

## Modern Models of Educational Environment Safety

*Tatiana Leonidovna Shaposhnikova, Dmitry Aleksandrovich Romanov,  
Marina Leonidovna Romanova and Natalia Aleksandrovna Tarasenko*

FGBOU VPO "Kuban State Technological University",  
Moskovskaya Street 2, 350072, Krasnodar, Russia

---

**Abstract:** It is a well-known fact that an educational institution cannot function successfully apart from the society. One of the most important criteria of the contemporary education is the education quality being an integral feature reflecting how well the education as a social institute copes with the tasks imposed on it. According to contemporary researches, one of the criteria of the educational process quality is its safety, absence of inadmissible risk of its subjects' health, honor and dignity endamage and one of the most important tasks of the educational environment is to create safe conditions for students' successful education and upbringing. However, the models of safe educational environment have not been fully developed yet. This does not allow to mend effective social cooperation among the educational institution, graduates' employers and social organizations. The research goal is to create the models of safe educational environment of the educational institution.

**Key words:** Student • Educational environment • Social system • Safety • Models

---

### INTRODUCTION

It is a well-known fact that an educational institution cannot function successfully apart from the society. According to the contemporary views, education is a social institute and sociocultural phenomena and an educational institution is a social system with the long-held social relations [1].

One of the most important categories of the contemporary education theory is the education quality as an integral feature reflecting how well the education as a social institute copes with the tasks imposed on it. According to contemporary researches, one of the criteria of the educational process quality is its safety, absence of inadmissible risk of its subjects' health, honor and dignity endamage [2] and one of the most important tasks of the educational environment is to create safe conditions for students' successful education and upbringing [3].

However, the models of safe educational environment have not been fully developed yet. This does not allow to mend effective social cooperation among the educational institution, graduates' employers

and social organizations. The research problem includes the question: what are the parameters of safe educational environment? The research goal is to create the models of safe educational environment of the educational institution.

Level of the problem development. World and native experience show the necessity and opportunity to increase the organizational culture of educational institutions [4]. According to the American education theory, the development of educational institution organizational culture is focused on coping with racial and ethnic conflicts within the educational institution; decreasing the rates of drugs abuse, violation in schools and students' mental health disorders; creating of emotionally and physically safe environment in the educational institution; expanding of powers and networks to support students in their personal and professional self-determination; strengthening of collaboration among the education, family and society as a whole. The most important basic principles of the "caring school" model are displayed in Table 1 and aspects of social relations can be found in Table 2.

---

**Corresponding Author:** Shaposhnikova, FGBOU VPO "Kuban State Technological University",  
Moskovskaya Street 2, 350072, Krasnodar, Russia.

Table 1: Basic principles of the “caring school” model

Principle	Description
Connections availability	Students, teachers and other participants of social interrelation have positive relations with one another
Availability of ample powers and opportunities for everyone	Students must understand that their actions matter in the creation of safe educational environment
Safety	Formation of students’ feeling of responsibility for their actions, thus creating conditions to prevent conflicts and safe education and upbringing threats
Cooperation	Joint efforts of teachers, students and other participants of the interrelation are focused on the creation of the organizational culture of the educational institution (safe educational environment)
Concurrence	Powers and responsibilities (as well as functions and tasks) of participants of the social and pedagogic interrelation are clearly determined
Feeling of general ownership	All participants of the social and pedagogic interrelation are involved in the life of the educational institution, thus the feeling of responsibility (including for material and technical valuables) is being formed
Mutual respect	All social relations in the educational institution are based on the acknowledgement of each interrelation participant’s (teacher’s, student’s, etc.) position, respect of his wishes, needs and beliefs
Gladness atmosphere	Maintenance of positive atmosphere in the educational institution as a whole and for each participant of the social and pedagogic interrelation while solving problems

Table 2: Aspects of social relations in the “caring school” model

Aspect	Characteristics
Relations between teachers	Development of the joint work culture contributes to decreasing of the professional isolation level, allows to exchange successful experience and provides teachers’ support
Relations between teachers and students	Teachers demonstrate respect, high expectations and support for students who do the same in response
Relations between students	Development of students’ self-esteem, the ability to control life situations, acceptance of school values and care about each other
Relations between educational institutions and social organizations	Friendly relations as a result of mutual support, partnership and common goals are established between participants of social and pedagogic interrelation

