

Social and Pedagogical Prerequisites for the Development of State and Public Administration of Education in Russia

Tatiana Alekseevna Pankova and Alfia Faritovna Guzairova

FSBEI "Orenburg State Pedagogical University", Orenburg, Russia

Abstract: This paper examines the main social and educational prerequisites of occurrence and formation of state and public administration in the national education system: the implementation of the idea of education openness through the educational reforms of Peter I; the appearance of the institute of patronage and charity for the needs of the people education; the development of social and pedagogical movement; and democratization of education management in the 90-ies of the twentieth century. Considering the genesis of socio-pedagogical movement, we should distinguish the controversial and dramatic period of 1900 - 1918 years ("the era of three revolutions"), when the socio-pedagogical movement, on the one hand, was one of the components of the arising civil society and on the other, one of the "revolutionary streams" that prepared the ground for democracy. Social and educational organization began to play an increasing role in the educational life of the country and in the development of education and pedagogy. A political system, based on authoritarianism and existed in the Soviet Union, dictated the essence of its relationship with education: maintaining maximum of traditional and national elements through severe administration and management at parallel use of modern educational achievements. Educational policy in an authoritarian regime was completely determined by the central authority of the state and only slightly depended on the rudimentary structures of civil society, including the local authorities.

Key words: Prerequisites of formation • State and public governance • Openness of education • Institute of patronage and charity • Social-pedagogical movement • Democratization of education management

INTRODUCTION

The forming modern practice of state and public management in education is based on a variety of theoretical, social, pedagogical, cultural and historical grounds. This necessitates the need to analyze the development of state and public management of education, its genesis and transformation, detection of the main prerequisites and features of the formation of a national education system.

The idea of involving public in the education management along with the government structures has undergone a complex and contradictory development over the XVIII-XX centuries in the history of Russia.

Based on the special historical and educational research (A.Ya. Butov, V.S. Bolodurin, M.V. Boguslavskiy, A.P. Bulkin, E.D. Dneprov, V.O. Kljuchevsky, G.B. Kornetov, M.V. Mikhailov, M.V.

Pevzner, A.I. Piskunov, M.N. Rutkevich, P.A. Sorokin and A.N. Shevelev), the following socio-educational prerequisites of occurrence and development of state and public management of education can be distinguished and essentially characterized.

The first prerequisite is the idea of education openness implemented through the educational reforms of Peter I (the first half of the XVIII century).

The name of Peter I, whose activity outstripped the needs of the culture of his time, is associated with the formation of government (civil service) in Russia, systematic training and formation of the network of educational institutions.

The Main Characteristics of this Period Are as Follows:

- Gradual secularization of culture and penetration of secular elements affected the scope of knowledge,

influenced the understanding of its value and relegated knowledge from the sacral sphere to the area of real human life: education became a means for changing social status [1];

- Orientation of the state and the upper strata of society to the culture of Europe, adoption of its technical and scientific achievements;
- Widening international contacts in industrial, economic, cultural and educational spheres;
- Setting the priority interest of the state in training and education of specialists relying on religion and church in the governmental, civil and religious affairs and in the education of citizens.
- Opening of professional state public schools for training specialists for management, industry, army and navy.

The Russian school, founded by the will of the Emperor, was the scene of constant clashes of class interests, a platform for testing the socio-political trends and the place of social experimentation.

The course to building a strong secular state pursued by Peter I could not be realized by people thinking in religious and dogmatic postulates. It was necessary to form a new national identity, free of the church dogma and based on the foundation of "enlightened patriotism" (V.O. Kljuchevsky). Russia needs secularly educated, widely knowledgeable and professionally competent people who are ready to dedicate themselves to serving the Fatherland. The formation of these people is possible only on the basis of nationalization of the ideas of European Enlightenment with its priorities of secular and vocational education. Russian young people by the order of Peter I left to learn science for Western Europe and the known educators and scientists came from there to Russia (Gluck, Forvarson, Euler, Bernoulli brothers, Pallas, et al.) to work at the institutions of a new type actively created by the state. These new schools differed from the earlier ones both in content and organization of the educational process and in the title. So, schools and a little later, the Academy of Sciences with the university and gymnasium replaced traditional Russian professional schools (colleges).

