

Sustainable Development of the Modern Rural School as a System of Educational Environment under the Conditions of Globalisation and Various Contradictions in Latvia

Irēna Katane

Institute of Education and Home Economics
Latvia University of Agriculture
E-mail: Irena.Katane@one.lv; Irena.Katane@ilva.lv

The aim of this article is to describe research "The Evaluation Model of the Rural School as Educational Environment" and offer analysis and evaluation of results. The author investigated the sustainable development of rural school as educational environment in the today's changing conditions from evolutionary, structural and functional aspects. Results of empirical researches testify that nowadays small rural schools as self-evaluating and self-developing systems of educational environment want to keep equilibrium with changeable outside environment. The author diagnosed: 1) new tendencies and priorities of rural schools' development; 2) both qualitative and quantitative fluctuation in the educational environments of the rural schools; 3) a number of the various models of rural schools' educational environments. In many rural places the rural school is the only (!) local educational environment therefore it accepts responsibility for not only sustainable self-development, but also for sustainable development of the whole local rural community. The Latvian rural school assumes subsidiary functions, including redress and preventive functions, enlarges target audience. The modern rural school has become an inwardly inclusive environment. It has become a formal and non-formal educational environment for pre-school children, pupils and their families, educators, the whole rural community in the context of life-long and wide-long learning.

Key words: changeability, educational environment; rural school; sustainable development.

Introduction

In the global (*world scale*) educational environment we can observe self-developing process. The Latvian rural schools function and development under the conditions of the great changeability. Conditional diversity makes us turn to concrete case studies, where rural school was researched as local educational environment in the evolutionary, structural and

functional aspects in the context of contradictions, new tendencies, yet unsolved problems and ongoing processes that take place in the global outside educational environment.

Since the 90-ies of the 20th century up to the beginning of the 21st century rural schools have been working in a period of great changes when the state has gained its independence and the society has started to develop a democratic and legal state. Changes have occurred in all spheres

of human activities and transition to market economy has started. In education as well, changes have started to appear and they still continue to develop. Regaining of the national independence and the change of the social-economic formation created pre-requisites for the change of social, educational and with these also pedagogical paradigms. The value dominants changed. With the change of the educational paradigms also the pedagogical paradigms of rural schools change influencing the formation of new educational environment models at general education rural schools. This process is influenced by the globalization and integration processes in the world that have directly been related to Latvia. The research and evaluation of the rural school as the educational environment is important in the context of European Union (EU) educational environment. Latvian educational environment has become an integral part of EU educational environment, and it directly influences changes in the educational environment of rural schools.

The investigation of the rural school as local educational environment is important and topical in the aspect of continuous (unceasing) educational environment where must be succession, systemic approach, fairly equivalent possibilities in the aspects of education accessibility and extraction, educational tender, as well as quality of education. Uneven and insufficient exchange of information, matter and energy (resources) in the educational environment of the country has caused irregular and unbalanced development in the following dimensions: 1) Riga and regions; 2) cities and countryside. The Latvian rural schools as open educational environments search for new opportunities of the development, set priorities and directions of the development under such conditions.

It is necessary to offer an ecological paradigm, a new perspective for substantiation and maintenance of sustainable development and humanistic target-oriented activities of rural schools under the countryside.

Materials and methods

When the author worked on the **scientific conception** she chose an ecological approach and humanistic approach as imperatives. They are complementary conceptual approaches in pedagogy which allow respect for a holistic approach in the investigation. These both approaches allowed working out of several models for research that secured multidimensional view in the research to the Latvian rural schools as the systems of educational environments. The author have included these models in her scientific conception and approbated in the empirical research.

The author has researched the rural school as:

- a self-assessing, self-developing, holistic environmental system that functions in the sphere of education and tries to ensure its own sustainable development as well as the development of rural cultural environment in the unified heterogeneous educational environment on global scale;
- multi-component educational environment;
- a humanistic target oriented, multi-functional social system which functions in the sphere of education that simultaneously is the formal and informal educational environment in the context of life-long and wide-long learning education for: a) pupils and pre-school children; b) school educators and members of the pupils' families; c) as well as – the whole local rural society;

- multi-level environmental system of education.

