

UDC 371.3

DOI: 10.23951/2782-2575-2024-4-71-89

CONCEPTS OF RURALITY IN MODERN EDUCATION: THE FORMULATION OF A RESEARCH PROBLEM

***Gulnafist A. Okushova¹, Elena E. Sartakova²,
Nadezhda A. Efremova-Shershukova³***

¹ *National Research Tomsk State University, Tomsk, Russian Federation*

^{2,3} *Tomsk State Pedagogical University, Tomsk, Russian Federation*

¹ *okushova@mail.ru*

² *sartakova@tspu.edu.ru*

³ *shna16@tspu.edu.ru*

Abstract. As the modern village evolves, with shifts in lifestyle, identity, daily practices, and a growing diversification of the rural economy, it becomes necessary to broaden the traditional range of career options for rural students.

An analysis of rural school development programs shows that, in most cases, the strategic educational objectives are hardly linked to the economic and sociocultural characteristics of the areas in which they are located. A task allocation that correlates with rural identity and the local sociocultural code is extremely rare.

If we look at the strategies for the vocational self-determination of rural students, generally oriented towards the agricultural sector, and the mechanisms for their implementation, we see that they are stereotypical and have a certain formalism. Perhaps for this very reason, the potential of a rural school is not really considered by those responsible as a factor and resource for the socio-economic development of the territory.

In this context, the goal setting of rural schools concerning the self-determined life of students, which is important for rural identity and the specificities of the territories in which they are located, is becoming increasingly important. In this case, the rural school can be considered a key element of the infrastructure that allows the diffusion and rooting of the rural code in the life and professional paths of rural youth.

The study aims to pose a research problem on the necessity of a modern concept of rurality within the framework of rural school pedagogy as an independent branch of pedagogical science. Our scientific research will refer to our previously formed understanding of rural school as “a complexly organized educational system capable of self-organization and self-regulation under the conditions of a hybrid (real/virtual) ontology... Its basic characteristics are multifunctionality, openness, continuity, adaptability to the local culture of a given rural society, and convergence.”

The existing concepts of rurality, which are based on a sociological approach, are interdisciplinary. The basic ideas about the network society are reflected in the scientific approaches used for the theoretical identification of the

village and the conceptualization of rurality in the post-industrial era. In our view, the most important approaches are the sociocultural, spatial, and systemic approaches.

The sociocultural approach makes it possible to expand the boundaries of research by considering a rural school in a system of cultural coordinates (meanings, values, value orientations, principles) that ensures social connections and at the center of which is the active human being (*homo activus*), a multidimensional bio-socio-cultural being. Spatial and systemic approaches are needed in research as complementary approaches. The spatial approach aims to explain the village's situation in the context of globalization and urbanization of the modern world and the implementation of Russian state programs for the economic development of territories. From a theoretical point of view, one can rely on understanding the village as a totality of changing physical and social spaces. A systematic approach helps to maintain the integrity and structure of the study.

The peculiarities of the new rurality and its characteristics can be considered in developing rural-oriented strategies for the self-determined lives of students in rural schools. Education that incorporates the sociocultural code by strengthening rurality should aim to develop creativity, critical thinking, communication skills, and the ability to work together. This is fundamental for future professionals who can reshape the rural economy by considering market demands.

Keywords: *concept, rural-oriented strategies, self-determined life, students, rural schools*

For citation: Okushova G.A., Sartakova E.E., Efremova-Shershukova N.A. Concepts of Rurality in Modern Education: the Formulation of a Research Problem. *Education & Pedagogy Journal*. 2024;4(12):71-89. doi: 10.23951/2782-2575-2024-4-71-89

The approach to conceptualizing a rural school that emerged in Russian pedagogical science defines it as a key infrastructure element that ensures the growing local population's socialization, education, and sociocultural development. The theoretical aspects of these processes are discussed in the works of A. Andreiko, L. Bayborodova, M. Guryanova, V. Gusenko, T. Kreslavskaya, P. Pivnenko, N. Shobonov, A. Tsirulnikova and T. Shergina. Modern trends in the development of rural schools are identified and described in the works of M. Alexandrova, L. Bayborodova, L. Vokhminova, L. Kobrina, E. Kosinova, and R. Sheraizina. Most studies consider the development paths of rural schools in the context of the modernization of the state education system and the socio-economic and cultural changes in public life that influence it. Empirically, they are expressed in the school's mission, objectives, and educational content, which are recorded in the educational organization's documents.

One of the strategic documents is the Development Program for Rural Schools, which sets out the teaching staff's mission, vision, goals, and objectives for the coming years. In setting these goals, the developers are guided by the federal and regional framework, the state national project

“Education,” and its sub-projects, which aim to provide students with opportunities for self-realization and talent development. In essence, it is about fulfilling the mission of the state – the formation and development of human capital necessary for the economic development of the country in the conditions of technological change, urbanization, diversification of the rural economy, labor shortages, population mobility, and internal migration.

However, an analysis of school development programs for rural areas shows that, in most cases, the strategic educational objectives are insufficiently linked to the economic and sociocultural characteristics of the regions in which they are located. Examination of the empirical experiences of innovative rural school development presented in the self-audit reports on official websites also suggests that student goal-setting is more consistent with global/federal trends than with local trends. In fact, each rural school development program includes the following goals: Creation of conditions for children’s physical, intellectual, moral, and spiritual development, taking into account their interests; personal development based on moral values and Russia’s historical experience, to develop an active attitude to life and civic self-awareness and foster a love for school and homeland; development of tolerance and self-education skills among students; diverse development of creative abilities.