Professional secular schools (of mathematics and navigation, artillery, engineering, "different-languages" and surgery), created in the era of Peter I, were oriented to the needs of society and trained professionals for various areas of domestic and economic life, government, army, navy, education and science. They were very

democratic and open to both children of the privileged and the lower strata (children of clerks, assistants to clerks, townspeople and soldiers) and used the learning system that enabled students to comprehend the science in individual pace and rhythm and the most diligent and capable of them to complete their education before others.

The special role of the educational reforms of Peter I in the development of the idea of openness of domestic education is seen by E.V. Ivanov as follows.

- The reforms of Peter I, covering all the spheres of national life, turned the Russian state to the western secularized culture with its historical priorities of freedom, democracy and humanism and set up this direction for a long time, up until today.
- The success of the reforms of Peter I is inextricably linked with the development and the rise of domestic education and enlightenment of the people, which best representatives could make a career and even get a title of nobility for their intellectual abilities and personal qualities.
- In the era of Peter I, there were the first real attempts to create the Russian educational system open to the world, society and partially to a person [2].

The second prerequisite is appearance of the institute of patronage and charity for the needs of public education.

According to the researchers A.I. Adamski, M.V. Boguslavskiy, V.I. Bochkarev, Ya.N. Dlugolenskiy, A.A. Sedelnikov and others the patronage movement in Russia appeared in the XVIII century. This movement had two strategies.

The first strategy may be denoted as a state-public, where the government was aimed at mobilizing public resources for public education, not including public in determining the content of the educational process and in the management of educational institutions.

The second strategy is public-state; it was to be recognized and accepted by the government to some extent as a result of a deep social crisis that led to the revolutionary manifestations of 1905.

According to the first development strategy of the institution of patronage, the practice of this movement was as follows. By the Imperial Decree of 1803 Russia was divided into six educational districts; in each of them the post of the state official curator was introduced. The Provision "On the training districts of the Ministry of Public Education" from 25.06.1835 and the Provision "On the councils within the office of curator of educational

districts" from 20.03.1860 approved the order of the activities of the curator of educational districts and the Board of Trustees: "before making a decision, the curator must first discuss the issue at the council" [2].

In addition to the conventional care for finance and functioning of educational institutions, Boards of Trustees in the districts were also in charge of the investigative measures on the facts of abuse of official status by education officials and teachers, consideration and evaluation of the advantages of training manuals and determining which of them are more useful for the educational institutions and approval of appointments of teachers and educational staff. Within the educational institutions, "to promote the success of the institution development from the side of society" it was allowed to create the boards of trustees, which co-existed with the teaching, college and economic councils of schools. Each institution independently determined the functions and powers of the board of trustees, which, as a rule, were as follows: promoting students' successful training, replenishing libraries, monitoring fundraising for the institution, help to poor students, monitoring the serviceability of the material part of the educational institution and annual inspection of its property on the inventory, preliminary consideration of estimates and statements of income and expenditure of the institution and preparation of opinions on them, determining salaries of the head of the educational institution and other official persons, determining tuition fees and exemption from tuition fees for poor students, representation in the city council or county assembly on the needs of the school. In the cities with several educational institutions (gymnasiums, progymnasiums, schools, public schools) single board of trustees could be formed for all of them, or each educational institution could have its own board of trustees. In case of different opinions of the Board of Trustees and the teachers' council of the institution on various issues, the final decision was made by the curator of the educational district. The board of trustees was formed from the persons who were elected by the strata and communities that supported the school at their own expense. The board of trustees also included the elected honorary citizens of the city who made the greatest contribution into improvement of the material well-being of the institution, representatives of the city council or country assembly and the teaching staff. After the election or nomination of the members of the board of trustees, the panel of the latter was approved by the curator of the educational district. This is how the vacancies of "indispensable" and "elected" members were

filled up. The voluntary members of patronage could be those who paid in the fixed annual membership fee. Members of the patronage also could nominate their representatives to the board of trustees and elect the honorary members (without fee) from the persons who had made considerable donations or rendered a great service to the patronage. As a rule, the honorary trustees were the representatives of nobility; for the representatives of the merchants, burghers and peasants the elected posts of honorary guardian and supervisor of honor were established. It is important to note that members of the boards of trustees of gymnasiums and progymnasiums were equated with state officials with the right to wear the uniform of the 6th rank of the Ministry of Education. Thus the Russian Institute of state and public patronage of education was built.

