

CHANGEABILITY AND DIVERSITY OF EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT OF LATVIAN RURAL SCHOOLS IN THE TWENTY FIRST CENTURY

Irēna Katane Dr.paed.

Institute of Education and Home Economics, Latvia University of Agriculture, Latvia

irena.katane@inbox.lv

Abstract: The Latvian rural school as educational environment works in the global (world scale) educational environment, where we can observe self-developing process. Conditions' diversity gives leave turn to concrete case studies, where rural school is researched as local educational environment in the evolutionary, structural and functional aspects in the context of contradictions, new tendencies, yet unsolved problems and ongoing processes which take place in the global outside educational environment. The investigation of the rural school as local educational environment is important and topical in the aspect of continuous (unceasing) educational environment where must be succession, systemic approach, fairly equivalent possibilities in the aspect of education accessibility and extraction, offering and quality of education.

The results of research indicate that, in order to provide for sustainable development of schools themselves, rural communities and areas in general, rural schools expand their target audience, formal and informal education and training offers, expand the range of their functions by taking additional functions, thus becoming lifelong learning environment providers for the whole rural community. The results of research show changes in and diversity of educational environment of rural schools, and it lets at least partially solve the issue of balanced development in the urban– rural dimension in Latvia. There is the great diversity of rural schools' educational environment.

Keywords: changeability, diversity, educational environment, rural schools, sustainable development.

Introduction

The Latvian rural school as educational environment works in the global (world scale) educational environment, where we can observe self-developing process. Conditions' diversity gives leave turn to concrete case studies, where rural school is researched as local educational environment in the evolutionary, structural and functional aspects in the context of contradictions, new tendencies, yet unsolved problems and ongoing processes which take place in the global outside educational environment. Since the end of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century Latvian rural schools function under the conditions of constantly changing environment, where the process of self-development is observed. Nowadays, due to the influence of economical, demographical and social crises the problem of the sustainability of a rural school as the educational environment has become urgent.

The results of our theoretical research testify that nowadays research of rural schools is a topical problem of science in many countries, including Australia, Belarus Canada, Finland, Ireland, Russia, Sweden, UK, USA etc. At the international symposium concerning the research on the rural educational environment in Europe there was particularly emphasized that there is a lack of studies on the problems of rural schools. (Hargreaves, 1996; Katane, 2005b; Katane, Laizane, 2012a).

The research on the educational environment of rural schools has become topical also in Latvia due to the fact that the sustainability of the educational environment of rural schools and rural communities is exposed to danger under the conditions of demographic and economic crisis.

The research on the educational environment of rural schools in Latvia is mostly performed at the Institute of Education and Home Economics of the Latvia University of Agriculture (Katane, 2005a; Katane, 2005b; Katane, 2006a; Katane, 2006b; Katane, 2006c; Katane, Laizane, 2009; Katane, Laizane, 2012a; Katane, Laizane, 2012b; Laizane, 2012).

The fact that there is an explicit tendency for the decrease of the number of small rural schools and that it is important to preserve especially rural schools and study the fluctuation of their educational

environment not only in Latvia, but also in other countries is proved by the research performed by several authors (Flora, Spears, Swanson, 2007; Theobald, Nachtigal, 1995; Unruh, Lundt, 1999).

The sustainable development of the society to a great extent is related to the rural community and the sustainable development of its cultural environment. The future existence of the Latvian nation and the awareness of the Latvian identity are impossible without the preservation of rural cultural environment and further development. It is especially important at the present moment, when assessing the consequences of the demographic and economic crisis we look at the future of our nation. The sustainability of rural cultural environment can be ensured, first of all, maintaining and further developing educational environment in rural areas. At present, approximately 30% of Latvia population live in rural areas. Despite the fact that it is almost one third of the population, the historically inherited disbalance and disharmony between the opportunity for education in the two dimensions is persistent in Latvia: 1) the capital and regions; 2) cities and rural areas. The problem of different education offered in the dimension *Riga-regions* is being solved on the level of higher education institutions- along with Riga higher education institutions successfully operate regional higher education institutions that try to maintain equilibrium in the educational environment providing their own educational offer. Unfortunately the problem of educational offer in the *urban and rural* dimension is still current.