At the same time, however, no goals or tasks arise from the sociocultural and economic uniqueness of the region where the educational institution is located. Let us clarify this thesis.

First. When considering the sociocultural uniqueness of the territory and the local community, it is extremely rare to find a breakdown of the tasks related to rural identity and the local sociocultural code. As for the terms ‘identity’ and ‘sociocultural code’ (sociocode, cultural code), we note that they are widely discussed in interdisciplinary academic discourse, while the concept of ‘rural identity’ is only considered in the context of rural studies. Native researcher N. Plotichkina, for example, believes that ‘rural identity,’ which is essentially an identity with a place, can be defined as a set of emotions, feelings, and meanings associated with a place that is significant for an individual’s self-determination; it is connected with a sense of rootedness, attachment to the land as a place of residence or origin, the so-called ‘spatial belonging’ [1].

We have not encountered any pedagogical studies that deal with the description of the phenomenon of rural identity. For the sake of fairness,

we point out that there are many scientific works dealing with issues of patriotic education and that the problem of forming a love for the homeland, its history, and culture is recorded in almost all documents of rural schools.

Second. It is obvious that a rural school, when setting its goals, is guided in one way or another by the economic uniqueness of the territory in which it operates: its specialization, historically developed work traditions, skills, and connections. However, if we look at the strategies for the professional self-determination of students in rural areas, generally oriented towards the agricultural sector, and the mechanisms for their implementation, it becomes clear that they are stereotypical and have a certain formalism. Perhaps for this very reason, the potential of a rural school is not really considered by those responsible as a factor and resource for the socio-economic development of the territory. A. Tsurulnikov writes about this with bitterness: "...in the program for the comprehensive development of rural areas, the education sector is represented only by quantitative indicators for capital repairs and the construction of new rural kindergartens and schools. Education as a factor for the development of the areas does not appear in the discussion of government programs either..." [2].

We see the consideration of the economic uniqueness of the territory and the local community in the context of changes caused by both global trends and domestic trends, as set out in the documents: "Strategy for the Sustainable Development of Rural Areas of the Russian Federation for the Period up to 2030" [3], "Integrated Development of Rural Areas" [4], "Digital Agriculture" [5], "Federal Scientific and Technical Program for the Development of Agriculture for 2017–2030" [6].

The transformation of the modern village, including the population's lifestyle, identity, everyday practices, and the trend towards diversification of the rural economy, requires expanding the existing traditional list of career choices for rural school students.

In this context, the question of the purpose of rural schools in relation to the self-determination of students' lives, which is relevant to rural identity and the specificities of the areas in which they live, is becoming increasingly important. In this case, the rural school can be considered a key element of the infrastructure that allows not only the diffusion but also the rooting of the code of rurality in the life and professional paths of rural youth.

The system transformations that have taken place in Russia over the last decade have significantly changed the appearance of rural

settlements, their social structure, and the way of life of villagers, contributing to a change in the quantitative and qualitative characteristics of social processes in rural areas. In this regard, it is difficult to disagree with the position of Russian scientists R. Sheraizina, M. Aleksandrova, and Z. Eflova, who believe that “in a situation of uncertainty and instability, the mission of a rural school increasingly goes beyond the boundaries of its educational activities” [7]. In fact, a rural school, as a key element of infrastructure, cannot take into account this change, which determines a graduate’s image, competencies and qualities, values, and life orientations. However, the study of the main documents of rural schools allows us to say that the goals formulated within the framework of the personality-oriented paradigm are standardized and of the same nature – it is about the development of the student’s talents and abilities, his self-development and self-realization as a harmoniously developed personality.

On the one hand, this uniformity is due to the legal framework, the prevailing pedagogical paradigm, and a single educational space; on the other hand, it does not reflect the specificities of rural areas, about which much has been written in the scientific literature and the documents of educational institutions. Rural schools, which declare their uniqueness in strategic documents based on territorial and sociocultural specificities, traditionally focus on universal pedagogical objectives when defining their pedagogical goals without referring to the rural area. Unfortunately, they do not consider the data on rural areas from related sciences: sociology, social philosophy, cultural studies, demography, and economics.

The latter is confirmed by a review of the current state of research on rural schools by A. Gorbushov, who examined a large amount of scientific literature on rural schools, which can be found in the scientific electronic library ‘eLIBRARY.RU.’ He believes “the sciences that deal with rural schools allow us to expand our understanding of rural schools and their sociocultural space.” However, as his analysis of the sources shows, although rural school issues fall within the field of interest of pedagogy, history, sociology, and economics, “the main literature on rural school is “pedagogical research, and for the understanding of rural school as a sociocultural factor of the village and as a culture-forming institution of rural area, the research of other sciences is necessary to understand the phenomenon of rural school better...” [8].

There is a contradictory situation: a rural school builds human capital, which is important as a carrier of knowledge, competencies, and values

for rural areas and the economy, but does not take into account the self-realization of students and their self-determined lives in the context of the sociocultural code of rurality/rural areas, nor in the broad context of the economic, social and political changes in which it develops.

Overcoming the identified contradiction is possible by solving the problem of the lack of rural-oriented strategies for the self-determined life of students in rural schools, the design of which can act as a factor for the development of the diversification of the economy of rural settlements. In addition, the modernized equipment of rural education systems (quantoriums and laboratories), the opportunity to learn about scientific research and technologies that do not only concern the agricultural sector and the vocationally oriented dialog with economic actors/industry partners open up broad perspectives for the design of strategies for vocational self-determination of rural school students in line with the current agenda for sustainable rural development and diversification of the rural economy.

