidarity in society by the means of internalization of generally valid cultural values; secondly, as a sociological and cultural institution that provides consolidation of society via the institutionalization of generally valid axiological and regulatory standards; thirdly, as an organizational and normalizing activity for the actors of upbringing, aimed at reaching unity of personality, culture and society [4]. The most important units for the realization of the consolidating potential of upbringing are the agents of the upbringing process and its principal actors that are nowadays represented by teachers, their professional communities, students' groups, organizations and associations. The actors of transmission of sociological and cultural experience take part in the process of upbringing only in cooperation. The end of the 20th century in Russia brought not only a transformation of basic state institutions and new matters of social differentiation, but also an evident evolution of the Russian mentality. During the transition to the new social relations a reappraisal of values and ideals took place, which was represented by the denial of communism's ideology and attempts to transform the basic upbringing values of school, family and high education institutions. At present it has brought about uncertainty in value orientation in social upbringing. An especially burning issue is the transformation of notions of patriotism and civic consciousness in the modern mass consciousness of Russians, and it concerns young people as well as the old.

It should be stated that civic values hold a special place in the value system of personality. Usually in unstable and conflictual societies, this type of value system, despite its fundamental nature, does not hold first place in relevance to personality. Character-building in this direction should be introduced, taking into account that recently the content of the notion of «patriotism» has crucially changed. Young people that were growing up in the years of social transformations have developed a critical attitude to their country, its history and state policy. Taking this into consideration, it is necessary to help students to conceive the essence of the spiritual life of the people, their customs and traditions, the genuine and objective history of their country. The formation of socially active students, citizens of Russia, is the most important direction of upbringing and developing students' civic consciousness, respect for human rights and freedoms, love to nature, country and family. Nowadays civic upbringing is understood as a spontaneous and improvised influence of family, state, educational and other structures of civic society asserted over personality to form its civic consciousness as a system of personally and professionally important values and relations reflecting a citizen's life [5; 351]. The formation of a patriotic civic position among young people is a key problem of modern upbringing in higher education institutions, though it is not always realized.

Turning the sociological and cultural potential of upbringing and higher education into pedagogical reality entails a number of difficulties: unclear assignment

in the new social conditions; denial of character building activities by some teachers in higher education institutions; unwillingness of students to change the values and behavioral norms that were acquired during pre-university socialization; influence of negative factors of supra-educational sociological and cultural space; insufficient activity of actors of the upbringing process. So, the first thing that faces a practitioner who plans an upbringing activity in a higher education institution is absence of clear guidelines and concrete aims for this activity. For example, in the process of analyzing of a number of programs of upbringing, I noticed some items that concern students' world view formation. This task was a high priority in the previous (Soviet) era of higher education development, where the formation of a communist worldview was considered to be of more importance than the formation of the professional qualities of future employees. Probably due to tradition, modern higher education institutions still have this item in their upbringing programs, without thinking that in present conditions it is nearly impossible. On the one hand, nowadays society and the state are more tolerant of different outlooks and do not demand any special type from future employees. For example, two extremes, religious and atheistic outlooks, are quite possible for a highly qualified professional. And moreover, implicitly current ideology gives preference to a citizen with a religious outlook; at least, it is more prestigious to consider yourself an Orthodox. That is why higher education institutions should hardly set themselves a mission of students' outlook formation. But the formation of the moral and social compass of young people, civic consciousness, patriotism, fairness and responsibility should be the task of higher education institutions. The upbringing potential of the older generation is now an unexplored field, though this age group has experienced the fundamental breakage in outlook and value system.