The development and improvement of the Latvian rural schools were studied in the followings contexts:

- in the context of rural social-cultural environment's specificity, including cultural history, pedagogical culture, relationships of interactions' subjects, their social roles and functions;
- in the context of mental environment: pedagogical paradigms, conceptions of schools' development, values' environment, information environment, didactic and up-bringing models, including content of formal and non-formal education etc.;
- in the context of human-built environment: physical environment of the rural school, including buildings, premises, classrooms and other rooms, methodical – material technological environment etc.;
- in the context of nature environment as an integral part of educational environment of the rural school.

In our investigation we studied and described a rural school as an *environmental/ecological system of education*, which is a “live”, whole organism that develops in its ecosystem, functions in the sphere of education based on the maintenance of self-regulation, self-development and balance with the regularities of the changing environment. The theoretic basis of this basic statement is (Katane, 2005c; 2005d):

- the scientific foundation of the statements of T. Parsons and R. Merton who suggested to investigate any social system, including the school as a “natural” organization that functions almost like a biological organism, a living being that is able to self-develop and self-

regulate in the influence of internal and external environment factors and whose interrelation with the outer environment is subject to definite correlations; the scientists in these investigations should take a position of an observer of a “natural phenomenon” and researcher without direct interference in their activities;

- usage of the notions “*live system*” and *ecosystem* in the conceptions and theories of the representatives of social system ecology – K. H. Fingerle, A. Leschinsky, R. Naul, B. Shenk, J. G. Miller, M. Ray, P. Roeder and others;
- the substantiation of the *homeostasis (self-regulation) principle* of social systems that helps to *maintain the balance with the outer environment* as well as the *morphogenetic regularities* and *reorientation regularities* of the development of a social system as a living organism on the basis of the feedback with the outer environment in the publications of W. Buckley, C. Broderic and J. Smith;
- the statements of H. Brunkhorst, H. Gudjons, A. Kuhn, E. Laszlo and others that the *social systems are autopoietic, that is, they continuously renew themselves and are self-referential, that is, they can refer to themselves; the systems have the ability to perceive the difference between the system (itself) and the environment (something else) and the ability to draw consequences;*
- the statements of the Russian scientist A. Prigozin who gives the comparison and analysis of two notions the *system* and *organization* stressing that not every social system is an organization, in turn, an organization is always a system, nevertheless, it differs from a usual system having

specific features – target oriented, coordinated, self-organizing and self-regulating activities;

- the statements that an *open system, dissipative structure tends to maintain balance with the outer environment*. These basic statements can be found in the conceptions of today's trends of the new, interdisciplinary sciences in the conceptions of the representatives of *synergetics and social synergetics* V. Bryansky, P. Florensky, H. Haken, S. Pozharsky, V. Vasilikova, S. Kapica, H. Knyazeva, S. Kurdyumov, I. Prigozin and I. Stengers.

Empirical, including experimental **research took place from the 2000th until the 2005th year**. It consist from **four periods**: 1) analysis and evaluation of the educational situation in the national and global level environment; 2) qualitative research: structure, functions, trends of development and collection of information and statistic data to Latvian ruralschools; 3) excreting characteristic qualities of modern rural school and working out the evaluation model of rural school as educational environment (128 indicators) and its experimental approbation

(inside expertise); 4) data processing, analyzing, evaluating and interpretation.

The total amount of rural schools of our research selection group constructs 46,6 % of main multitude of Latvia rural schools: it is 277 schools of 595 Latvian rural schools – general amount of Latvian rural schools (See Table), including 83 secondary schools, 192 primary schools, 2 elementary schools; breakdown by Latvia regions: 60 in Kurzeme, 58 in Latgale, 91 in Vidzeme and 68 in Zemgale; selection group represent rural schools from 26 Latvian districts.

The different respondents (in total – 552) – heads and subheads of the rural schools, educators, students, students' parents, internal and external experts etc. participated in this research.