We point out that there is a rich layer of psychological and pedagogical research in Russian science on the life, personal, and professional self-determination of students, including the works of K. Abulkhanova-Slavskaya, E. Golovakh, N. Kasatkina, E. Klimov, L. Mitina, N. Pryazhnikova, G. Sillaste, T. Shalavina and S. Chistyakova. Our theoretical analysis shows that no comprehensive research in Russian school pedagogy deals with the identified problem.

The study described in this article aims to pose a research problem on the necessity of a modern concept of rurality within the framework of rural school pedagogy as an independent branch of pedagogical science. Our scientific investigation will focus on our previously formed understanding of a rural school as a “complexly organized educational system capable of self-organization and self-regulation under the conditions of a hybrid (real/virtual) ontology... The basic characteristics can be identified as multifunctionality, openness, continuity, adaptability to the local culture of a given rural society, and convergence” [9].

Let us now look at some aspects of the methodology used to study this topic. Since the problem of the lack of rural-oriented strategies for the self-determined life of students in rural schools, whose design can be a factor in the development of the diversification of the economy of rural settlements, is interdisciplinary in nature, to study it, we must go beyond the traditional pedagogical search. The topic under study can be approached from the perspective of rural studies, as there is already an established methodology “at the intersection of agricultural economics

and history, socio-economic geography, social and cultural anthropology, cultural studies, sociolinguistics, social psychology, sociology, and political science” [10]. Here, we should emphasize the value of the scientific fields of rural sociology (subdivisions: Sociology of Rural Population, Sociology of Local Rural Communities, Sociology of Rural Youth), Peasant Studies, and Agricultural Economics.

In view of this, at the general scientific level, we will use theories and original concepts of socio-humanitarian discourse that serve the theoretical identification of modern society. The development of a rural school must be considered in the context of processes that reflect changes in rural areas and the community living there. Let us highlight the most relevant ones for our research: “Global Village” (M. McLuhan), “The Third Wave” (E. Toffler), “Society as Communication” (N. Luhmann), “Risk Society” (U. Beck), “The Consumer Society” (J. Baudrillard), “Control Society” (S. Garfinkel), “The Network Society” (M. Castells), “The Digital Society” (D. Tapscott).

They can be classified for various reasons. In the context of the topic dealt with here, we can separately emphasize a number of original ideas, the so-called concepts of the information society. The post-industrial information society (E. Toffler) / information society (M. Castells) is the common unifying feature. Given the pronounced trends of digitalization and networking, it would be more accurate to use the terms “digital society” and “network society.” In our view, the most important of these can be sociocultural, spatial, and systemic approaches. The sociocultural approach allows to expand the boundaries of research by considering a rural school in a system of cultural coordinates (meanings, values, value orientations, principles) that provide social connections and at the center of which is *homo activus* as a multidimensional bio-socio-cultural being [11]. Of particular interest are the applied ideas of Russian sociologists and cultural scientists about the structure of values, the sociocultural and cultural code of T. Artanomova [12], T. Evdokimova [13], A. Zavyalova [14], V. Savitsky [15] and others.

The ideas of A. Tsirulnikov, one of the authoritative developers of the methodological foundations, content, tools, and mechanisms of the sociocultural approach to developing education in rural areas, are important to us [2].

Spatial and systemic approaches are needed in research as complementary approaches. First, the spatial approach aims to explain the situation of the village in terms of globalization and urbanization in the modern world and the implementation of Russian state programs for

the economic development of territories. From the theoretical point of view, one can rely on understanding the village as a totality of changing physical and social spaces (A. Lefebvre, P. Sorokin, P. Bourdieu). As for the applied aspect, useful ideas about rural areas, the diversification of the rural economy, and the human capital of rural areas can be found in the works of T. Nefedova [16–18], S. Podgorskaya, T. Miroshnichenko and G. Bakhmatova [19]. Secondly, our attention is focused on the educational space formed by the rural school. The operational and analytical possibilities of the concept of educational space are described in detail in the pedagogical literature.

A systematic approach helps to maintain the integrity and structure of the study. From the point of view of post-classical studies, rural schools as social objects “belong to the type of complex, self-developing systems, taking into account their historical development” [20]. They are characterized by closedness due to a binary code, non-linearity, autopoetics / self-organization.

At the specific scientific level, the methodological basis of the study is an extensive corpus of theories on the self-determination of students in their lives, including professional self-determination. It includes sociological, socio-philosophical, psychological, and pedagogical theories and concepts. In the academic literature, various aspects of youth self-determination have been studied, including the decisions that young people make regarding their life path, the relationship between professional self-determination and life perspective, as well as the specifics of its formation (E. Golovakha), life paths and orientations in the process of inclusion in public life (M. Ashmane, A. Matulenis, M. Titma), the relationship between subjective and objective factors of self-determination in life (A. Vishnyak, E. Donchenko, V. Pilipenko). Their works redefine the role of subjective factors in the self-determination process of young people, helping to clarify and specify concepts such as life perspective, value orientations, lifestyle, life purpose, and life plan. A shared characteristic of this approach is the focus on how personal factors influence the process of self-determination in both life and career choices.

The ideas of S. Rubinstein can have a special influence on the development of the concept of rurality: Each stage of a person's life plays an important role in the life path of an individual; by the main concept, he means the vital relations to the world, to other people, to oneself, which determine the dependence of the individual on life and, conversely, the dependence of life on the individual. The views of

K. Abulkhanova-Slavskaya, who identifies the main features of a life strategy; E. Avduevskaya and T. Arakantseva, who explain the process of self-determination as a process of gender and value-semantic self-determination, choice of profession and identity formation, seem interesting. The work of G. Sillaste, who conducted sociological studies on self-determination in the life of rural youth at the beginning of the 21st century, is of great importance to us.