The social practice value system of generations does not have sense on its own, what matters are the factors of coincidence or difference of value systems of actors in upbringing (students and teachers). The reality perception of the generations of the end of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st has dramatically changed. "A lot of features that were only potentially present in the culture of the 1960s became not only dominant, but even in many respects have run dry at the turn of the 21st century: the cult of youth, which implies radicalism, strength, and energy, has been replaced by the "cool" stage, the stage of cold moderation. It showed up, first, in the semantic change of the category of "youth" by the beginning of the 21st century: it acquired the meaning of a special type of lifestyle, self-sentiment and a level of social activity. The second essential feature of current transformations is the dramatic change in the value system, where the moderation of consumerism and the denial of standard products have replaced the hedonism of the 1960s. Nowadays a typical representative of the modern generation is a student, who is or will be a "white collar" worker; this student is not a negationist, he is young and rather conformist, and he is not strongly against the values of the older generation. His axiological assets consist not of social freedom, as it was for the generation of 1960s, but of incorporation into society, not denial of acquisitiveness, but prosperity, not opposing, but cooperation, not denial of antecedents' culture, but indifference to it" [6; 109-110]. Indirect proof of this view of the modern generation is represented by the analysis of the participation of Russian youth in the socio-political movements of our times and by the very existence and essence of youth associations. A.A. Muhin

in his studies of socio-political associations of modern youth analyzed their activity, images of their leaders and connections with “grown-up” political forces [7]. Despite the apparent variety and number (about twenty) of youth organizations and movements in post-Soviet Russia, they all have something in common (which can become the subject of stand-alone sociological research). The range of youth associations’ directions reflects the main political and ideological positions of society: they vary from revolutionary to moderately servile and oppositional. The analysis of the politically active ideology of modern youth gives a general guide for researching the whole generation. Along with this, the guide is extremely general and imprecise for the description of the ideals and basic ideological values of Russian youth in the 21st century. To study the value priorities of the most “advanced” part of the generation it is possible to rely on the research into the identity of higher education students. Since 2006 we have been monitoring the quality of the educational and upbringing process in higher education institutions of Tyumen, and via it we also studied the changes of the value system of these young people. In our studies of 2006-2011 we have found that the majority of students have an individualistic outlook, they do not have well-shaped civic notions and identify the wellbeing of Russian society and the state with the comfort of daily life. Teachers in their turn stress the importance of terminal values for the formation of a solid ideological basis for modern Russian society and its welfare as an integral structure. Continuous changes in society cause feeling of anxiety and uncertainty concerning the future. According to the results of sociological research undertaken by the scientists of the Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Science, only 16% of Russians call the current country situation trouble-free, while 73% consider it to be troubled and recessionary. Moreover, a large majority of Russians live in a state of stress with a constant feeling of a tense and complicated social realm [8].

Our research into the world of values of the actors of the educational and upbringing process, including mutual evaluations, was undertaken in four base units that include instrumentative values as well as terminal ones: vital values, moral standards and value systems, attitude to one’s profession, civic and patriotic values. Analysis of the enquiry results shows that there are no fundamental intergenerational contradictions or values gap between modern students and teachers, and there exist only some differences of assessment in the basic units. Among university teachers the same base values as among students dominate, but “material welfare” has a lesser ratio. The smallest ratio for the majority of teachers was given to the value of pleasure and fun, and civic self-determination and strengthening of friendly ties were also named among the less important. Thus teachers and students show a high level of desire for stability. The values that are connected with personal activity, such as spiritual and moral self-cultivation, development of professional skills, self-realization and development of interpersonal relations such as love and friendship have a medium ratio. In the study of patriotism and civic consciousness of the actors of the educational and upbringing process we found out that the majority of students have an individualistic outlook and do not have well-shaped civic notions; they identify the wellbeing of Russian society and the state with the comfort of daily life. This attitude is reflected in the fact that they connect their idea of “good life in Russia” with value categories like family, love, stability, freedom, career, peace, welfare, home and justice. On the contrary, teachers tend to stress

the importance of terminal values that are necessary for the formation of the whole value basis of modern Russian society and its wellbeing as an integral structure; these values are family, legitimacy, professionalism, spirituality, stability, culture, safety, welfare, power and patriotism.