The second strategy - public and state patronage of education - was due to the rapid development of non-governmental industry and the local territorial self-government in Russia.

The objective requirements of the development of private and corporate industrial production, on the one hand and the orthodox Christian norms and values, cultivated in the traditions of Russian communal self-consciousness, which became the basis of what in modern terminology is called the "social responsibility of business", on the other hand, contributed to the investment of private capital in public education, namely non-state educational and vocational training institutions and in the forms of charities usually directed to non-governmental "county" (local public authorities, "municipal" - in modern terminology) schools.

- Here are a few facts to illustrate these processes.

Creation of the institute of local self-government in the form of provincial, rural county and urban self-government in Russia in 1864 (which not only differed from the general traditional system of administrative and bureaucratic management, but also opposed to this system defying it by the very public essence) opened up new possibilities of public participation in the development of public education. V.I. Charnolusky wrote: "Having established the local county authority the country received a public institution, which, by its very nature, organically stood out from the general mainstream of the bureaucratic regime of the country and had to become a natural hub for uniting social forces..." [3].

For example, the Russian government's budget in 1914 amounted to 3.6 billion rubles, which was 9 times more than the total budget of the Russian local self-government (347.5 million). At the same time, the cost of education from the government budget in 1914 amounted to 155.3 million rubles; and expenses of the county budgets for the same purpose amounted to a little less than 107 million rubles. These figures clearly show that one of the priorities, which were from the beginning determined by local county authorities, was just education. During the period from 1904 to 1914, expenditures of local county authorities and town councils for public education annually grew by 20% and amounted to 40% of local budgets. Of the 426 county authorities 400 already implemented their own programs of primary "general education" of the population and in general intended to build the necessary network of public schools by 1917 and to complete this building by 1920. In the study "Education and pedagogical thought in the Orenburg region. Pages of History (1735-1940 years)" V.S. Bolodurin notes the active educational policy of the board of the Orenburg Cossack Army in the nineteenth century. Virtually in every Cossack village the compulsory schools for boys and later for girls appeared. The literacy rate (64.7%) among the Cossack population in the late nineteenth century was the highest not only among the population of the Orenburg province, but also in the entire Russia. The effectiveness of teaching in these schools is proved by the fact that 98% of the Orenburg Cossacks, drafted to the military service before the World War I, were literate [4].

In the annals of the history of Russian patronage of education, a significant place was occupied by such industrialists and public figures, as dynasties of Demidov, Bakhrushin, S.I. Prokhorov, S. Morozov and et al.

By the end of the nineteenth century in Russia there was a significant number of different professional schools - school of nurses, governesses, cabinetmakers, printing students, cooking art, typing, bookbinding and drawing. Most of the schools were supported at the expense of middle-class and crafts communities, as well as by private donations. By 1903, in Russia there were more than 930 private free schools operating at the expense of donations from enthusiastic nobles [5].

In the early twentieth century, more than thirty thousand Russian cooperatives and consumer and credit associations, representing more than ten million members, implemented their educational programs, provided financial support to the existing county schools, opened new schools, publishing houses and public cultural

institutions. It is in the field of education that cooperatives actively grouped and united for common socially important activities.

Thus, the rapid development of the real non-governmental economic and civil sectors of Russian society has allowed not only organizing the non-governmental sector of education, but also in partnership with the state developing and realizing the public state educational policies and programs and introducing the public and governmental authorities at school on the spur of the moment.

The third premise is the development of socio-pedagogical movement.

Socio-pedagogical movement emerged in Russia at the turn of the 50-60-ies of the XIX century to unite various educators, scholars, students and public officials, i.e. individuals interested in education development. A.I. Adamski determines the socio-pedagogical movement as a non-governmental and non-departmental form of professional educational co-organization realizing its objectives and goals, expressing the efficient (theoretical and practical) relation to the current educational system and building its own communication with society [6].

Among the most important social and educational institutions of this period there were Pedagogical Society at Moscow, Kazan and the Novorossiysk (Odessa) universities. Their meetings, in the years of social upheaval, addressed the issues of school reform, education for adults and the general condition of public education.

One of the important factors in the development of socio-pedagogical movement was democratic pedagogical journalism, which covered the problems of extending the scope of public participation in school education, the establishment of a single general public school, the introduction of general free primary education and propagating the best pedagogical views among the democratic intelligentsia. From 1890 to 1904 in Russia, 43 new teachers' press agencies were created; most of them reflected the ideology of reforms [7].