According to contemporary researches, the education humanization (including the creation of safe educational environment) is inseparably related to the tolerance formation (establishment) with participants of the educational process—teachers and students. Models of small society tolerant safety are described in the work [5]: according to the author, tolerant safety (intolerant danger) of the social system is determined by the percentage of individuals with tolerance (intolerance) as a basic (situational) personality feature. Herewith, safety of education and upbringing conditions is determined not only by teachers’ and students’ tolerance. Safe educational environment must be focused on supporting a student in his/her personal and professional self-determination, stimulating him/her to develop personally and professionally and providing preventive measures of drug addiction and health damage. The interrelation between the educational environment safety and student’s personal and professional development has not been duly studied [6].

**Research Organization:** The research base is an engineering higher educational institution (Kuban State Technological University). In order to discover the

interrelation between students’ individual social experience and tolerance, the author diagnosed tolerance and social experience of students (n=2364) who entered the educational institution in 2006-2012. The level of students’ emotional burnout syndrome was defined on the basis of using *Mental Burnout Questionnaire* by V.E. Orel and I.G. Senin.

**Main Part:** According to the authors, educational environment safety can be its both basic and situational feature (as well as danger of educational environment can be basic or situational feature). In other words, safety (danger) of the educational environment as a social system can be formed both stably and unstably (Table 3). Safe educational environment is considered to be the educational environment for which the danger is a situational or basic feature.

Thus, parameters of the educational environment safety can be displayed with the aid of the following integral indicators (latent variables): potential of the educational environment of the higher educational institution for students’ personal and professional growth (P1), tolerant safety of social educational environment (P2), guarantee not to damage somatic and mental health,

Table 3: Classification of educational environment safety levels

Safety level	Characteristics
Safety is a basic feature	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Multicultural social environment of the educational institution is the most important external resource of students' personal and professional development (internal resources include personal and professional features).</li> <li>2. Positive relations clearly dominate between participants of social and pedagogic interrelation (administration of the educational institution, teachers, students, social organizations, graduates' employers, etc.), they are characterized by common goals, stable motivation to joint solving of problems.</li> <li>3. Under any conditions there is a minimal possibility to damage somatic (physical) and mental health, honor and dignity of participants of social and pedagogic interrelation.</li> <li>4. There is effective support for the student in his/her personal and professional self-determination, psychological and professional maintenance of all types of students' educational and professional activity.</li> <li>5. Motives of participants of social and pedagogic interrelation to socially valuable and personally important types of activity are not distinctly differentiated, i.e. they are realized in the integrity (system).</li> <li>6. There is optimization of social and pedagogic interrelation in order to improve organizational culture of the educational institution (educational environment).</li> </ol>
Safety is a situational feature	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Multicultural social environment of the educational institution is an external resource of students' personal and professional development that matters at adequate level of internal resources formation; conflict-free interrelation in such environment is provided by measures of administrative and state regulation as well as passive tolerance of participants of social and pedagogic interrelation.</li> <li>2. Positive relations that can worsen under certain conditions dominate between participants of social and pedagogic interrelation; there is a motivation to joint solving of problems but it does not have a stable character.</li> <li>3. There is a low possibility of damaging somatic (physical) and mental health, honor and dignity of participants of social and pedagogic interrelation, but it depends on the specific situation in the social system (educational environment).</li> <li>4. There is support for the student in his/her personal and professional self-determination that basically includes help in choosing life and professional way but not coping with difficulties related to the choice realization; psychological and pedagogic maintenance of all types of educational and professional activity of students has a systematic character but it is not improved (it is maintained on a specific level).</li> <li>5. Motives of participants of social and pedagogic interrelation to socially valuable types of activity have a distinctly expressed focus but it does not always realized in the system.</li> <li>6. Social and pedagogic interrelation is maintained at the target level but it is not systematically improved.</li> </ol>
Danger is a basic feature	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Conflicts stipulated by individual and sociocultural differences between people often take place in multicultural environment of the educational institution (their reason is individuals' intolerance as a basic feature of a personality), there is a high level of intolerant danger of the social environment.</li> <li>2. Negative relations, antagonistic interrelations (inconsistency), actions disagreement clearly dominate between participants of social and pedagogic interrelation.</li> <li>3. Under any conditions there is a high possibility of damaging mental (and sometimes physical) health, honor and dignity of subjects of social and pedagogic interrelation, a subject can become a victim of a crime towards him.</li> <li>4. There is no support for the student in his/her personal and professional self-determination; psychological and pedagogic maintenance of students' educational and professional activity is not efficient and is often deformed that demotivates students to perform successful educational and professional activity, contributes to emotional burnout syndrome.</li> <li>5. Negative attitude of participants of social and pedagogic interrelation to socially valuable types of activity, confrontation between socially valuable and personally important activity.</li> <li>6. Organizational culture of the educational institution (educational environment) worsens.</li> </ol>
Danger is a situational feature	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Multicultural environment of the educational institution is rather a factor of conflicts than of personal and professional development of the interrelations subjects; its reason is individuals' intolerance as a situational feature of a personality.</li> <li>2. It is difficult to categorically define what type of interrelations (positive or negative) dominates between participants of social and pedagogic interrelation; not many participants act coherently to solve problems.</li> <li>3. Under specific conditions there is a high possibility to damage mental health, honor and dignity of subjects of social and pedagogic interrelation.</li> <li>4. Students are nor regularly supported in their personal and professional self-determination, it is seldom effective; psychological and pedagogic maintenance of students' educational and professional activity is not always efficient as a result of domination of traditional pedagogic technologies that do not entirely correspond to competence- and personality-oriented approaches in education.</li> <li>5. Careless and passive and negative attitude of participants of social and pedagogic interrelation to socially valuable types of activity.</li> <li>6. Organizational culture of the educational institution (educational environment) does not improve.</li> </ol>