Methods of the research: studies of scientific literature; self-assessment (reflection) of the pedagogical experience; observations; analysis of documents, including statistic data and self-evaluation reports of Latvian rural schools; expert statement method; internal (inside) expertise of rural schools as educational environments; experiment (the stating experiment in rural conditions and the forming experiment in laboratory conditions); technics

Table. Statistic data of rural schools research selection group pertaining to total amount of Latvia rural schools of main multitude

Rural schools	Statistic data of Latvia rural schools of main multitude		Statistic data of rural schools of research selection group		Statistic data of rural schools of research selection group pertaining to <u>total amount of Latvian rural schools of main multitude (%)</u>
	Absolute parameters	Percental parameters (%)	Absolute parameters	Percental parameters within the framework of research selection group (%)	
Secondary schools	152	25,6	83	30,0	13,9
Elementary schools	405	68,0	192	69,3	32,3
Primary schools	38	6,4	2	0,7	0,4
In total:	595	100	277	100	46,6

of projective tests; discussions (open interviews); questionnaires; methods of mathematical statistics using the SPSS software.

Results and discussion

In this article we offer results of the research what were acquired in the 1st and 2nd periods and validated in the 3rd and 4th periods of empirical, including experimental research. The results of our research were theoretical approved in the several International Scientific Conferences.

The situation in the Latvian and global level educational environment: analysis and evaluation (Katane, 2003; 2004; 2005c; 2005d). The changes in the 90-ies of the 20th century influenced all the spheres of human activities, first of all, they should be related to the changes of thinking. Alongside with the changes in the educational environment of Latvia we can observe contradictions of paradigmatic nature, because at present in the educational environment of Latvia we have established educational paradigms of three kinds: 1) *conservative – pragmatic* paradigm that has survived from the times of soviet pedagogy; 2) formally stated *humanistic – phenomenological* paradigm, and 3) *liberal – rational* paradigm what came from the educational environment of modern Western countries in the end of the 20th century.

In Latvia we diagnosed contradictions what exist among the educational paradigms what are the causes of contradictions among the conceptual approaches of the Latvian schools in defining the target-oriented performance and practical implementation, among the pedagogical paradigms of each teacher.

There are analyzed and assessed paradigmatic contradictions in education that are found, as a result of research, also in the educational environment of global (mega-

level, contradictions between: the *global and local*; the *universal and individual*; the *traditional and modern*; the *long-term and short-term* strategies; the *competition and co-operation*; the *increase of information and the possibilities of human to acquire it* in the form of knowledge and skills; the *mental and material* world; the *needs of modern societies and needs of human as individuality*: towards *the perfection, self-realization of human* as and towards *liberalization of the labour market* directed the life-long educational conceptions.

Alongside with the changes in the 90-ies of the 20th century in Latvia, there started the process of the *decentralization* of schools instead of *centralization* as it was before and the process towards the relative autonomy of schools concerning some spheres of their performance, towards the *depolitization* of schools. Nowadays there is an increase of the availability and exchange opportunities of information and experience concerning innovations both at the regional, state and global level that is largely connected with the processes of globalization and integration. There is an *increase of competitions among schools*, the relations of market economics enter the educational environment of schools.

We observe the change for the worse of the demographic situation in Latvia, particularly in the country. *At present we can establish several tendencies that already indicate the fact of decrease in number of pupils and also schools in the country. These tendencies really expose to danger the sustainability of the country cultural environment of rural general education schools.*

The results of the research of individual cases prove that in this situation in many places the rural municipalities, the inhabitants of rural areas try to find *the alternative solutions for the preservation of their educational environment:*

instead of the closed down schools in their premises very often the non-formal educational environment is established and offered to the community (public schools, public universities, methodological consultation centres of formal and non-formal education). It indicates that we can observe the process of self-renewal and transformation into another quality within the country educational environment. There is an increase in number of the city residents, who choose the small rural schools to be the educational environment for their children.

The research shows that:

- *there still maintains the historically inherited disharmony among the possibilities to obtain education in Latvia*; these differences (contradictions) are in two dimensions – 1) *Riga and regions*; 2) *cities and rural areas*;
- there exist differences between the educational environment of urban and rural schools (the differences between the types, status, the number of students and teachers, the pedagogical paradigms of schools, history of development of urban and rural schools come to an existence etc.), so quantitative and qualitative differences have been stated in the educational environment of schools in Latvia;
- the comprehensive educational establishments (schools) often are the only (!) suppliers of education in the country, the preservers and developers of the educational environment of country that have the goal of ensuring the availability of life-long education and the continuation of education in the country.