In our view, the ideas presented can serve as a theoretical foundation for developing a pedagogical approach to creating rural-oriented strategies for student self-determination in schools, highlighting various mechanisms as key factors in fostering economic diversification in rural communities.

In connection with the last thesis, it is necessary to refer to works dealing with the technology of educational design itself. In general, we have relied on the interpretation of this concept presented in the dissertation by I. Malkova [21]. At present, methodological foundations of design in education have been developed (Yu. Gromyko, G. Ilyin, G. Petrova, V. Slobodchikov and P. Shchedrovitsky); ways of using project activities to organize the educational process (E. Polat and V. Guzeev), features of the use and organization of project activities in an innovative educational institution and educational practice (A. Zotkin, G. Prozumentova, T. Stetsyuk, and A. Tubelsky).

The following methods are used in our work: general theoretical methods: Analysis of scientific literature; system analysis; generalization, classification, comparison, systematization, design and modeling of pedagogical processes; analysis of primary data/documents; generalization of experiences in the functioning of rural schools; and empirical methods: participatory pedagogical observation; questionnaires, tests; interviews.

Let us now turn to the analysis of modern approaches and concepts of rurality. Developing rural-oriented strategies for students' self-determination in rural schools requires understanding what constitutes a village and a rural way of life under digitalization, urbanization, the convergence of technology and science, and social mobility. Of course, addressing this topic requires immersion in the broader context of social change.

The most popular scientific approach to the study of rural settlements and rural lifestyles is the sociological one. It has a long tradition in Russian socio-humanitarian discourse, for example, in the sociological essays of V. Selivanov, "The Year of the Russian Peasant" (1856–1857) and "The Day of the Landowner" (1858). The famous Russian

sociologist Zh. Toshchenko writes in a short historical excursus that “the first attempts at a sociological analysis of the social problems of the village are reflected in the ‘Letters from the Village’ by A. Engelhardt (12 letters, 1872–1887),” in which the conservative peasant thinking, the adherence of the peasants to the traditions and customs of their ancestors is described [22]. The author of the ‘Letters’ is A. Engelhardt, a Russian agrochemist, rural landowner, farmer, and former professor at the St. Petersburg Institute of Agriculture, who was banished to his estate Batishchevo, Dorogobuzh district, Smolensk province, for “political unreliability” [23].

Interest in rural areas during Soviet sociology studies can hardly be described as stable. According to researchers, one of the first works of Soviet sociology of rural areas is the unique work “Village (1917–1927)” by A. Bolshakova (1887–1938). Among the active scientists who developed this scientific direction in the 60s–70s of the 20th century were Yu. Harutyunyan, T. Zaslavskaya, and I. Ryvkina. Thus, one of the most detailed studies of the phenomenon of the rural way of life, including people’s value orientations, life attitudes and behavioral stereotypes, living conditions, social control, and partnership, interaction with nature, can be found in the work of I. Ryvkina [24]. Her research approaches in rural sociology were developed by Z. Kalugina, P. Simush, V. Tomilin, O. Fadeeva, and others.

The modern Russian village is heterogeneous, as it has territorial and other characteristics elaborated by various researchers. The understanding of the new rural realities that emerged in connection with the economic and political changes after the collapse of the Soviet Union is reflected in the works of sociologists of the late 20th and early 21st centuries: V. Agafonov and G. Butyrin, S. Barsukova, L. Bondarenko, T. Boyak, I. Valeeva, R. Gataullina, F. Ziyatdinova, A. Ogarkova, O. Nechiporenko, V. Patsiorkovsky, R. Salakhutdinova, G. Shirokalova, A. Khagurov, and others. T. Shanin, his followers, and participants V. Vinogradsky and A. Nikulin occupy a special place in the study of rural life. V. Staroverov, P. Velikiy, and others make original judgments based on empirical research.

Modern concepts of rurality based on a sociological approach are inherently interdisciplinary. Thus, if we extrapolate the concepts of real virtuality and network society of the influential modern sociologist M. Castells, we can say that the village today is immersed in the context of a hybrid ontology and, like the city, has a permanent connection to the global network – the Internet. The village, like the city, lives in a

timeless time and in the space of flows of the network society. (M. Castells). British sociologist N. Couldry analyzes the nature of ongoing technological changes and concludes that the convergence of place, media, digital technology, and communication leads to 'convergent spaces' and new values and enriches the meaning of community activities. This observation also applies to the rural community.

These basic ideas are reflected in the scientific approaches used for the theoretical identification of the village and the conceptualization of rurality in the post-industrial era. E. Melnikova points out that "the village itself has not only ceased to be a closed space of some specific rural practices, institutions, and identities, but its study has also gradually outgrown the boundaries of sub-disciplines labeled in the West with the formula Rural Studies or in Russia with the concept of 'peasant studies.' [25]. She writes that "one of the results of the search for approaches and theoretical frameworks to describe the modern situation has been the emergence of new terms: 'post-rural' (Cloke, Goodwin 1992; Murdoch, Pratt 1993), 'industrialized village' (Oswald, 2013), 'post-peasantry' (Buzalka, 2008), 'post-agrarian village' (Shchepanskaya, 2014), 'ruralization' (Pavlov, 2017; Bon, 2009; others), 'urbanization' (Nefedova, Pallot, 2006) and others. At the same time, the study of rurality itself came into the orbit of the study of other, more general phenomena, such as postmodern forms of nomadism, a dispersed lifestyle, migration due to lifestyle migration), tourism, and the heritage industry, global economies and new forms of sociality (Chio 2017; Vasantkumar 2017)" [25].