To ensure the viability of Latvian rural schools in the contemporary conditions of crises, the changes in the rural educational environment take place not only „top down” but also „bottom up”. Schools become self-organizing, self-assessing and self-developing systems of educational environment, that change with an aim to ensure sustainable development for themselves and the whole rural community, and its cultural environment in future.

The *aim* of this article is to analyse and evaluate the results of theoretical and empirical studies within the context of sustainable development of rural schools and rural communities in Latvia.

Methodology

The synergistic and ecological paradigm evolved in the research of educational environment. We support the finding of M.Fullan (Fullan, 1993) that *the basis for successful transformation of education is not only the ability to implement the latest approaches, but rather an ability to overcome rises and falls created by planned and unplanned changes, at the same time growing themselves and developing.*

In our investigation we studied and described a rural school as an *environmental system of education*, which is a *living system*, whole organism that develops in its ecosystem, functions in the sphere of education based on the maintenance of self-regulation, self-development and balance with the regularities of the changing environment. The theoretic basis of our research were the following basic statements:

- any social system, including the school, is a *natural* organization that functions almost like a biological organism, a living being that is able to self-develop and self-regulate in the influence of internal and external environment factors and whose interrelation with the outer environment is subject to definite correlations (Parsons, 1951; Merton, 1948; Fend, 1991; Miller, 1978; Ray, 1988);
- the *homeostasis (self-regulation) principle* of social systems that helps to *maintain the balance with the outer environment* as well as the *morphogenetic regularities and reorientation regularities* of the development of a social system as a living organism on the basis of the feedback with the outer environment; *the social systems are autopoietic, that is, they continuously renew themselves and are self-referential, that is, they can refer to themselves; the systems have the ability to perceive the difference between the system (itself) and the environment (something else) and the ability to draw consequences* (Buckly, 1967; Gudjons, 1998);
- not every social system is an organization, in turn, an organization is always a system, nevertheless, it differs from a usual system having specific indicators: target oriented, coordinated, self-organizing and self-regulating activities (Пригожин, 1983);

- an *open system, dissipative structure tends to maintain balance with the outer environment*; a viable system is only a system that is open for new information; able to study the processes going on in the surrounding environment, including transformational processes; can learn from the experience of others; ready, on the basis of obtained new information and new experience, to draw conclusions necessary for ensuring its *viability* and *sustainability*, and, on the basis of these conclusions, change continuously (Breidlid, 2004; Haken, Portugali, 1996; Haken, Portugali, 2005; Knyazeva, Kurdyumov, 2001; Prigogine, Nicolis, 1977; Prigogine, Stengers, 1983).

The observations and our research show that since the end of the twentieth century the process of transformation takes place in the educational environment of rural schools in Latvia. A rural school as an educational environment becomes more open for the whole local society, namely, rural community. In order to substantiate these processes, we believe it is essential to provide *the substantiation of the conception of community's education, emphasising the significance of the school for the rural community's life and facilitation of its development*. The *concept of community school* became a guarantee for the viability and sustainability of rural schools:

- a rural school functions as the centre of the community and serves as a provider of different services, the more effective means it becomes for the maintenance of the community; schools as the centres of community reach their status in two ways, firstly, integrating even more in the community, secondly, widening the educational environment, in order to use all the resources of the community more effectively (Bingler, Quinn, Sullivan, 2003; Miller, 1993; Miller, 1995);
- from the economic perspective a rural school is the main employer in rural areas, where both teaching and technical staff are employed; effective relationships between the school and the community help people to pool the local resources, which is necessary and important for the improvement of school's environment (Agbo, 2007; Harmon, Schafft, 2009; Hobbs, 1988);
- the well-functioning rural schools increase the social integration of the community within the environment, securing the identity of local people and the importance of realizing a mutual task; *community rural school* operates as a centre for different community events with an aim to involve people in various civic and community matters; they also provide premises that facilitate the getting together of community inhabitants in order to participate in physical activities, stage theatre plays, organize the meetings of the board of the school; the directors of rural schools must have a whole vision about the creation of mutually beneficial process of cooperation between the school and the community; especially rural schools serve as a symbol of community's autonomy, viability and identity (Budge, 2006; Harmon, Schafft, 2009; Minzey, 1976).