The activity and sustainable development of rural schools nowadays is affected by the processes, changes, contradictions, problems

existing at all levels and in all components of educational ecosystem.

We excreted **the tendencies and priorities of the sustainable development of the Latvian rural schools as systems of educational environment** (Katane, 2003; 2004; 2005c; 2005b).

Trend 1. The improvement of the environmental qualities as a prior trend in the provisions of the sustainable development of the schools which offer general education in the countryside:

1) democratic style of school management and the work of all the school team as the pre-conditions of the humanization and democratization of pedagogical environment (the significance of the team-work for the provision of effective and sustainable development of school; 2) teachers' further education and improvement of their professional skills (rural schools as self-evaluating and self-organizing systems that study); 3) the systematic and purposeful methodological work of rural school; 4) the insurance of the human-centered, individual and differentiated approaches are important basic principles for the performance of rural school; 5) the cultivation and maintaining of the school spiritual environment by means of values education; 6) the improvement of the physical environment of school; 7) the tidying out, taking care of and research (the greening of school premises, taking care of the nature parks, located near the school; participation of school in the regional shows, contests on the best school, rural municipality, participation in the international projects and the obtaining of *the candidate of Eco-school* and *the status of Eco-school*) of the nature environment of school (internal and external).

Trend 2. The increase of educational supply:

1) the increase of the number of programmes of formal education up to 6 elementary (first

and secondary education levels' programmes; 2) the supply of non-formal, including interest related, education, to all those who are interested in it; 3) the supply of the family education; 4) the supply various formal and non-formal educational programmes of adult education.

Trend 3. *The choice of the priorities concerning the development and performance of rural schools for the implementation of the formal and non-formal educational environment content:*

1) foreign language education; 2) natural sciences and mathematics, computer studies; 3) environmental education; 4) the education of the cultural history environment; 5) the humanities and social sciences; 6) physical education; 7) values education (including the education of ethical, Christian values); 8) health education; 9) the education of the facilitation of the choice of vocational education and career (non-formal vocational (agricultural) education; nautical school education etc.); 10) art education.

Trend 4. *The enlargement of the target audience of education and the extension age limits of the interaction subjects.* Rural schools are intensively looking for the opportunities:

1) to enlarge their target audience, 2) to extend the age limits of the subjects, involved in the educational process by actually offering the opportunities of life-long education in their educational environment in the country. It manifestates like this:

- the attraction of students from the administrative territories of neighbouring municipalities, including cities;
- the supply concerning the integration opportunities into the educational environment of rural schools for the children with special needs, residing in a particular country environment;

- the involvement of children at the age of pre-school into the educational environment of rural schools;
- rural schools very successfully integrate the minority children into their educational environment thus enlarging their target audience;
- rural schools try to provide *all the children of school age*, living on the territory of municipality, *with the compulsory elementary education*;
- alongside with the enlargement of the number of different types of subjects, involved in the educational process, the rural schools in fact extent also the age limits of their target audience.

Trend 5. *The broadening of the range of rural school functions (formal and non-formal):*

1) rural schools accept responsibility for the education opportunities in the country and carry out significant activities in the field of culture, they are an open environment of cultural education to all local community by organizing different events and enabling to participate in them all those interested; thus rural schools transform into the educational and cultural centres of local scale; 2) rural schools accept responsibility for the health of their students by taking different preventive measures; 3) rural schools tackle the social work, including social care regarding their students, students' families and even all local community; 4) rural schools offer their services in the sphere of rural tourism; 5) rural schools organize pupils' summer camps on the school, district/regional, republic and even international level with different goals and objectives, as well as spheres of activities.

Trend 6. *The co-operation and collaboration in the internal and external environment of rural*

schools: we established that rural schools form a wide network of co-operation and collaboration with different partners in the spheres of education and culture both on the regional, state and international level.

Trend 7. The inclusion of well-known people's names and surnames into the names of rural schools: to emphasize the rich cultural history of the educational environment of the school and region, as well as the significance of school for the national development of Latvia and the facilitation of the development of national identity on the whole. This we can also call some kind of *preventive measures* in order to protect the rural school from the unfavourable impact of external environment within the context of sustainable development (in our research sample there were 18 schools of this kind).