An interesting and productive approach to the conceptualization of rurality was undertaken by a scientific team of Russian anthropologists who focused on "the search and analysis of various hybrid forms of non-urban and non-rural life and the points of emergence of these social hybrids" [26]. The research results were presented at the regular "New Ruralism" seminar at the Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography. Peter the Great (Kunstkamera) RAS.

The "new ruralism" refers "not only to the ideology of rural romanticism and closeness to nature, which has become a well-sold brand, but also to a new model of rural life and a new rural identity" [25]. It accumulates values that sometimes contradict each other: Autonomy and sociality, naturalness and technology, national patriotism and multiculturalism, love of antiquity, and passion for the latest developments.

The transformation processes' uncertainty, uncontrollability, and incompleteness can explain the pluralism of these values. The researchers conclude that in the context of the 'new rurality,' the concept of 'work' loses its link with the idea of collective production and becomes synonymous with personal effort and that the rural population (locals and visitors) is willing to go beyond the limited space and participate in a more global agenda by declaring themselves and their uniqueness. And not in agriculture but in rural/ethnographic/agrarian tourism, museum practices [27], and folk crafts.

The new rurality can be viewed from the perspective of post-productivism, which European sociologists developed in the 1990s. It is about the transition from productivism to post-productivism, in which the production of rural goods, e.g., agricultural products, gives way to cultural consumption and leisure. According to the observations of Finnish sociologists, "the mobile use of natural resources and the growing importance of leisure activities in rural areas have brought new types of activities and new people to these areas" [28]. Thus, the natural and cultural heritage of the village in contemporary Russia functions as a resource for sociocultural shaping, with the impression economy and tourism seen as the result of diversification.

I would particularly like to emphasize the following thoughts by O. Brednikova on the new rurality: "In connection with the reshaping of the life scenarios of rural dwellers, the boundaries of their living space are expanding and going beyond the boundaries of the locality and the "small rural societies." And perhaps the most significant change is the destruction of the mechanism of continuity and social reproduction in the village" [29]. This concerns the prevailing stereotypical ideas about the agricultural orientation of rural settlements and the predetermined work activities of children learning in rural schools.

The 'new rurality' is thus reflected in all social institutions operating in rural areas. Researchers note an increasing individualism, which could be due to the development of the network society of the information age (M Castells). It manifests itself in the transition from collective production to individual entrepreneurship in economic relations. At the same time, the village ceases to be a place where only agricultural products are produced, and a decline in the role of agriculture can be observed – the "post-productive turn of the rural economy." In a sense, the village is becoming multi-profiled/multi-structured (a new paradigm of rural development based on the doctrine of the multi-structural economy is emerging).

The new rurality is accompanied by the digitalization of agriculture, in which technologies are significantly changing the organizational and digital processes of economic relations between economic entities in the field of intersectoral interaction and economic value creation. According to the Decree of the President of the Russian Federation of July 21, 2020, No 474, digital transformation is one of the national development goals of the Russian Federation. Thus, the national project ‘Digital Economy’ includes the implementation of the following initiatives: “Regulation of the digital environment,” “Information infrastructure,” “Personnel for the digital economy,” “Information security,” “Digital technologies,” “Digital public administration,” “Artificial intelligence.”

The departmental project “Digital Agriculture” of the Russian Ministry of Agriculture aims to create a unified national digital platform in the agro-industrial complex, leading to the full digitalization of agriculture. It includes four main activities: the creation and implementation of a national platform for the digital public administration of agriculture “Digital Agriculture”; the “Agrosolutions” module of the national platform for the digital public administration of agriculture; the training and retraining of personnel for the digital economy “Land of Knowledge”; the implementation of digital technologies: digital platforms, technologies for collecting, processing and analyzing big data, artificial intelligence technology, cloud services, the Internet of Things, radio frequency identification technology (RFID), Digital Twin, industrial robots / automated lines, additive technologies.

In the context of the new rurality, the sphere of cultural production and emotional consumption emerges in the village alongside agriculture, in which physical labor is supplemented by artificial intelligence: Tourism, creative industries, and local history. Researcher M. Mukhanova writes that “the trends observed in rural settlements are expanding the institutional capabilities of villagers, which indicates a transition to the next stage of the market economy based on the intellectualization of labor, as well as new requirements for the labor practice of workers, which will entail changes in the social and structural processes of the Russian village.”

The glocalization of the village, the digitalization, and the internalization of rural life are changing villagers’ everyday practices and life strategies. It is obvious that the ‘new rurality’ should be reflected in the functioning of a rural school: in the educational content, in the principles of organizing the educational process in a rural school, in pedagogical work, in career guidance, in the formation of life

strategies of rural students. Most importantly, human capital development in rural areas is becoming increasingly vital as the country advances technologically. Large-scale projects led by major companies focus on enhancing crop selection, improving livestock genetics, and implementing digital technologies – each critical in ensuring the nation's food security and technological sovereignty.

The particularities of the new rurality and its characteristics can be considered in developing rural-oriented strategies for a self-determined life for students in rural schools. An education that incorporates the sociocultural code underlying 'ruralism' should aim to develop creativity, critical thinking, communication skills, and the ability to work together. This is a fundamental requirement for future professionals who can transform the rural economy in response to market needs. How can an environment conducive to developing and promoting interest in the rural economy be created, and what tools can be used?