Table 4: Levels of components of the students' emotional burnout syndrome (low level of the educational environment safety)

Components of emotional burnout syndrome	Levels of the syndrome components (in % of the total number of the examined ones)			
	Zero	Low	Middle	High
Depersonalization	36.9	34.5	18.4	11.2
Decrease in life activity efficiency self-esteem	24.6	37.4	22.3	15.7
Psychoemotional exhaustion	35.7	29.6	23.5	11.2

Table 5: Levels of components of the students' emotional burnout syndrome (middle level of the educational environment safety)

Components of emotional burnout syndrome	Levels of the syndrome components (in % of the total number of the examined ones)			
	Zero	Low	Middle	High
Depersonalization	44.7	32.7	13.3	9.3
Decrease in life activity efficiency self-esteem	33.7	34.8	19.3	12.2
Psychoemotional exhaustion	47.5	25.5	18.5	8.5

Table 6: Levels of components of the students' emotional burnout syndrome (high level of the educational environment safety)

Components of emotional burnout syndrome	Levels of the syndrome components (in % of the total number of the examined ones)			
	Zero	Low	Middle	High
Depersonalization	66.2	18.6	10.5	4.7
Decrease in life activity efficiency self-esteem	58.5	25	12.3	4.2
Psychoemotional exhaustion	71.5	20.5	5.5	2.5

honor and dignity of subjects of social and pedagogic interrelation (P3), level of the support for students in their personal and professional self-determination (P4), level of psychological and pedagogic maintenance of students' educational and professional activity (P5), quality of social and pedagogic interrelation (P6). All variables mentioned above are estimated as latent (qualimetric) indicators on 100 points relations scale. Methods of diagnosing these indicators are described in the works [7-10]. Gradation of variables value is the following: from 0 to 25 points-very low level, from 25 to 50 points-low level, from 50 to 75 points-middle level, from 75 to 100 points-high level. Respectively, the gradation of the educational environment safety as a whole is the following: from 0 to 150 points-very low level, from 150 to 300 points-low level, from 400 to 450 points-middle level, from 450 to 600 points-high level. The importance of P4 and P5 parameters for diagnosing the educational environment safety is in the fact that without the support for students in their personal and professional self-determination and psychological and pedagogic maintenance of educational and professional activity there is a high risk of students' disappointment in educational process, inability to cope with difficulties related to educational and professional activity, emotional burnout syndrome. Comfortable and safe conditions for personal and professional development are impossible without the support for students in their personal and professional self-determination, psychological and

pedagogic maintenance of educational and professional activity and joint activity (social and pedagogic interrelation) on maintaining and improving of educational process if the educational institution does not interrelate with graduates' employers.

