
PEDAGOGICS

THEORETICAL PROBLEMS OF INNOVATIVE DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATION

© V. I. ZAGVYAZINSKY

Tyumen State University (Tyumen)

rao@utmn.ru

UDC 37.014.3(470+571)

OBJECTIVES OF RUSSIAN EDUCATION REFORMATION*

SUMMARY. The article reveals the discrepancy of the educational policy and the educational reform practice of the traditional humane and personal paradigm of education and a perspective social and personal cultural attitude to innovative transformations in the educational sphere. The variety of paradigmatic approaches due to multi-functionality of modern education is revealed, but, unlike supporters of multi-paradigmatic approach, the author insists on the need to highlight leading ideas and attitudes in the unified social and personal paradigm, defining possibilities of transition to advancing education, ensuring key positions, human and social resources of the development of social and economic, socio-cultural, scientific, administrative and other society spheres. The author proves the necessity to ensure and take into account not only personal, but economic and social efficiency of education as well. Economy, education and culture are closely connected and interdependent social spheres. The lag of one of them slows down progressive development of other society spheres as a whole. On the other hand, the advance stimulates their development and the society as a whole.

KEY WORDS. Education Development Strategy, modern educational paradigm, the multi-paradigmatic theory, the efficiency of education, synthesis paradigm, social and personally oriented training and education, social status of education, advancing education.

In the late 80s early 90s of the 20th century Russian education development objectives changed radically. This transformation was connected to the social

* The research was carried out with the assistance of the Ministry of education and science of Russian Federation within the State order for 2012-2013 (6.1048.2011).

reconstruction, the change of political ideals for public development, general instability, hard search for the national idea, and ambiguity of social perspectives. At the first stage of Perestroika (up to the mid 90s) its purposes seemed to be clear: democratization, de-ideologization (concerning political ideology), diversification, focus on personality and one's personal development. In fact, during that period of time the state abandoned education. It was scarcely funded, mostly on the leftover principle. Its staff reserves started to get exhausted. Russia started to lose world leadership in education. The teaching staff generally suffered from aging and feminization. The upbringing system of education was destroyed, the network of children and youth voluntary organizations collapsed. Market categories and structures turned out to influence education in a destructive way; the system of vocational education began to fall apart. However, the school was given relative freedom, so the creative initiative of teachers-innovators, that had long been kept back by multiple guidelines and instructions, broke loose and shaped into a powerful movement of "collaboration pedagogy". Due to the initiative, that gave birth to the renewal of educational objectives, contents and organization, the education survived during the hard period of 90s.

The second half of the 90s is characterized by the conceptual renewal of the education theory – the conception of person centered education and upbringing was asserted (E.V. Bondarevskaya, V.V. Serikov, I.S. Yakimanskaya and others) and efficiently implemented. Although, focus on a person, one's talents realization, taking into account one's individual inclinations, forming learners' subjective opinion and ability to set and achieve their aims is undoubtedly useful, but it is inevitably accompanied by some disregard for social matter, social mandate and social nature of the whole educational process. Due to the absolutization of the person centered approach to education, a human was replaced by a person; meanwhile, a person is "a tool, body, instrument of acquiring the human nature" (B.S. Bratus').

At the beginning of the 21st century the state returned to the field of education and began promoting state educational strategy and policy. But education got seriously effected by the market economy and the urge to make education fit in with the structure of market relations. A number of new concepts, like "human capital", "economic efficiency", "man hour" (as a unit to measure teacher's work), "educational service", its suppliers and consumers, "paid education" and others, emerged and started to claim leadership in the development of education. Unified State Examination (USE) was introduced to function as both the secondary school final test and university entrance exam. Then, State Final Certification (SFC) for the middle school mainly in the test-form was instituted as well as per capita financing and standard labor rate. These initiatives though reasonable were often introduced half-baked, under administrative pressure, and thus, often led to the considerable expenses like several thousand village schools' liquidation.

During this period, education reformation, like any other reorganization activity, needed definite, conceptual perspective and conceptual plan of the process and result of the rearrangement. It is generally set within the educational paradigm. **Paradigm**

(from Greek *paradeigma* – example, model) – is a general notion of the purposes and the essence of the process; its normative model which defines direction and ways of its development. It is the wholesome idea of the methodological approaches, values criteria, overall conceptual layout of the main point, possibilities and results of the pedagogical process and its connection to the cultural development. Social development inevitably causes the change in the contents of the educational paradigm and consequently in the approaches to the practice of innovative reorganizations in the field.

There are two basic approaches to the understanding and reorganizing of the educational process according to the criterion of centering.

The first approach is known as **authoritarian**. It puts a teacher, as the carrier of educational values and contents, in the centre of the educational process. According to this approach a teacher strictly determines the whole process, while implementing standards, regulations and programs established by the state. He/she is meant to define exact tasks, plan the contents, forms and methods of education, assess the results.