However, opposition of their goals, objectives, content of educational policy and social and educational activities, in the absence of hard antagonism at the level of forms, means and methods of cooperation, has led to insufficient positive results in realization of the objectives of public policy and social work in education. This was conditioned not only by the reluctance of the state to share their authority with the public, but by the lack of orientation of social-pedagogical movement to cooperation.

Considering the genesis of socio-pedagogical movement, we should highlight the controversial and dramatic period of 1900 - 1918 years. ("The era of the three revolutions"), when the socio-pedagogical movement acted, on the one hand, as one of the components of the emerging civil society and on the other - as one of the "revolutionary streams" that prepared the ground for democracy. Social and educational organizations began to play an increasingly important role in the educational life of the country and in the development of people's education and pedagogy.

M.V. Mikhailova classifies socio-educational organization as follows.

- General educational, targeted to promote the improvement of various types of education;
- Scientific and educational non-governmental organizations, mostly developing the issues of educational theory and its applications in school practice;
- Vocational and educational organizations that have contributed to uniting teachers, protection of their legal and civil rights, improvement of professional level, financial situation, working and living conditions [8].

These organizations increasingly manifested themselves as an active counterweight to the state school policy and contributed to an exacerbation of public interest in the problems of public education. So, the desire of the teaching community to create the all-Russian movement was natural. The first step in uniting teachers was the first officially authorized all-Russian congress of the representatives of the teachers' societies of mutual aid (1902/1903), which strongly advocated the need to establish the All-Russian Union of Teachers and developed a draft charter of the teachers associations. According to this draft, the Union united various independent educational societies, to conduct congresses of public education, establish a central information bureau, Central Pedagogical Museum and establish a periodical. Despite that the Union of Teachers managed to achieve the goals only partially (due to the nature of the Union as an underground organization and frequent arrests of its members), its role in laying the foundations of the nationwide professional and political associations is worth noting.

The largest and the most illustrative phenomenon was the activities of All-Russian Teachers' Union (ARTU) in 1905-1907. ARTU brought together teachers, researchers, administrative staff, writers, journalists,

librarians and lawyers. The Central Bureau included such famous figures as V.P. Vakhterov, V.V. Vodovozov, V.A. Gerdt, Ya.I. Dushechkin, V.I. Charnolusky, N.V. Chekhov and others. Under ARTU initiative in 1907, the Federation of National and Regional Associations of Teachers was formed. In 1908, in the conditions of social and political reaction the Union ceased operations and renewed the activities in April 1917 as ARTU, keeping the ideological continuity with previous organization, restoring its structure and adding the following activities to the charter: the implementation of the principle of school autonomy (understood as self-government, which was realized by a team of teachers, parents, students and the public; self-determination of schools in teaching and educational activities, creative development of plans and programs by the teachers; election of school directors by the teaching staff; economic independence, etc.); broad support for the teaching profession and the struggle for the interests of the teachers [9].

Reviewing the socio-educational organizations in Russia in the XX century, we should mention the All-Russian Teachers Society founded in 1915, which, despite the objectives regulated in the charter (scientific development of the issues of pedagogy and adjacent scientific disciplines, dissemination of pedagogical knowledge, support to pedagogical associations in solving their problems), mainly focused on the association of professional teachers' organizations and support for the teachers - victims of the war.

In Orenburg, in the second half of XIX - early XX century, a number of teachers associations were created: "Association of mutual aid for the students of primary schools of Orenburg Province" and "Society for the promotion of public education." The branches of the Russian Psychological Society and the All-Russian Geographic Society functioned as well; and in 1913 the branch of "Orenburg family and teaching society" was opened.

Thus, having considered the key points in the history of socio-pedagogical movement in the pre-socialist Russia, we come to the following conclusion. While noting the efforts of the teaching community in creating, organizing and uniting the professional societies, they could not establish a single coordinating authority to direct and integrate the scientific research and educational activities of the educational associations.

Later during the 70 years of the USSR, the professional teachers' organizations and scientific and educational associations operated strictly under the control of the state.