Since 2000 the theoretical and empirical research of the rural educational environment has been performed in the Institute of Education and Home Economics at Latvia University of Agriculture. Three stages of the research can be defined: 1) work on the basis of ecological approach in the research of education, the creation of theoretic basis for the research of rural schools' educational environment, empirical research on the changeability of the rural schools' environment (2000-2005) (Katane, 2005a; 2005b; 2006a; 2006b; 2006c); 2) the completion of methodological basis for the research (2005-2009) (Katane, 2007; Katane, 2009a; Katane, 2009b); 3) empirical research on the changeability of the rural schools' educational environment (2008-2012), which was based on the results of the research performed in the previous stages and served as a continuation for the commenced research (Katane, Laizāne, 2009; Katane, Laizāne, 2012a; Katane, Laizāne, 2012b; Laizāne, 2012).

The basis for the first empirical research (the first stage of the research): 277 rural schools, including 33 rural primary schools which participated in the internal investigation of the educational environment. The basis for the second empirical research (the third stage of the research): 60 rural schools, including 31 rural primary and secondary school which participated in the internal investigation of the educational environment. Schools of both empirical research bases represented all regions of Latvia.

During the first research of the rural schools' educational environment a method of assessment was developed, important factor being a specifically developed system of assessment indicators (altogether 128 indicators), which represented several levels of schools' educational environment and environmental contexts. In the second research the system of indicators for the assessment of schools' educational environment was modified (shortened), through analysis and evaluation retaining indicators that were the most essential and conforming to the contemporary conditions for the assessment of schools' educational environment (altogether 50 indicators).

During both empirical research stages the changes in the schools' educational environment were investigated during the respective periods (2000-2005; 2008-2012).

Results and discussion

The results of the research lets pinpoint several tendencies in the development of rural schools' educational environment, which were equally conspicuous in the environment of schools-research basis for the first research, as well as in the environment of the schools- research basis for the second research. Here are the most important of them.

- In order to ensure their own and rural community's sustainability, the rural schools broaden their target audience, including in its environment also pre-school children and adults, thus ensuring an opportunity for lifelong education in rural areas.
- Rural schools expand the range of their offer of non-formal education, including the offer of professional development, interest-related education, offer of professional profile programmes etc., using the technical and material resources of the school.
- Rural schools expand the range of their functions, assuming additional functions, including functions that are not typical to a school, for example, the elimination of social negations and their prevention, as well as the functions of social rehabilitation in the rural community, taking care for children in the day centres of these schools.
- With the growing of educational offer, increase of the target audience and the functions, the process of self-complicating in rural schools' educational environment has been observed. Different types of subdivisions of the environment are created (educational centres for adults, associations, school development funds, bodies of pre-school education within the framework of the school, centres for the rural tourism etc.)
- Rural schools act not only as educational but also the cultural centres in rural communities.
- Schools become the informative centres of the whole rural community, developing and offering to the whole community the resources of their library and computer classes.

In order to evaluate the changeability of the rural schools' educational environment, both in the first (2000-2005), and the second (2008-2012) empirical research, on the basis of all obtained data, all indicators of the educational environment in schools were divided into two big groups: 1) indicators (features) that indicate the constantness or unchangeability of rural schools' educational environment in 2) indicators (features) that indicate the changeability of rural schools' educational environment. The data were processed checking the correspondence of feature selections applying the test for the determination of Chi – Square (χ^2) criterion in SPSS programme.

The question of the research was as follows: is whether the number of constant features equal to the number of changeable features of the educational environment in rural schools?

Table 1

Distribution of qualities according to the qualities group (2000 – 2005; 2008 – 2012)

Groups of qualities	2000 – 2005 (N = 128)			2008 – 2012 (N = 50)		
	The Observed qualities N	Indicative allocation N	Difference	The Observed qualities N	Indicative allocation N	Difference
Constant qualities	67	64	3,0	24	25	1.0
Changeable qualities	61	64	-3,0	26	25	-1,0

The data were processed by means of SPSS software. We obtained the following results (Table 1, Table 2).