Continuing innovations and consequent transformations, reformations and restructurings of social segments lead to the increase of social instability and risks. The innovative potential of teachers is not always taken into consideration during the modernization processes, whereas we think that the innovative readiness of a teacher is the main condition and safeguard of reform. The innovation readiness components encompass not only the sphere of professional competence of the actors of education, but also include their social and psychological characteristics. It is the absence of innovation readiness that often causes failures of reformation. In the teachers' responses to the open questions there is a clearly visible motif of tiredness with reforms. It was clear in 2006 already, and the enquiry of 2011 indicates that the situation has been exacerbated. For example, 63% of the teachers who took part in this enquiry rather clearly expressed that modern reform makes the Russian education system worse. Around 7% spoke out in favor of reform; they also carefully noted some improvements and progress. It is interesting that almost no teacher declined to evaluate these reforms; everyone expressed an opinion towards their essence and consequences. It is obvious that the last decades have significantly reduced teachers' motivation for quality work and professional growth. Nevertheless, the vast majority of teachers do not regret their professional choice, they are oriented towards creative and pedagogical activity and consider training of highly qualified specialists and development of creative abilities of students to be the main task of higher education. But it is important to mention that the number of teachers (only about 7%) considering the formation of civic and moral notions and outlook of young people as part of their task has lowered since 2006.

An interesting fact is that the question pool concerning upbringing activity caused clearly negative reactions among respondents. In the enquiry of 2011 only 21% of teachers acknowledged the importance of the task of personal development of a student as a task of their personal activity. And only 6.6% of teachers gave positive answers to direct questions about their readiness to carry out upbringing activities. They consider the formation of personal qualities of a student, their civic consciousness, and moral qualities to lie beyond the professional duty of higher education teaching personnel. Even the formation of the professional and business skills of students is considered by them to be an excessive demand — only 52% of respondents are ready to think of it as of their task. The urgent problems of social relations in modern Russia like lack of tolerance, inter-ethnic and religious conflicts are not supposed as seen by teachers to be solved with the help of higher education institutions. 97% of teachers claim that no one taught them how to develop students' tolerance, and 95% of them are ready to delegate the upbringing activity to special pedagogues, while they, teachers, would deal only with professional education. 87% of higher-education teaching personnel even think that upbringing is the duty of the family and it is too late and needless to solve this problem in a higher education institution. Also, they do not regard the extra-curricular activities of students, student organizations and self-autonomy as their upbringing activity and do not see themselves as the actors of upbringing. Thus nowadays higher

education teaching personnel are not ready to take on the responsibility for students' upbringing either methodically or psychologically. Systematic organization of upbringing activity in university will require significant changes in teacher training and organizational activities of the administration of universities.

REFERENCES

1. Modern Educational Process: State and Problems («Round Table») // Sociological Research. 2005. No. 4.
2. Toshchenko, J.T. Centaur Problem (Experience in Philosophical and Sociological Analysis). Moscow: New Chronograph, 2011.
3. Decree of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation on September 2, 2011. No. 2257 «On Amendments to the Decree of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation dated November 8, 2010. № 1116 «On the Target Values, Concerning Performance of the Budget Educational Institutions under the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation» (Published: October 5, 2011, came in force: October 16, 2011)
4. Barsukova, T.I. Upbringing in Modern Russian Society (Sociocultural Analysis): Dissertation for Degree of Candidate of Sociology, 2006. 380 p. Russian State Library Dissertational Department, 71:07-22/21
5. Strategy of Upbringing in the Educational System of Russia. Moscow, 2004.
6. Kostina, A.V. Mass Culture as a Phenomenon of Postindustrial Society. Moscow: LKI, 2008.
7. Mukhin, A.A. Generation 2008: Our Guys and Not Our Guys. Moscow: Algorithm, 2006.
8. Gorshkov, M.K. Is the Russian Society Ready for Modernization: Analytical Report. Moscow, 2010. 179 p. URL: http://www.isras.ru/analytical_report_modernization.html