The multi-level and multi-component educational environment of the rural school is characterized by a great variety. One of the types of the rural school changeability is the reorganization or liquidation of the educational environment of rural schools by “the competent authorities”. The changeability of rural schools is determined also their chosen directions and priorities of development, it is possible to observe the hierarchization of schools. The existence, development and changeability of a rural school as the educational environment depend on a very essential indicator, namely, on the correspondence of their environmental system to the students and their parents' interests and needs. The educational environment of the rural school changes alongside with the enlargement of the educational offer, target audience and interaction with the external environment (the network of collaboration partners).

Alongside with the increase of the number and age of subjects, involved into the art, lan-

guages, physical education, the social sciences and other types of education, enlarge also the didactic substructures or didactic sectors of a particular rural school both the levels of formal teaching-learning, pedagogical environment and educational environment. There emerge new formal and non-formal substructures of the rural school environment: 1) at the level of formal teaching-learning environment; 2) at the level of pedagogical environment; 3) at the level of whole educational environment.

We established various educational environmental models of the rural school in Latvia (Katane, 2005c; 2005d). The multi-level and multi-component educational environment of the rural school is characterized by a **great diversity**. These environmental models of rural schools we theoretically called: 1) *the rural elementary school/primary school – the kindergarten*; 2) *the rural elementary school/secondary school – the centre of the second opportunity education* (evening/shift work schools); 3) *the rural school – rural information centre*; 4) *the rural school* (secondary, elementary, primary) – *the centre of non-formal education for the pupils' family members*; 5) *the rural elementary school/secondary school – the centre of adult education*; 6) *the rural secondary school – methodological consultation centre of one of the higher educational establishments of Latvia*; 7) *the rural school – methodological consultation centre of one of the vocational education establishments* (elementary education or secondary education level) *of Latvia*; 8) *the rural school – the non-formal basis of the higher level educational establishment* (the non-formal basis of the elementary and/or secondary level of a particular vocational educational establishment/institution; the rural school – the non-formal basis of the particular comprehensive and/or secondary

schools of commercial studies in towns/cities/regions (in collaboration with the higher level educational establishments, rural school evaluates and improves the quality of its educational environment because every year the great proportion of its students continue their studies at the same particular educational establishments); 9) *the rural school – the centre of the environmental education*; 10) *the rural school – the centre of the cultural environment education, as well as rural tourism*; 11) *the rural elementary school – the spiritual, mental centre of the inhabitants of rural areas*; 12) *the country school – the rural centre of physical education*; 13) *the country school – the centre of commercial studies*; 14) *the rural school – the centre of art education* etc. There are also diagnosed *the combined models of the educational environment of country schools*, for example: 1) *the rural school – the rural centre of education (life-long education)*; 2) *the rural school (secondary school, elementary school, primary school) – the centre of culture education of local scale* etc.

The great diversity of educational environments' models of the rural schools, what exists in Latvia countryside, is the outcome of influence of various factors, for example, priorities and trends of the rural schools' development; educational needs of the rural local community; forms of interaction between the particular rural school and its outside environment.

There are three forms of interaction between educational environment of the rural school and outside environment: 1) the school aspires to influence processes what take place in outside environment; 2) educational environment of the rural school develops under the influence of outside environment; 3) there is a bilateral interaction between educational environment of the rural school and outside environment.

Various rural local communities have different educational needs what depend on various factors: economical situation and employment of people, demographic situation, social structure and age peculiarities of rural inhabitants, yet acquired education, values orientation, attitudes, wishes and possibilities of self-realization, etc.

The results of our research testify that attention and activity of pedagogues-innovators and creative pedagogues' collective of Latvia rural school are turned to output of new conceptions of strategic development and practical approbation of new educational environment's models. It is important to offer scientific conceptions, theories and new, untraditional education environment's models for rural schools nowadays. It is necessary to offer an ecological paradigm, a new perspective for substantiation and maintenance of sustainable development and humanistic target-oriented activities of rural schools in the countryside. By comparing the obtained results with the research carried out in other countries concerning the rural schools, we could conclude that the changeability of rural schools under the present conditions is subjected to the regularities, because scientists can observe it in the rural educational environment of many countries.

