

**8<sup>th</sup> icCSBs 2019**  
**The Annual International Conference on Cognitive - Social,  
and Behavioural Sciences**

**MODERN CHILDHOOD AND DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATION  
AS A SOCIALIZATION SPACE: MILESTONE 2020**

Irina Wagner (a)\*, Tatyana Volosovets (b), Olga Gukalenko (c),  
Marina Guryanova (d), Ivan Kirillov (e), Elena Kutepova (f)

\*Corresponding author

- (a) The Federal State Budget Scientific Institution «Institute of Study of Childhood, Family and Education of the Russian Academy of Education» 105062, ul. Makarenko, 5/16, Moscow, Russia, wagner.mil@mail.ru  
(b) The Federal State Budget Scientific Institution «Institute of Study of Childhood, Family and Education of the Russian Academy of Education» 105062, ul. Makarenko, 5/16, Moscow, Russia, volosovets@yandex.ru  
(c) The Federal State Budget Scientific Institution «Institute of Study of Childhood, Family and Education of the Russian Academy of Education» 105062, ul. Makarenko, 5/16, Moscow, Russia, olga\_gukalenko@mail.ru  
(d) The Federal State Budget Scientific Institution «Institute of Study of Childhood, Family and Education of the Russian Academy of Education» 105062, ul. Makarenko, 5/16, Moscow, Russia, guryanowamp@yandex.ru  
(e) The Federal State Budget Scientific Institution «Institute of Study of Childhood, Family and Education of the Russian Academy of Education» 105062, ul. Makarenko, 5/16, Moscow, Russia, ivkirillov@yandex.ru (f) The Federal State Budget Scientific Institution «Institute of Study of Childhood, Family and Education of the Russian Academy of Education» 105062, ul. Makarenko, 5/16, Moscow, Russia, enkutepova@mail.ru

***Abstract***

The article refers the trends and prospects of nurture development in Russia. The beginning of the 2020s has a symbolic meaning of a new phase, the reason for a retrospective analysis of the nurture development and defining its prospects. During these 30 years nurture as a social institute has passed a complicated way from almost complete demolition in the beginning of the 1990s to obtaining recognition as a priority of the state policy in the field of childhood in the middle of the 2010s. At the turn of the decade a question arises: What is new? Do the factors to be changed exist? What are the trends of nurture development, characteristics and risks of socialization in the beginning of the 2020s? The key for reconsidering the novelty of the situation in the field of nurture, which is introduced in the article, is called “the phenomenon of childhood”. The article shows that the transformations of childhood in the modern world condition the actualization of the subjective format of nurture. Nurture today is not a transfer of experience from generation to generation, but the interaction between generations, mutual creation of culture, in which the development of a growing personality occurs. The methodological meaning for the science of nurture is in recognizing children as the subjects of the process of creating culture; reconsideration of the growing role of a personal social experience of a child; shift of emphasis on the pedagogical support of self-actualization of children, their self-determination, recognizing the value of childhood.

© 2019 Published by Future Academy [www.FutureAcademy.org](http://www.FutureAcademy.org).UK

**Keywords:** Childhood, education, nurture, socialization, milestone 2020.



## 1. Introduction

One of the features of the modern civilization and the Russian society in particular can be distinctly seen as the intensive transformation of the phenomenon of childhood. Even without losing ourselves in special sociological and psychological-pedagogical studies in our everyday life we can find a lot of examples of the facts, confirming that the modern children build up a new social-cultural space, distance themselves from the older generations, realize their own projects seeking or not seeking advice from adults, create, search for, build up a kind of new world, a new culture unknown to us; run away into the future either not taking into account the experience of older generation altogether or reformatting it according to themselves, at the same time solving in their own way the problems unsolved by the older generations.

The reforms of social and educational policy influencing the children's life directly or indirectly leave off-camera the changes of children's everyday life. Nowadays the work for improving access to education leaves out of account the children's conceptions of the educational methods suitable for them and the ideas whether the programme corresponds to their demands. The research shows that involving the schoolchildren into decision making process helps to improve the relationship between the pedagogues and the students and creates more effective educational environment as the result (Feldstein, 2011).

For the modern scientific research of the problems of childhood, nurture and socialization, the actualization of the novelty of the modern situation is characteristic (Guryanova, 2018). Very often the transformation of the phenomenon of childhood is connected with the digital socialization (Borisov, Gukalenko, & Pustovoytov, 2018; Kaznacheeva & Shubina, 2016; Usoltseva, 2010). The new generation is referred as the media-generation, which is a correct, but not an exhaustive characteristic. Digitalization is one of the factors of the transformation of the modern childhood, its deep changes in the modern conditions. It is important to admit the uniqueness, multiple-aspects of life experience of the modern children, which actualizes the problem of concession to them the self-realization space, designing the socialization space in the subject format (Wagner, 2018).

In this aspect the approach to the development of the juridical support of childhood of the foreign researchers is interesting. It represents the direction connected with defining the status of children in the scientific research as the co-researchers and the direction providing the participation of children in decision making (Shaw, Brady, & Davey, 2011). UNICEF subdivides the practices of participation of children in decision making process in three categories: 1. The consultative process: the adults initiate the process of obtaining information concerning improvement of the legal system, work with children etc. from the children themselves; 2. The participative initiatives: creating conditions for understanding the principles by children and application of them in practice; involving children in designing policy and social-psychological services, influencing them; 3. Promoting self-advocacy: transfer of authority and supporting children in awareness and realization of their goals and initiatives (Lansdown, 2001).

The volume of the practical recommendations concerning operationalization of the principles and values in the process of involving children into decision making is quite sufficient (Save the Children, 2010). The children's parliaments and involvement children into preparing reports concerning realization of the convention of the rights of the child are considered as of a "high-level" (Miller, 2008).