The second approach, which in fact runs counter to the first, is **humanistic**. A learner, being considered a unique, absolutely valuable person, is put in the centre of the educational process.

Further on, some attempts to describe the paradigm interpretations in terms of the basic models have been undertaken. Thus, I.A. Kolesnikova singles out three educational paradigms on the basis of the sources and direction of the educational process: scientific- technocratic, humanist and exoteric [1].

G.B. Kornetov believes that, taking into account the sources and ways of goal-setting in education as well as the specific character of pedagogical interaction, it is possible to combine the diverse pedagogical processes in three paradigms: pedagogy of authority, pedagogy of manipulation and pedagogy of support. He points out that on practice within some definite technologies these paradigm models are usually used combined, with one of them becoming prevalent [2].

I.G. Fomicheva proposed a multidimensional scheme of pedagogical paradigms, placed on two axes. On the axis of typological differences she finds authoritarian (authoritarianly overwhelming and authoritarianly developing) and humanistic (non-violent and free) education. On the axis of the model differences there are four basic types of pedagogical activity: theocentric, sociocentric, naturecentric and anthropocentric [3].

Due to the differences in the main educational schemes, the idea of **polyparadigmatics**, based on the possibility of developing educational models with different paradigms in the core, appeared (M.K. Mamardashvili, M.S. Kagan, I.A. Kolesnikov and others).

Such a differentiated approach to the defining and applying paradigms is clear. It reflects the diversity of educational functions (individualization, socialization, personal development, health preservation, culture creation, acquiring knowledge and etc.), multiple aspects of pedagogical research, multiple focus of innovations, diversity of conditions, resources and means. However, multiplicity and diversity that are not hierarchically organized do not unfold the system, the network links, creative core

and reorganization perspectives. Using such an approach it is hard to grasp the whole picture of the subject of pedagogy. **Paradigmatic synthesis** becomes necessary and the question about its core element is being raised.

The history of philosophic and pedagogic thought progressive development reveals the progressive, leading role of the humanistic approach, which is relatively complete in the conceptions of person-centered pedagogy.

Recently some successful attempts of paradigmatic synthesis have been made within person-centered pedagogy and competency building approach. In the first case, the subject-oriented learning has been replaced with the essential-logical learning of the world and a person's capabilities, development of one's abilities to master and improve the surrounding world. Alongside with the external (social) sources, new personal formations are constructed with the help of the internal dialogue; meaning-making, reflection, self-determination collisions; ability to put forward and implement aims of one's own activity [4].

In the second case (competency building approach), the knowledge about the world and oneself; various capabilities and personal qualities; ability to act in a definite situation are successfully generalized.

Every researcher or creative practicing teacher uses some paradigm (mostly **humanist-personal**) as a basis, but always tries to enrich it with a number of principles and conceptions often taken from other paradigms. Thus, composite and complex approaches emerge: person-pragmatist, person-developing, social-personal, cultural creative, systematic technological, individual personal and others. Two interconnected processes are often highlighted in education – socialization and individualization, as far as the content of education is determined by the social mandate and takes place in the social environment, but is meant to preserve and develop human individuality. After all, education serves both a person and a society where people live. That is why we may define its nature primarily as **social-personal** and within this leading paradigm we can use other paradigmatic approaches. Though, we should take into account that some degree of authoritarianism, external determination, disciplining and organization due to the lack of life experience in children and youth (and often in adults too) is absolutely necessary; as well as unlimited use of the natural and social cultural potential: innate talents (nature-centered orientation), spiritual traditions and ideals (ethical and theocentric orientation), perspectives of innovative development of the economics (“economics of knowledge”), informational revolution, conception of the sustainable development based on the rational environmental management. Thus, we suggest an integrated conception of the **single educational paradigm** – social-personal, humanistic and cultural creative in the content, while actively pragmatist in the ways and technologies of implementation.

Polyparadigmatics may be justified in the aspect analytical research, but on the whole, such an approach will cause the loss of the single aim, will make it impossible to use single criteria to define comparative efficiency of the educational systems and total effectiveness of education.

There is a gap between the educational strategy, declared in the prescriptive guidelines and based on the humanistic paradigm (RF Constitution, 1992 and 2013

laws on education) that is actually implemented by the educational policy through the market principles, and the practice of Russian educational system reformation [5]. It provokes some kind of paradigmatic failure.

In this situation practice turned out to be disoriented, its guidelines blurred and indistinct, though it showed a tendency to preserve humanistic developing traditions. It was some kind of positive inertia of developing education and upbringing that refuted the notion of the direct relation between education and the level and needs of economy.