Is it a systematic approach/creation of ecosystems, involvement of employers, and communication with partners? What technological innovations can transform the learning process, and how can we ensure access to these technologies for a wide range of learners? What are the effective formats of collaboration between rural schools and representatives of the goods and services market to ensure the relevance of educational programs, their importance to rural identity, and the specificities of the areas in which they are located? What tools can be developed to ensure that the self-determined life of students in rural schools acts as a factor in the development of the diversification of the economy in rural settlements?

From our point of view, the development of the modern concept of rurality in science as a whole and in the context of rural school pedagogy, in particular, will help to concretize not only the modern characteristics of rural schools but also rural-oriented strategies for a self-determined life of students in this group of educational institutions.

References

1. Plotichkina N.V. Sel'skaya identichnost' kak "identichnost' s mestom" [Rural identity as "identity with place"]. *Sborniki konferentsiy NIC Sotsiosfera – Conference proceedings of the Scientific Research Center Sociosphere*. 2019;34:34-38 (in Russian).
2. Tsurul'nikov A.M. Sotsiokul'turnyy podkhod k razvitiyu obrazovaniya v sel'skikh territoriyakh [Sociocultural approach to the development of education in rural areas]. *Pedagogika sel'skoy shkoly – Pedagogy of rural school*. 2022;2(12):5-32 (in Russian).
3. *Rasporyazhenie Pravitel'stva Rossii ot 02 fevralya 2015 g.* [Order of the Government of Russia dated February 2, 2015] (in Russian). URL: <https://www.garant.ru/products/ipo/prime/doc/70761426/#101>

4. *Ofitsial'nyy sayt gosudarstvennoy programmy "Kompleksnoe razvitie sel'skikh territoriy"* [Official website of the state program "Integrated development of rural areas"] (in Russian). URL: https://kpct.pф/#fiz_licam
5. *Vedomstvenniy proekt "Tsifrovoye sel'skoye hozyaystvo"* [Departmental project "Digital agriculture"]. Moscow, FGBNU "Rosinformagrotekh" Publ., 2019:48 p. (in Russian).
6. *Postanovlenie Pravitel'stva Rossiyskoy Federatsii ot 25 avgusta 2017 g. No. 996 "Ob utverzhdenii Federal'noy nauchno-tekhnicheskoy programmy razvitiya sel'skogo hozyaystva na 2017–2030 gody"* [On approval of the Federal Scientific and Technical Program for the Development of Agriculture for 2017–2030] (in Russian). URL: <https://mcx.gov.ru/upload/iblock/1e1/qbvh1oqz9rptbwjxz3qodtfdgn97a14.pdf>.
7. Sherayzina R.M., Aleksandrova M.V., Eflova Z.B. Sel'skaya shkola i sel'skiy uchitel': produktivnye rossiyskie i zarubezhnye praktiki [Rural school and rural teacher: productive Russian and foreign practices]. *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta – Tomsk State University Journal*. 2021;466;190–201 (in Russian).
8. Gorbushov A.A. Issledovaniya sel'skoy shkoly Rossii v NEB "eLIBRARY.RU" i predstavlenie sotsiokul'turnogo prostranstva sel'skoy shkoly v virtual'noy srede, v tom chisle v sotsial'nykh setyakh [Research of rural schools in Russia in the NEL "eLIBRARY.RU" and presentation of the sociocultural space of rural schools in a virtual environment, including social networks]. *Problemy sovremennogo obrazovaniya – Problems of modern education*. 2022;5:116–123 (in Russian).
9. Sartakova E.E., Okushova G.A., Eretnova E.P. Sel'skaya shkola v usloviyakh sociokul'turnoy modernizatsii obrazovaniya: postneklassicheskie osnovaniya dlya kontseptualizatsii [Rural school in the context of sociocultural modernization of education: post-non-classical grounds for conceptualization]. *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta – Tomsk State University Journal*. 2022;481:206–214 (in Russian).
10. Semenenko I.S. Sel'skoye mestnoye soobshchestvo v fokuse politiki razvitiya: nauchnyy diskurs i evropeyskie politicheskie realii [Rural Local Community in Focus of Development Policy: Scientific Discourse and European Political Realities]. *Yuzhno-rossiyskiy zhurnal social'nykh nauk – South-Russian Journal of Social Sciences*. 2019;3:6–27 (in Russian).
11. Lapin N.I. *Puti Rossii: sotsiokul'turnye transformatsii* [Russia's Paths: Sociocultural Transformations]. Moscow, Institut filosofii RAN Publ., 2000, 194 p. (in Russian).
12. Artamonova T.A. Sotsiokul'turnyy potentsial sel'skogo obraza zhizni s pozitsii novykh tsivilizatsionnykh otnosheniy: vzglyad iz Sibiri [Sociocultural potential of rural lifestyle from the standpoint of new civilizational relations: a view from Siberia]. *Idei i idealy – Ideas and ideals*. 2022;3-2:468–485 (in Russian).
13. Evdokimova T.G. Teoretiko-metodologicheskie osnovaniya izucheniya tsennostnykh orientatsiy [Theoretical and methodological foundations for studying value orientations]. *Vestnik RGGU. Seriya "Filosofiya. Sociologiya. Iskusstvovedenie" – Bulletin of the Russian State University for the Humanities. Series "Philosophy. Sociology. Art Criticism"* 2018;1(11):65–75 (in Russian).
14. Zav'yalova A.N. Sotsiokul'turniy kod kak sistemoobrazuyushchiy faktor strukturirovaniya i funktsionirovaniya goroda [Sociocultural code as a system-forming factor in the structuring and functioning of the city]. *Mezhdunarodnyy nauchno-issledovatel'skiy zhurnal – International research journal*. 2014;9(28):139–140 (in Russian).
15. Savitskiy V.M. Kul'turnye kody: sushchnost', sostav i funktsionirovaniye v protsesse obshcheniya [Cultural codes: essence, composition and functioning in the process of communication]. *Diskurs professional'noy kommunikatsii – Discourse of professional communication*. 2019;4(1):68–77 (in Russian).