The rural schools become the multi-functional centres of the rural community, which offer the formal and non-formal education to pupils, their family members, children at the age of pre-school, as well as to all interested in it, to local community not only in Latvia, but also in many other countries. There are developing the new models of the educational environment of rural schools also in the USA, Australia, Canada, Russia, Byelorussia and other countries. Within the educational environment of the world (mega-)

level and the state (macro-) level of Latvia we can observe the tendency, when country schools transform into multi-level, multi-component and multi-functional centres, into the educational environment, which is opened to whole local rural community (Bronfenbrenner, 2000; DeYoung, Theobald, 1991; Harmon, Howley, Sanders, 1996; Stern, 1994; Harmon et al., 1998; Theobald, Nachtigal, 1995; Unruh, Lundt, 1999; Сельская школа... , 1999; Состояние сельской школы, 2000; Рогачёв, 1997).

When comparing the results of our research with the results of comparative international research that performed by the Education Research Institute of the University of Latvia (Kangro, 2004), we concluded that: 1) the positive changes in the educational environments of rural schools have influenced also the level of the students' learning achievements, it has significantly increased during the last four years; 2) at the international level the significant increase of the Latvian students' achievements in all the research content spheres has taken place due to the positive changes in the educational environment of rural schools and the significant dynamics of the increase of the rural school pupils' achievement level; 3) irrespectively of the differences that are related to such aspects of our research and the international comparative research as: a) scientific fields, b) research methodology, c) research subjects; d) sizes of the samples, there are results obtained, which enable us to conclude that in the parallelly performed different studies **the diagnosed qualitative and quantitative changes in the educational environments of rural schools are objective** and that these changes significantly influence the increase of the rural school pupils' learning achievement level that improves the Latvian pupils' learning achievement indicators also at the international

level in comparison to the learning achievements of the pupils from other countries (Katane, 2005c; 2005d).

Conclusions

1. In modern times, there are three educational paradigms in Latvia: 1) *conservative – pragmatic* paradigm that has survived from the times of soviet pedagogy; 2) nowadays formally stated *humanistic – phenomenological* paradigm, and 3) from the educational environment of modern Western countries comes *liberal – rational* paradigm. These educational paradigms create contradictions what are the causes of contradictions among the conceptual approaches of the Latvian schools in defining the target-oriented performance and practical implementation, among the pedagogical paradigms of each teacher.

2. In the Latvian educational environment we discovered also those contradictions what are characteristic for global level educational environment; contradictions between: the *global* and *local*; the *universal* and *individual*; the *traditional* and *modern*; the *long-term* and *short-term* strategies; the *competition* and *co-operation*; *the increase of information* and *the possibilities of human to acquire it* in the form of knowledge and skills; the *mental* and *material* world; the *needs of modern societies* and *needs of human as individuality*: towards *the perfection, self-realization of human* as and towards *liberalization of the labour market* directed the life-long educational conceptions.

3. Nowadays there is an increase of the availability and exchange opportunities of information and accumulation of educational experience concerning innovations both at the local, regional, national (state) and global level that is

largely connected with the processes of globalization and integration.

4. Nowadays the demographic crease and urbanization process endanger the sustainable development of the Latvian rural schools. In this situation in many places the rural municipalities, the inhabitants of rural areas try to find *the alternative solutions for the preservation of their educational environment*, for example, instead of the closed down small rural schools in their premises very often the non-formal educational environment (public schools, public universities, methodological consultation centres of formal and non-formal education) is established and offered to the community. It indicates that we can observe the process of self-renewal and transformation into another quality within the rural educational environment.

5. There is an *increase of competitions among schools*, particularly among urban and rural schools, and among same rural schools as well: the relations of market economics enter the educational environment of the Latvian schools. Under these conditions rural schools as self-evaluating and self-organizing systems of educational environment search new, no traditional models of their sustainable development.

6. Modern rural schools, respecting the humanistic approach, in their activities:

- 1) try to ensure the educational environment that facilitates their pupils' development, socialization and culturalization;
- 2) offer life-long learning opportunities to the rural inhabitants near the place of their residence;
- 3) accept responsibility for their and the local community's sustainable development within the modern changeable environment;
- 4) try to find new possibilities for enlarging their target audience;
- 5) increase the number of formal and non-

formal programmes and functions by extending the age limits of their target audience and thus complicating their structure. The rural schools perform traditional functions in the sphere of education, at the same time they accept the responsibility of performing also additional functions, many of them having preventive or compensatory nature.