The paradigmatic failure, mostly caused by the complex conversion to the new social economic formation, led to ambiguity and uncertainty of many regulatory guidelines about main aims and basic products (results) of education.

Firstly, it is important to specify what is implied by the well-known formula: to provide efficiency, quality and accessibility of education.

Talking about **efficiency**, it is necessary to underline that one should judge about economical, social and personal effects of education, and evaluate its immediate and distant results. The latter is quite significant and requires “long-term” investment, while businessmen mostly prefer to get quick short-term results (profit). But it is much more dangerous when this position of quick economic efficiency is taken up by the state that starts taking measures to economize on education. Consequently, this economy causes huge social economical and cultural expenses. The techniques to measure economical effect of education are almost never used, though they were developed long ago, and it is common knowledge that they can not be identified as expenses on education. We need to find out the predicted and real educational effects, general efficiency of its renewed options in particular. High efficiency of education and direct relation between economic effect and educational level have been proved by the academician S.G. Stroumilin’s research published in the early 20s of the previous century, and subsequent works by Russian and foreign scholars (M. Blaug, V.A.Zhamin, E.N. Zhilcov, G.A. Egiazarian, Y.V.Kroupnov, D.N. Novozhilov, T. Shultz and others) [6-9].

Social effect of education is more difficult to measure. It is expressed through the improvement of social relations, ways of interaction and cooperation, civil solidarity, collective responsibility, crime rate and dynamics, change of social guidelines and moral ideals, dynamics of social activity of young people and other social groups, peculiarities and succession of traditions, etc.

There are a number of diagnostic tools developed and used in sociology and social psychology – polling, questionnaires, extrapolations of tendencies, expert evaluation, trends and others.

Personal effect is connected with the improvement of values and moral norms, abilities (especially creative ones), ideals, desires, will power. The tools for developing and evaluating personal effect are well developed in psychology of personality and widely practiced.

The quality of education is defined by the degree of the achievement of socially-approved educational aims, like the level of upbringing and general culture, education and competence, general and specific (including professional) personal development.

These are the qualities determined by the educational paradigm approved by the society and the state. Meanwhile, some vital, mostly distant social and economic results are being neglected and ignored.

Talking about **accessibility** of education, some peculiarities of its interpretations should be noted. Thus, they evaluate only the issues specified in the standards (primary and secondary compulsory education) and the number of state-funded places (professional education) controlled by the state. According to such a position, accessibility does not mean common accessibility.

Spatial accessibility (walking distance, transport) is also important. Can education be considered accessible if a school is situated at a distance of several dozens kilometers away from one's home?

The theory of paradigmatics, the study of multiple educational paradigms and the right of scholars and managers-reformers to use different educational paradigms justified the application of the false market-economical paradigm in education reformation and caused scientific and practical paradigmatic failure.

During the considered period some ugly phenomena appeared in education, like competition for the best USE results between regions, schools and teachers or evaluation of governmental institutions' activity according to the USE results or introduction of paper (or paper-electronic) and in fact prescriptive style of administrative management in education.

Informatization of education, using Internet and the possibilities of distance education turned out to be a fresh and powerful reserve for its development, especially in the recent decade. However, such threats as losing the book culture, technocratic tendencies in educational perspectives assessment, conversion to clip and "button" patterns of learners' mental and practical activity instead of creative and well-founded approaches increased.

The issue of social status of education should be paid special attention to, as far as it stipulates the success of the realization of its social functions. It is common knowledge that education traditionally performs its significant educational and developing functions. However, modern Russian education is multifunctional. It also fulfils, though not always purposefully and sometimes even spontaneously, such important social functions as social support, provision of social stability and progress, preserving and boosting culture, preserving health, safeguarding and succession of traditions, innovative development of all social fields.

Some other functions of education are considered to be quite important and both scientifically and practically significant. They are realization of "economics of knowledge", increasing and using of "human capital", human ability to perform highly productive and creative labor, as well as using of informational and innovative possibilities and resources.

Thus, education provides key aspects and main (human and social) resources for the development of social economic, social cultural, scientific, administrative and other fields of public and state life. It can not serve economy alone, though economic development as well as political will of the managing bodies mostly define the possibilities of its development.

All the above mentioned makes it possible to define economy, education and culture as tightly connected, interdependent social domains. With one of them lagging behind, the consistent development of the society is halted. Meanwhile, advancement of one domain encourages and promotes the development of two others and, consequently, the society on the whole.

Besides, education is meant, especially in the periods of crisis, to outrun other social sectors, to prepare staff able to provide for future changes.

V.V. Putin paid attention to this fact and underlined: "The main hope for Russia today is a high educational level of the population, primarily, of the young people. We are at the threshold of a new social reality. "Educational revolution" radically changes the image of Russian society and Russian economy. Even if at present our economy does not need so many workers with higher education – there is no way back. People should not be slaves of the existing economic structure and labor market, but the latter should create such conditions that people with high educational level and needs might get what they want" [11].