16. Nefedova T.G., Pokrovskiy N.E., Treyvish A.I. Urbanizatsiya, dezurbanizatsiya i sel'sko-gorodskie soobshchestva v usloviyakh rosta gorizontallyy mobil'nosti naseleniya [Urbanization, deurbanization and rural-urban communities in the context of increasing horizontal population mobility]. *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya – Sociological research*. 2015;12:60-69 (in Russian).
17. Nefedova T.G., Mkrtchyan N.V. Migratsiya sel'skogo naseleniya i dinamika sel'skokhozyaystvennoy zanyatosti v regionakh Rossii [Migration of rural population and dynamics of agricultural employment in the regions of Russia]. *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta – Bulletin of Moscow University*. 2017;5(5):58-67 (in Russian).
18. Nefedova T.G. Dvadsat' pyat' let postsovetскому sel'skomu khozyaystvu Rossii: geograficheskie tendentsii i protivorechiya [Twenty-five years of post-Soviet agriculture in Russia: geographic trends and contradictions]. *Izvestiya Rossiyskoy akademii nauk – News of the Russian Academy of Sciences*. 2017;5:8-19 (in Russian).
19. Podgorskaya S.V., Mirosnichenko T.A., Bakhmatova G.A. *Sovremennye aspekty diversifikatsii sel'skoy ekonomiki v usloviyakh tsivilizatsionnykh transformatsiy* [Modern aspects of diversification of rural economy in the context of civilizational transformations]. Rostov on Don, 2021:112 p. (in Russian).
20. Stepin V.S. Klassika, neklassika, postneklassika: kriterii razlicheniya [Classics, non-classics, post-non-classics: criteria for distinction]. In: Stepin V.S. (ed.) *Postneklassika: filosofiya, nauka, kul'tura* [Post-non-classical: philosophy, science, culture.]. Saint Petersburg, Mir Publ., 2009:249-295 (in Russian).
21. Malkova I.Yu. *Kontseptsiya i praktika organizatsii obrazovatel'nogo proektirovaniya v innovatsionnoy shkole* [The concept and practice of organizing educational design in an innovative school]. Avtoreferat dissertatsii na soiskanie uchenoy stepeni doktora pedagogicheskikh nauk [Abstract of a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences]. Tomsk, 2008:42 p. (in Russian).
22. Toshchenko Zh.T. Smysly zhiznennogo mira sel'skikh zhiteley [Meanings of the life world of rural residents]. In: Toshchenko Zh.T. (ed.) *Smysly sel'skoy zhizni (Opyt sociologicheskogo analiza)* [Meanings of rural life (Experience of sociological analysis)]. Moscow, Centr social'nogo prognozirovaniya i marketinga Publ., 2016:368 p. (in Russian).
23. Pichuzhkin N.A. "Pis'ma" Aleksandra Engel'gardta (k 150-letiyu "12 pisem iz derevni") ["Letters" by Alexander Engelhardt (on the 150th anniversary of "12 Letters from the Village")]. *Nauka bez granits – Science without borders*. 2021;1(53):14-19 (in Russian).
24. Ryvkina R.V. *Obraz zhizni sel'skogo naseleniya: metodologiya, metodika i rezul'taty izucheniya sotsial'no-ekonomicheskikh aspektov zhiznedeyatel'nosti na primere Zapadnoy Sibiri* [Lifestyle of the rural population: methodology, methods and results of studying the socio-economic aspects of life using the example of Western Siberia]. Novosibirsk, Nauka Publ., 1979:352 p. (in Russian).
25. Mel'nikova E.A. Derevnnya v gorodskikh proektsiyakh sovremennykh rossiyan [The village in the urban projections of modern Russians]. *Etnograficheskoe obozrenie – Ethnographic Review*. 2020;6:5-11 (in Russian).
26. Novaya "sel'skost'" v sovremennoy Rossii. *Ofitsial'niy sayt nauchnogo issledovaniya antropologov* [New "rurality" in modern Russia] (in Russian). URL: <http://project1092903.tilda.ws/#rec85745372>
27. Kupriyanov P.S., Savina N.A. Sovremenniy muzey russkoy derevni: proizvodstvo sel'skosti byvshimi gorozhanami [Contemporary Museum of the Russian Village: Production of Rurality by Former City-Dwellers]. *Etnograficheskoe obozrenie – Ethnographic Review*. 2020;6:12-30 (in Russian).

28. Rannikko P., Varis E., Piipponen M. Koyvusel'ga. Sotsial'naya transformatsiya lesozagotovitel'nogo poselka v rossiyskoj Karelii [Social Transformation of a Logging Village in Russian Karelia]. *Studia Humanitatis Borealis*. 2016;2:32-47(in Russian).
29. Brednikova O. Derevnja umerla? Da zdravstvuet derevnja! [Is the village dead? Long live the village!]. In: Brednikova O., Bogdanovich E. (eds) *Vdali ot gorodov. Zhizn' postsovetskoy derevni* [Far from the cities. Life in a post-Soviet village]. Saint Petersburg: Aleteiya Publ., 2013. 55 p. (in Russian).

Information about the authors:

Gulnafist A. Okushova, Candidate of Philosophy, Associate Professor, Tomsk State University (pr. Lenina, 36, Tomsk, Russian Federation, 634050).
E-mail: okushova@mail.ru

Elena E. Sartakova, Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor, Professor, Tomsk State Pedagogical University (ul. Kievskaya, 60, Tomsk, Russian Federation, 634061).
E-mail: sartakova@tspu.edu.ru.