7. Modern rural schools as the self-evaluating and self-organizing educational environmental systems have become an *inwardly inclusive environment*:

- *integrate into their environment* –

- 1) pre-schoolers;
- 2) children with special needs;
- 3) minority children;
- 4) adolescents and young people, who have not yet obtained in the urban environment the elementary education, corresponding to their age;
- 5) children from the cities, who could not and/or did not want to adapt to and integrate themselves into the educational environment of large urban schools;
- 6) their students' family members by involving them into the implementation of the pedagogical goals, as well as further education;
- 7) all those members of rural community, who are interested in it – people, residing in the local rural area, including adults, thus extending the age limits of their target audience and complicating their structure.

- *self-complicate by increasing the number of the formal and non-formal substructures of their educational environment.*

8. The process of *qualitative and quantitative changes* has started in the internal environment of rural schools:

- 1) nowadays there survive the indications, structural formations, characteristic to the

educational environment of rural schools, at the same time we can diagnose new indications and structural formations;

- 2) the new school educational paradigms, conceptions of sustainable development, didactics and up-bringing models take shape in the educational environment of rural school;
- 3) the rural schools started to improve qualities of all the environmental components.

9. We can observe a *great variety of the educational environment* of rural schools that emerges from:

- 1) the specifics of particular rural environment;
- 2) educational needs of pupils, educators, pupils' family members, as well as all local community;
- 3) various forms of interaction with outside educational environment.

10. There are several regularities in the development of the modern rural schools and its interaction with the external environment: causal relationships and interchanges that are diagnosed and proved by the research carried out not only in Latvia, but also in several countries (USA, Russia, etc).

REFERENCES

- Bronfenbrenner U. Development science in the 21st century: Emerging theoretical models, research designs, and empirical findings // *Social development*. 2000, vol. 9 (1), p. 115–125.
- Capper C. A. Rural Community Influences on Effective School Practices // *Journal of Educational Administration*. 1993, vol. 31 (3), p. 20–38.
- DeYoung A. J., Theobald P. Community Schools in the National Context: The social and cultural impact of educational reform movements on American rural schools // *Journal of Research in Rural Education*. 1991, vol. 7(3), p. 3–14.
- Flora C. B., Spears J., Swanson L. *Rural Communities: Legacy and Change*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. 1992 // <http://npin.org/library/2002/n00630/n00630.html> Resource was being described in the 20th January, 2002.
- Harmon H., Howley C., & Sanders J. Doctoral Research in Rural Education and the Rural R & D Menu // *Journal of Research in Rural Education*. 1996, vol. 12 (2), p. 68–75.
- Harmon H., Howley C., Smith C., & Dickens B. *Planning schools for rural communities*. Charleston, WV: AEL, 1998 // <http://www.ael.org/rel/rural/rurltool.htm> – Resource was being described in the 3rd April, 2004.
- Katane I. Lauku skolu ilgtspējība mūsdienu izglītībā. Starptautiskās konferences “Lauku vide. Izglītība. Personība” raksti. Latvija, Jelgava: LLU, 2003. P. 188–192.
- Katane I. Lauku skolas kā izglītības vides izvērtēšanas modelis. Promocijas darbs pedagogijas zinātnes skolas pedagogijas apakšnozarē. Zin. vad. L. Pēks. Daugavpils: Daugavpils Universitāte, 2005c. 195 lpp.
- Katane I. Development of Latvia Rural School as Education Environment in Eco- and Chrono- Systems. The International Scientific Conference Proceedings “Research for Rural Development 2004.” Latvia, Jelgava: LLU, 2004. P. 231–239.
- Katane I. Education Ecology as Philosophically Methodological Basis, New Perspectives for Interdisciplinary Research of Education Environment. The International Scientific Conference “ATEE Spring University 2005. Changing Education in a Changing Society: Europe 15+10”, 5–7 May, 2005 // Proceedings. Volume I. Lithuania, Klaipeda, Klaipeda University, 2005a. P. 108–118.
- Katane I. Rural School as Multidimensional Education Environment: Conceptual Model in aspect of education ecology // *Scientific Articles of the Fourth International Conference “Person. Color. Nature. Music”*, 18–21 May, 2005. Latvia, Daugavpils: Daugavpils University, 2005b. P. 173–188.
- Katane I. The Evaluation Model of the Rural School as Educational Environment. Summary of Doctoral Dissertation. Pedagogy science. Sub-sector: School pedagogy. Daugavpils: University of Daugavpils. 2005d. P. 35–72.
- Kangro A. Mācīšanās nākotnei. OECD valstu