Table 2

Obtained results (2000 -2005; 2008 – 2012)

N	Indicators	The Obtained Values	
		2000 - 2005	2008 - 2012
1.	Chi – Square (χ^2)	0,281	0,080
2.	df	1	1
3.	Asymp.Sig.	0,586	0,777

In the first empirical research it could be concluded that with the materiality level $\alpha=0,05$ and the degree of freedom $df=1$ the value of the Chi – Square criterion is: $\chi^2=0,281 < \chi^2_{0,05;1}=3,84$; but $p=0,586 > \alpha=0,05$.

However, the results of the second empirical research enabled us to conclude that with materiality level $\alpha=0,05$ and the degree of freedom $df=1$ the value of the Chi – Square criterion is: $\chi^2=0,08 < \chi^2_{0,05;1}=3,84$; but $p=0,777 > \alpha=0,05$.

The hypothesis H_0 could not be given with 95% possibility both in the first (2000-2005), and the second (2008-2012) empirical research. This meant that the number of qualities which indicated the constantness of rural schools' educational environment was statistically equal to the number of those qualities which indicated the changeability of rural schools' educational environment. These qualities were evenly distributed. This means that in Latvian rural schools' educational environment the process of bifurcation or splitting takes place: 1) the specifics of educational environment in rural schools is maintained, its traditional values; 2) the process of searching for innovations and changes takes place.

On the basis of our research (results we could work out classification of the rural schools' educational environment. There are the following environmental models groups of the Latvian rural schools.

1. *Traditional educational environmental models* offer the most widespread educational environmental models such as a basic or secondary rural school (functioning of schools responds to the Educational Law of Latvian Republic, the school's functions correspond to pupils' audience accordingly to basic or secondary school's educational programs). The school's operation is without any changes because, firstly, *the school's administration does not see any danger for school's existence and sustainability in future*, there is enough number of pupils and set of forms that have not substantially changed in the last years, that is why the rural school does not want to change anything in its every day work because the basic audience is saved – schoolchildren and youngsters, secondly, *the school's administration and all personnel perceive danger of school's existence and its sustainability in future* because the number of pupils and forms have decreased or it has been always a situation that the amount of pupils and forms were very low. Therefore the school as an environmental system is not opened to changes from inside („from the bottom”), but waits for favourable reforms from outside („from the top”).

2. *Educational environmental models of structural reorganization* include multi-structural educational environment. It is related to comprehensive schools that as a result of the optimization in the time of the reform in 2009/2010 school year have become the component of the multi-structural educational environment or substructure: 1) have become a multi-structural educational environmental center that has got one or more branch offices; 2) have lost their independence and were joined to some rural secondary school or basic school in such way becoming the branch office of this particular school.

3. *Multi-functional and multi-structural educational environmental models within the framework of one school* encompass rural schools that offer multi-divisional educational environment for all rural community because the rural schools are social-cultural environments which offer the formal and non-formal education in the aspect of life-long and wide-long learning. By broadening target audience and functions in the aspect of a person's age period 'down' – preschool and school age children and 'up' – adult formal and non-formal education, rural schools as an educational environment system form new substructures.

4. *Combined (mixed) educational environmental models* include the features of a multi-structural and multi-functional educational environmental model. The rural school as a multi-structural educational center or as a branch office broadens its functions and increases its target audience by offering a wide range of formal and non-formal educational programmes.