For now education just meets the needs of the past or of the present at best. It tries to catch up with and serves other social fields, but does not create advancing potential, educational backlog. In order to move on to **advancing** education, it is necessary to develop two relatively new directions of pedagogical science and educational practice – **pedagogical prognostics** and **pedagogical political science**. Taking into consideration quite approximate social economic forecasts, the former is meant to predict the future pedagogical reality and forthcoming social needs for a citizen, worker, specialist personality and for the guidelines and norms of public relations and civil regulations 5-10 years in advance. The latter has to suggest to the governing and managing structures some scientifically founded guidelines and technologies for preparing new management decisions in education that would consider relevance of all the possible options, risks and profits of the forthcoming reforms.

Supposedly, social strategy, educational policy and practice of the future development of the national education would be successful on condition of the systematic work at the solution of the burning issues and tasks.

It is necessary:

To revise the correlation between economy, educational policy and practical reformation of education in order to confirm real, but not declarative role of education as a priority field for the society that depends on economy, but at the same time defines conditions and possibilities of economic development.

To specify the contents of the humane social-personal educational paradigm, its relevant and perspective outline and the conditions of its implementation.

To study educational environment and to single out practical "sore spots", still disconnected links between social strategy, educational policy and practice of educational systems reformation in order to make scientifically founded managing decisions, taking into account their economic, social and personal efficiency (including delayed one) and possible risks.

To provide advancing development of the issues and technologies of pedagogical prognostication, modeling and planning in order to ensure an advancing character of education.

To make moral, civil, labor and professional upbringing the priority in education.

To achieve harmonious combination of conventional and cutting edge educational technologies, using developing potential of cooperative pedagogy, team work methodology, problem-based, context, dialogue, project learning in combination with new possibilities of Internet, distant education and software programs.

To provide consistent and complete implementation of the competency building approach as the way to realize culturological conception that includes value-conative, knowledge, pragmatist-operational constituents in their modern interpretation and operationalization. To encourage a learner to move on from acquiring information to getting objective meaning of the knowledge, then to its understanding (personal meaning, meaning for oneself), and readiness to pass it on and ability to use it for others, for common good.

It is necessary to work intensively at reviving the respectful status of the pedagogical profession and create conditions for life, work and professional growth of a teacher as well as for an influx of young talented specialists to education.

REFERENCES

1. Kolesnikova, I.A. *Pedagogicheskaja real'nost' v zerkale mezhpardigmal'noj refleksii* [Educational reality in the mirror of inter-paradigm reflection]. St. Petersburg, 1999. (in Russian).

2. Kornetov, G.B. *Pedagogicheskie paradigmy bazovyh modelej obrazovanija* [Pedagogical paradigm of education basic models]. Moscow, 2001. (in Russian).

3. Fomicheva, I.G. *Filosofija obrazovanija* [Philosophy of Education]. Novosibirsk, 2004. (in Russian).

4. Serikov, V.V. *Lichnostno orientirovannoe obrazovanie: poisk novoj paradigmy* [Personally oriented education: the search for a new paradigm]. Moscow, 1998. (in Russian).

5. Zagvyazinsky V.I. On the role of pedagogy in the harmonization of social policy, education policies and practices of the education reform in Russia. *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Serija 20: Pedagogicheskoe obrazovanie — Vestnik of Moscow University. S. 20: Pedagogical Education*. 2010. № 4. Pp. 3-10. (in Russian).

6. Strumilin, S.G. *Hozjajstvennoe znachenie narodnogo obrazovanija* [The economic value of public education]. Moscow-Leningrad, 1924. (in Russian).

7. Novozhilov, D.N. The definition of economic efficiency of education. *Narodnoe obrazovanie — Public Education*. 2011. № 3. (in Russian).

8. Blaug, M. *Metodologija jekonomicheskoi nauki ili Kak jekonomisty ob, jasnjajut* [The methodology of economics or how economists explain]. Tran. fr. Eng. Moscow: NP «Journal of Economic Issues», 2004. (in Russian).

9. *Aktual'nye voprosy jekonomiki narodnogo obrazovanija* [Current Issues of Education Economics] / Gen. Ed. V.A. Zhamin. Moscow: Prosveshhenie, 1965. (in Russian).

10. Krupnov, Ju.V. Economics of education or saving in education // Internet magazine «Russian pereplet». URL: <http://www.pereplet.ru/text/krupnov23coct02.html> (in Russian).

11. Putin, V.V. *Rossija sosredotachivaetsja. Orientiry* [Russia focuses. Landmarks]. Moscow, 2012. (in Russian).