Starptautiskās skolēnu novērtēšanas programmas otrā cikla pirmo rezultātu paziņošana Latvijā. Prezentācijas materiāls. 2004.gada 7.decembris. Latvijas Universitāte, Pedagoģijas un psiholoģijas fakultāte, 2004 // www.izm.gov.lv/dokumenti/visparizglijotsa%20izglitiba/occd-20041207.pps – Resurss aprakstīts 2005.gada 12.janvārī.

Stern J. D. The Condition of Education in Rural Schools. Washington, DC: U.S., Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, 2004 // <http://npin.org/library/2002/n00630/n00630.html> – Resource was being described in the 21st May, 2002.

Theobald P., Nachtigal P. Culture, Community, and the Promise of Rural Education // Phi Delta Kappan. 1995, vol. 77 (2), p. 132–135.

Unruh R., Lundt J. C. Rural school community

relationships in north central Montana: The role of school in rural communities // The Rural Educator. 1999, vol. 21 (1), p. 15–19.

Сельская школа на рубеже веков. Авторский кол.: В. Т. Лисовский, М. П. Гурьянова, Г. В. Пичугина и др. Псков: ПИПКРО, 1999 // <http://www.lib/msu.su/lib2000.html> – Описание ресурса 16 февраля 2002 года.

Состояние сельской школы России и перспективы ее устойчивого развития. В рамках комплексной программы Российской академия образования (РАО), Институт педагогики социальной работы. Москва: Издательство АСОИиР РФ, 2000. 255 с.

Рогачёв С. А. Социально-педагогические условия совершенствования образовательного процесса в сельской малочисленной школе: Автореферат дис. ... канд. пед. наук. Воронеж, 1997. С. 1–22.

GLOBALIZACIJOS ĪTAKA DARNIAI LATVIJOS KAIMO MOKYKLŪ PLĒTRAI

Irēna Katané

Santrauka

Spartējantys globalizācijas procesai daro ītaku Latvijas kaimo mokykloms. Straipsnyje pristatomas tyrimas, kurio tikslas yra išryškinti mažų kaimo mokyklų pastangas išlikti darnios plėtros sąlygomis išsaugant savo vidinę edukacinę aplinką nuo neigiamų išorinės aplinkos poveikių. Tyrimas buvo darytas 2000–2005 metais. Buvo ištirtos 277 kaimo mokyklos (46,6 proc. visų kaimo mokyklų, žr. lentelę). Tyrimo duomenų analizė parodė, kad dėl globalizacijos įtakos didėja mokyklų konkurencija. Švietimo organizacijų santykiai vis dažniau yra grindžiami laisvosios rinkos principais. Tai neigiamai veikia kaimo mokyklas. Mažėjantis moksleivių skaičius kelia grės-

mę kaimo mokyklų išlikimui. Lyginant 2000 ir 2004 metų kaimo mokyklų situaciją, išryškėjo naujos kaimo mokyklų kaitos tendencijos. Kad išliktų ir išsaugotų savo aplinką, mokyklos keičia savo vizijas ir ugdymo koncepcijas (siekia tapti ekologinėmis, labiau į žmogų orientuotomis mokyklomis), stengiasi praplėsti savo veiklos ribas, t. y. pradeda įgyvendinti ikimokyklinio ugdymo, formalaus ir neformalaus suaugusiųjų ugdymo, šeimų švietimo programas. Taip pat keičiasi mokyklų požiūris į santykius su išorine aplinka: plečiasi mokyklų bendradarbiavimas su partneriais švietimo ir kultūros srityse, atsirado bendradarbiaujančių mokyklų tinklas.

[teikta: 2005 11 23

Priimta: 2005 12 27