In the studies, we note that a political system, existed in the Soviet Union and based on authoritarianism, dictated the essence of its relationship with education, namely: maintaining maximum traditional and national elements through strict administration in management at parallel use of modern educational achievements. Educational policy in an authoritarian regime was completely determined by the central authority of the state and only slightly depended on the rudimentary structures of civil society, including the local self-government. In the Soviet period, a system of triple subordination of public education to departmental, governmental and Party organs was formed and in fact the later had a dominant role. As a result, the system of education in Russia was formed under the initiative from the "top" and was intended for implementation of public contracts [10].

Thus, the insularity of school, formed for decades, contributed to the growth of negative social phenomenon of public alienation from the school, which, in turn, led to its gradual stagnation and low economic and managerial efficiency.

The need for public participation in the management of education, the ineffectiveness of the existing schemes, techniques and principles of departmental organization and management was verbalized already in the 90-ies of the twentieth century.

Relevance of the problems of democratization of education management in modern Russia is conditioned by socio-economic reasons:

- Collapse of the old rigidly centralized system of education in the late 80's and early 90's of the last century;
- Collapse of a single educational space that existed in the territory of the former Soviet Union;
- Total under-funding of education;
- A change of stereotype about the monopoly role of the state in the administration of educational institutions;
- Growing objective need in democratic development of the educational sector and modernization of its management;
- Formation of social contract in education;
- Increasing demands of society to the quality of educational services.

Awareness of inefficiency of the existing educational schemes, technologies and principles of departmental organization and management, the necessity of public

inclusion in education management has identified new targets of the education system and required the appropriate legislative base and the new education policy.

The RF Law "On Education" adopted in 1992 stipulated basic principles of the state policy in the field of education (Article 2). Among them are the state-social character of education management that meets the needs of society and the autonomy of educational institutions; besides the law says about the need to build management of the institutions (state and municipal) based on the principles of undivided authority and government, provides the students, their parents or legal representatives and, of course, the employees of educational institutions with the right to participate in the management of school.

Targets of the government policy documents (the Law "On Education", National Education Doctrine, Concepts of modernization of Russian education, public administration of general education institutions, public administration of the institutions of general education and state and public management of general education and democratization of general education management in Russia) point to the gradually forming focus on the development of civil society in Russia and in this regard, the growth of social activity of the population and creation of conditions for strengthening public influence on decision-making by the authorities, i.e. on changes in the system of education management.

CONCLUSION

Thus, qualitative changes in education are impossible without the participation of society, as education itself is the sphere of public activities and life. State-public management of education turns schools towards the society, helps to eliminate the state monopoly on education, turns the school from the state institution to a social institution, equally serving the interests and needs of the individual, society and the state.

REFERENCES

1. Pankova, T.A., 2003. Reform of the Education System in Russia in the 90-ies: a Sociological Survey. Monograph. Moscow: Logos, pp: 136.
2. Wiborg, S., 2009. The enduring nature of egalitarian education in Scandinavia: an English perspective. Forum for Promoting 3-19 Comprehensive Education. Leicester, 51(2): 117-130.

3. Charnolusky, V.I., 1911. District Council and Public Education. Part II. St. Petersburg.
4. Guzairova, A.F., 2009. State and Public Management of Territorial System of Education. Monograph. Orenburg: Publishing House of SU "the Regional Centre of Education Development", pp: 158.
5. Pankova, T.A., 2004. Sozialbedeutende schulmission. Wissenschafts und praxisin-regration in innovationsprozessen der heutigen gesellschaft. Deutsch-Russische wis-senschaftlich-praktische koproduktion. Berlin, pp: 89-96.
6. Boguslavskiy, M.V., 1993. All-Russian Union of Teachers. Russian Pedagogical Encyclopedia, Vol. 1. Moscow, pp: 176.
7. Pankova, T.A., May 2007. Pedagogical College Graduates' Life Plans and their Realization. Russian Education and Society, pp: 50-59.
8. Green, A., 2008. Le modele de l'ecole unique, l'egalite et la chouette de Minerve. In *Revue francaise de pedagogie*. Inst.ped.nat. Paris, 164: 15-26.
9. Bolodurin, V.S., 2001. Education and Pedagogical Thought in Orenburg Region. Pages of History (years 1735-1940). Orenburg: Orenburg Publishing, pp: 320.
10. Scheerens, J. and R. Maslowski, 2008. Autonomie des etablissements scolaires: des moyens a la recherche d'un objectif? *Revue francaise de pedagogie*. Inst.ped.nat. Paris, 164: 27-36.