Conclusions

- Already beginning with the 1970-ies till nowadays, an important place in the science of western countries has been given to the concept of a rural community school, and the theoretical basis and future development of it can be found in the publications of several western scientists, who point out the importance of interdisciplinary approach in the research of the educational environment.
- In the 21st century in order to ensure sustainable development for itself and the whole community the rural schools' educational environment is continuously changing: many Latvian rural schools extend their educational offer and increase their target audience, widening the scope of the target audience's age and offered educational programmes, assuming additional functions and self-complicating the structure of its educational environment.
- The results of both empiric research phases testify that the process of bifurcation or splitting takes place: 1) the specifics of educational environment in rural schools is maintained, its traditional values; 2) the process of searching for innovations and changes in rural schools' educational environment takes place. This reveals the uninterrupted changeability of rural schools' educational environment.
- Having assessed the threats of external environment and their own inner potential, rural schools become the educational environment for the whole community thus finding efficient and productive means for the sustainability provision, resources and ways (means) that create a great diversity of models for a school as community's educational environment. This changeability and diversity of rural schools provide opportunities for the solution of the issue of balanced development in the *urban-rural* dimension in Latvia, which facilitates the sustainable development of rural cultural environment in Latvia in general.
- On the basis of the results obtained during the research, all models of rural schools' educational environment can be divided into four groups: 1) traditional educational environmental model; 2) educational environmental models of structural reorganization; 3) multi-functional and multi-structural educational environmental model; 4) combined (mixed) educational environmental model.

Bibliography

1. Agbo S.A. (2007). Addressing School-Community Relations in a Cross-Cultural Context: A Collaborative Action to Bridge the Gap Between First Nations and the School, *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, Vol. 22 (No. 8), pp. 1-14.
2. Binger S., Quinn L., Sullivan K. (2003). *Schools as Centres of Community: A Citizen's Guide for Planning and Design*. Second edition. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Educational Facilities, KnowledgeWorks Foundation, Council of Educational Facility Planners, Building Educational Success Together, Coalition for Community Schools, USA.
3. Breidlid A. (2004). Sustainable Development, Indigenous Knowledge and Education in South Africa, *Journal of Teacher Education and Training*, Vol. 4, pp. 3-18.
4. Buckley W. (1967). *Sociology and modern systems theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice – Hall.
5. Budge K. (2006). Rural leaders, rural places: Problem, privilege, and possibility, *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, Vol. 21 (No. 13), pp. 1-10.
6. Fend H. (1991). Soziale Erfolge im Bildungswesen: Die Bedeutung der sozialen Stellung in der Schulklasse (Social success in the educational system: The significance of social position in the school class). Pekrun R., Fend H. (Hg.). *Schule und Persönlichkeitsentwicklung. Ein Resümee der Längsschnittsforschung (School and the development of personality: A summary of longitudinal research)*. Stuttgart: Enke, S. 217-238. (in German)
7. Flora C.B., Spears J., Swanson L. (2007). *Rural communities: Legacy and change*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 416 pp.