Nadezhda A. Efremova-Shershukova, Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor, Tomsk State Pedagogical University (ul. Kievskaya, 60, Tomsk, Russian Federation, 634061).
E-mail: shna16@tspu.edu.ru

КОНЦЕПЦИИ РУРАЛЬНОСТИ (СЕЛЬСКОСТИ) В СОВРЕМЕННОМ ОБРАЗОВАНИИ: ПОСТАНОВКА ИССЛЕДОВАТЕЛЬСКОЙ ПРОБЛЕМЫ

Гульнафист Алтаевна Окушова¹,

Елена Евгеньевна Сартакова²,

Надежда Александровна Ефремова-Шершукова³

¹ *Национальный исследовательский Томский государственный университет, Томск, Россия*

^{2, 3} *Томский государственный педагогический университет, Томск, Россия*

¹ *okushova@mail.ru*

² *sartakova@tspu.edu.ru*

³ *shna16@tspu.edu.ru*

Аннотация. Трансформация современного села: образа жизни населения, его идентичности, повседневных практик, а также тенденция диверсификации сельской экономики требуют расширения сложившегося традиционного перечня профессионального выбора сельских школьников.

Анализ программ развития сельских школ показывает, что в большинстве случаев стратегические образовательные цели и задачи слабо увязываются с экономической и социокультурной спецификой территорий, на которых они расположены. Крайне редко встречается декомпозиция задач, коррелирующих с сельской / руральной идентичностью и локальным социокультурным кодом.

Рассмотрение стратегий профессионального самоопределения сельских школьников, в обобщённом виде направленных на сельскохозяйственный сектор, а также механизмы их реализации свидетельствует об их стереотипности и определённом формализме. Возможно, что именно поэтому потенциал сельской школы фактически не рассматривается управленцами как фактор и ресурс развития социально-экономического развития территории.

В связи с этим актуализируется вопрос целеполагания сельских школ относительно жизненного самоопределения обучающихся, релевантного сельской идентичности и специфике территорий присутствия. Именно в этом случае сельская школа может рассматриваться как ключевой элемент инфраструктуры, не просто транслирующий, но и укореняющий код сельскости / руральности в жизненных и профессиональных траекториях сельской молодёжи.

Цель исследования заключается в постановке исследовательской проблемы о необходимости современной концепции руральности (сельскости) в рамках педагогики сельской школы как самостоятельной отрасли педагогической науки. В научном поиске мы будем опираться на ранее сформированное нами понимание сельской школы как «сложноорганизованной образовательной системы, способной к самоорганизации и саморегуляции в условиях «гибридной» (реальной/виртуальной) онтологии... В качестве ее базовых характеристик

можно выделить: полифункциональность, открытость, преемственность и адаптивность к локальной культуре конкретного сельского социума, конвергентность».

Имеющиеся концепции руральности (сельскости), опираясь на социологический подход, имеют междисциплинарный характер. Идеи фундаментального уровня о сетевом обществе отразились на научных подходах, используемых для теоретической идентификации села и концептуализации руральности в условиях постиндустриальной эпохи. В качестве основных с нашей точки зрения, могут выступать социокультурный, пространственный и системный подходы.

Социокультурный подход позволяет расширить исследовательские границы, рассматривая сельскую школу в системе культурных координат (смыслов, ценностей, ценностных ориентаций, принципов), обеспечивающих социальные связи, в центре которых находится человек активный (*homo activus*) – многомерное био-социо-культурное существо. Пространственный и системный подходы необходимы в исследовании в качестве комплементарных. Пространственный подход направлен на экспликацию положения села в условиях глобализации и урбанизации современного мира, реализации российских государственных программ экономического развития территорий. В теоретическом аспекте можно опираться на понимание села как совокупности трансформирующихся пространств, как физических, так и социальных. Системный подход позволяет удерживать целостность и структурированность исследования.

Специфика новой сельскости, её характеристики могут быть учтены при проектировании рурально-ориентированных стратегий жизненного самоопределения обучающихся сельских школ. Образование, в котором проявляется социокультурный код, укореняя «сельскость», должно быть направлено на развитие креативности, критического мышления, коммуникативных навыков и способности к сотрудничеству. Это принципиально важно для будущих специалистов, способных преобразовывать сельскую экономику с учетом требований рынка.

Ключевые слова: концепция, рурально-ориентированные стратегии, жизненное самоопределение, обучающиеся, сельские школы

Для цитирования: Okushova G.A., Sartakova E.E., Efremova-Shershukova N.A. Concepts of Rurality in Modern Education: the Formulation of a Research Problem // *Education & Pedagogy Journal*. 2024. Issue 4 (12). P. 71–89. doi: 10.23951/2782-2575-2024-4-71-89

Информация об авторах:

Окушова Гульнафист Алтаевна, кандидат философских наук, доцент, Томский государственный университет (пр. Ленина, 36, Томск, Россия, 634050).
E-mail: okushova@mail.ru

Сартакова Елена Евгеньевна, доктор педагогических наук, доцент, профессор, Томский государственный педагогический университет (ул. Киевская, 60, Томск, Россия, 634061).
E-mail: sartakova@tspu.edu.ru.

Ефремова-Шершукова Надежда Александровна, кандидат исторических наук, доцент, Томский государственный педагогический университет (ул. Киевская, 60, Томск, Россия, 634061).
E-mail: shnal6@tspu.edu.ru

Submitted October 10, 2024