Researches on the basis of the engineering higher educational institution discovered the availability of strong interrelation between the educational environment safety (we do not name departments and administering sub-departments due to ethical reasons) and emotional burnout of students (Tables 4-6). As one can see, the risk of students' emotional burnout naturally decreases as the educational environment safety increases [11].

In its turn, the factor of safe educational environment [12] is personal and professional features of participants of the social and professional interrelation. The researches on the basis of the engineering higher educational institution allowed to discover the following critical factors of safe educational environment: tolerance and legal culture of all participants without exception, communicative competence of the structural subdivisions administration of the educational institution, employers, teachers and representatives of social organizations, management competence of the structural subdivisions administration of educational institutions and graduates' employers, psychological and pedagogic competence of teachers and their readiness for researches and informational culture of teachers' and students' personality.

**Summary:** This article shows the results of many years' researches made by the authors. According to the authors, the creation of safe educational environment is the basis of the education humanization and the safety itself is a determining factor of its quality. That's why diagnostics of the educational environment safety must be a component of the education quality monitoring.

### CONCLUSIONS

The research results allow to make the conclusion that the educational environment safety is a critical (principally important) factor of the students' personal and professional development and its provision is a social and pedagogic task, its resolving being dependent upon social and pedagogic interrelation of the educational institution administration, employees, students, graduates' employers and social organizations. The educational environment as a social system is the most important external resource of students' personal and professional development (its internal resource is personal and professional features).

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work has been done within the state order from the Education and Science Ministry of the RF No. 10.7079.2013r. *Motivation Research and Development of Incentives System to Form Students' Tolerance* and under financial support from the Russian Humanitarian Scientific Fund No. 13-06-00350 dated 13.06.2013 in the context of the *Monitoring of Recurrent Education Quality* topic.

### REFERENCES

1. George, M.P., 2007. Implementing School-Wide Behavior Change: Lessons from the Field. *Psychology in the Schools*, 44(1): 41-51.
2. Kiseleva, E.S., 2012. Monitoring of the Education Process Quality. *Uchenye zapiski universiteta imeni P.F. Lesgafta*, 11(93): 44-49.
3. Dovgopolova, A.G., 2013. Development of the Organizational Structure of the American School in the Concept of a "Caring School". *Uchenye zapiski universiteta imeni P.F. Lesgafta*, 2(96): 40-44.
4. Bryan, J., 2008. Strengths-Based Partnerships: A School-Family-Community Partnership Approach to Empowering Students. *Professional School Counseling*, 12(2): 149-156.
5. Romanova, M.L., 2013. Mathematic Models of the Tolerant Students Environment. *Uchenye zapiski universiteta imeni P.F. Lesgafta*, 4(98): 95-99.
6. Glatter, R., 2003. Collaboration, Collaboration, Collaboration: the Origins and Implications of a Policy. *Management in Education*, 17(5): 16-20.
7. Voroshilova, I.S., 0000. Support of a Student in Personal and Professional Identity. *Uchenye zapiski universiteta imeni P.F. Lesgafta*, 2(96): 19-23.
8. Daurova, M.P., 2012. The "School of Interaction" as a Form of Optimization of the Educational Process of an Educational Institution. *New Technology*, 1: 62-68.
9. Kiseleva, E.S., 2013. Connection between Tolerance and Personal and Professional Development of a Student. *Uchenye zapiski universiteta imeni P.F. Lesgafta*, 9(103): 62-67.
10. Shaposhnikova, T.L., 2013. Conditions to Inculcate Tolerance in Students. Romanova M.L., Tarasenko N.A. *Life Sci J*;10(11s):325-330] (ISSN:1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 60
11. Fullan, M., 1992. Visions that Blind. *Educational Leadership*, 49(5): 19-20.
12. Home, K. and P. Home, 1999. The Dark Side of Zero Tolerance: Can Punishment Lead to Safe Schools? Date Views 11.09.2013 [www.pdkintl.org/kappan/kski9901.htm](http://www.pdkintl.org/kappan/kski9901.htm).