8. Fullan M. (1993). *Change Forces: Probing the Depth of Educational Reform*. London: Falmer Press, 162 pp.
9. Gudjons H. (1998). *Pedagoģijas pamatatziņas* (Pedagogical basic cognitions). Rīga: Zvaigzne ABC, 394 lpp. (in Latvian)
10. Haken H., Portugali J. (2005). A synergetic interpretation of cue-dependent prospective memory, *Cognitive Processing*, Vol. 6, pp. 87-97.
11. Haken H., Portugali J. (1996). Synergetics, inter-representation networks and cognitive maps. Portugali J. (Ed.), *The Construction of Cognitive Maps*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 45-67.
12. Hargreaves L., M. (1996). Issues in rural primary education in Europe. Summary of symposium on research on rural education in Europe *European Conference on Educational Research*, Seville, p. 13. [online] [24.11.2012]. Available at <http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED408116>
13. Harmon H.L., Schafft K. (2009). Rural School leadership for collaborative community development, *The Rural Educator*, Vol. 30 (No.3), pp. 4-9.
14. Hobbs D. (1988). *Community economic development innovation: The key to rural school improvement and rural revitalization*. Kansas City, MO: Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory.
15. Katane I. (2005a). Education Ecology as Philosophically Methodological Basis, New Perspectives for Interdisciplinary Research of Education Environment. Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference "ATEE Spring University 2005. Changing Education in a Changing Society: Europe 15+10", Vol. I. Klaipeda University, Klaipeda, pp. 108-118.
16. Katane I. (2005b). *The Evaluation Model of the Rural School as Educational Environment*. Summary of Doctoral Thesis. Daugavpils: Daugavpils University, pp. 37-73.
17. Katane I. (2006a). Modern Rural School as an Open, Inclusive Educational Environment in Latvia, *Journal of Science Education*, Vol. 7, pp. 34-36
18. Katane I. (2007). *No ekoloģiskās paradigmas līdz vides modelim izglītības pētniecībā*. Monogrāfisko pētījumu sērija „Izglītības ekoloģija” (*From Ecological Paradigm to Educational Model in Research of Education*. Series of Monographic Research “Ecology of Education”). Jelgava: LLU, 239 lpp. (in Latvian)
19. Katane I. (2006b). Sustainable Development and Changeability of Rural School as an Educational Environment in Latvia. Pipere A. (ed.). *Education and Sustainable Development: First Steps Toward Changes, BBCC/ISE Collection of Articles, Vol. 1*. Daugavpils: Saule, pp. 265-279.
20. Katane I. (2006c). Sustainable Development of the Modern Rural School as a System of Educational Environment under the Conditions of Globalisation and Various Contradictions in Latvia, *Acta Paedagogica Vilnensia*, Vol.16, pp. 27-39.
21. Katane I. (2009a) Developmental Aspects of Educational Ecology. Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference *Rural Environment. Education. Personality*. Jelgava: LLU TF IMI, pp. 259 – 274.
22. Katane I. (2009b) Ecology of Education as a New Interdisciplinary Research Trend. Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference *Latvia University of Agriculture – 70*. Jelgava: LLU, pp. 183 – 184.
23. Katane I., Laizāne A. (2009) The Concept of Rural School in the Context of Environment and Development. Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference *Rural Environment. Education. Personality*. Jelgava: LLU TF IMI, pp. 292 - 304.
24. Katane I., Laizāne A. (2012a). *Divdesmit pirmā gadsimta lauku skolas izglītības vide Latvijā un ārzemēs*. Monogrāfisko pētījumu sērija „Izglītības ekoloģija” (*The Rural School’s Educational Environment of the 21st century in Latvia and Abroad*. Series of Monographic Research “Ecology of Education”). Jelgava: LLU TF IMI, 284 lpp. (in Latvian)
25. Katane I., Laizāne A. (2012b). The Evaluation of Diversity of Educational Environmental Models of Latvian Rural Schools. Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference *Society, Integration, Education*. Rēzekne: RA, pp. 76 - 85.
26. Knyazeva H., Kurdyumov S. (2001) Nonlinear Synthesis and Coevolution of Complex Systems, *World Futures*, Vol. 57, pp. 239-261.

27. Laizāne A. (2012). *The Evaluation of Fluctuation and Diversity of the Educational Environment of Rural Schools in Latvia*. Summary of Doctoral Thesis. Jelgava: Latvia University of Agriculture, pp. 38 – 81.
28. Merton R.K. (1948). The self-fulfilling prophecy, *Antioch Review*, Vol. 8, pp. 193-210.
29. Miller J.G. (1978). *Living systems*. New York: McGraw.
30. Miller B.A. (1993). Rural Distress and Survival: The School and the Importance of "Community", *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, Fall, Vol. 9 (No. 2), pp. 84-103.
31. Miller B.A. (1995). The role of rural schools in community development: Policy issues and implications, *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, Vol. 11 (No. 3), pp. 163-172.
32. Minzey J.D. (1976). Community education. Goodman S.E. (ed.), *Handbook on contemporary education*, New York: R.R. Bowker Company, pp. 75-78.
33. Parsons T. (1951). *The Social System*. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.
34. Prigogine I., Nicolis G. (1977). *Self-Organization in Non-Equilibrium Systems: From Dissipative Structures to Order through Fluctuations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
35. Prigogine I., Stengers I. (1983). *Order Out of Chaos*. Bantam Books, New York.
36. Ray M.P. (1988). An ecological model of the family, *Home Economics Forum*, pp. 2 – 15.
37. Theobald P., Nachtigal P. (1995). Culture, community, and the promise of rural education, *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 77 (No. 2), pp.132-135.
38. Unruh R., Lundt J. C. (1999). Rural school community relationships in north central Montana: The role of school in rural communities, *The Rural Educator*, Vol. 21 (No. 1), pp. 15-19.
39. Пригожин А.И. (1983) *Организации: системы и люди* (Organizations: Systems and people). Москва: Издательство политической литературы, 176 с. (in Russian)