## **2. Problem Statement**

In the modern world under the influence of a high dynamics of the social-cultural development as well as the processes of globalization, integration and digitalization the intensive transformations of the phenomenon of childhood take place. They challenge pedagogical science, which during the centuries have been considering nurture as the transfer of the social-cultural experience from generation to generation. The modern childhood does not just passively adopt the experience of older generations, but forms its own new social-cultural experience in advanced tempo. The subjectivity of growing generations in the modern social practice declares itself so intensively that we should acknowledge childhood as a full-fledged subject of creating culture. That conditions a deep contradiction between the traditions of pedagogical science and the dynamics of renovation of the socialization mechanisms of the growing generations and the necessity of forming new approaches to the development of education for the positive socialization of children. In Russia during the last 30 years nurture as a social institute has passed a complicated way from almost complete demolition in the beginning of the 1990s to obtaining recognition as a priority of the state policy in the field of childhood in the middle of the 2010s. At the turn of the decade a question arises: What is new? Does the modern nurture correspond to the demands of childhood? Do the factors to be changed exist and what is the main vector of renovation? Today it is clearly seen that it is necessary to design new conceptual approaches to the nurture development basing on understanding that we are dealing with a new condition – the phenomenon of the modern childhood.

## **3. Research Questions**

Designing new models and ways of nurture development can be successful if we answer the following questions: What transformations of the phenomenon of childhood take place nowadays? How the transformations of the phenomenon of childhood influence the processes of nurture and socialization of children? What are the trends of nurture development, characteristics and risks of socialization in the beginning of the 2020s? What conditions for the positive socialization of children to be created today, in the nearest prospective?

## **4. Purpose of the Study**

Taking into account the transformations of modern childhood, to characterize a new vector of development of the science in the field of nurture. To identify trends in the development of nurture in the Russian education at the milestone 2020 and to determine the conceptual approaches to positive socialization of children

## **5. Research Methods**

The characteristics of the modern stage of the nurture development have been studied by the analysis of the governmental acts; the documents of the strategic format; programme-methodological documents of the federal and regional levels. A special attention has been drawn to studying the experience of realization of the federal state educational standards of the preschool and of the basic

general education in designing of those the authors took part. The modern experience of designing the nurture process has been analyzed by studying the curriculum of the preschool education as well as the programmes of nurture in educational organizations, presented in the open access. The analysis of the modern practice of nurture and socialization of children reflected in the publications in the periodical issues and in the materials of the web-sites of educational organizations has been carried out. The results of scientific research in the field of nurture and socialization have been studied. The method of the theoretical modelling of the space of socialization of children in the educational process in the beginning of the 2020s has been applied.

## 6. Findings

The end of the decade is always a reason to turn back, to estimate the current situation and to define the prospects of the new period of development. The milestone of 2020 can be seen as the most favourable one in the nurture development in comparison with the previous periods of the nurture development in Russia in last 30 years. The positive characteristic of the current period is conditioned firstly by the fact that during the last 5 years nurture has become a priority of the state policy in the interests of childhood. This priority can be seen with the utmost clearance from 2012 and is reflected in the legal acts, programmes, documents up to today. It is enough to mention such fundamental documents as The Strategy of Nurture in the Russian Federation for the period up to 2025 (approved by the Direction of the Government of the Russian Federation of the 29th of May 2015 №996-r ), nurture component of the Federal State Educational Standards of the General Education (FGOS OO); FGOS of the Preschool Education (approved by the Order of the Ministry of Education and Science of Russia from the 17th of October 2013 (Volosovets, 2017; Volosovets, & Kutepova, 2014; Volosovets & Kirillov, 2017); professional standard “Specialist in the Sphere of Nurture” (approved by the Order of the Ministry of Labour of Russia of 10.01.2017 №10n (Wagner & Volosovets, 2017). The Decree of the President of the Russian Federation declared the Decade of Childhood from 2018. The political decisions conditioned the growth of social status of nurture, enhancement of nurture function of the educational intuitions, decreasing the risks of socialization. In the beginning of the 1990s when total destroying the system of nurture took place, it was difficult to imagine such degree of state support of nurture. Gradual revival of nurture, which represent one of the cultural values of the Russian society and belongs to the best traditions of the Russian culture, began in the end of the 1990s-beginning of the 2000s: the first programmes of development of nurture in the educational system, first courses for pedagogues concerning organization of the process of nurture, conferences and conquests of the systems of nurture took place. In the 2000s a range of federal targeted programmes appeared (The State Program of Patriotic Nurture of the Citizens of the Russian Federation etc.), a step-by-step reconsidering of the losses of the 1990s, building up new approaches to the development of education, recognition of the necessity of enhancement of the nurture function of educational organizations. By the 2010s the basis for returning nurture into the life of the Russian society in the whole scale and for reaching a new step of development as a social institute has formed. And it has been achieved. Nurture has taken priority positions in the state policy which is extremely necessary.

But necessary does not mean sufficient. To review today's nurture situation it is important to

consider the problem not “from above” only, but from the positions of pedagogics, from the positions of childhood creating conditions for the positive socialization which is the main goal of all the efforts taken “from above”.

The above mentioned documents describe nurture as a social institute. Further on, from the pedagogical and culturological, axiological angle we should talk of the children. From this “children’s”, “pedagogical” angle in the beginning of the 2020s we have got the new challenges to be answered by the pedagogical theory and practice. The main challenge for the modern science of nurture is the intensiveness of the transformations of the phenomenon of childhood. Today becomes obvious the contradiction between extreme enhancement of the subject role of the growing generations in creating culture and insufficient readiness of the pedagogical science to present to the children the space for self-realization, choice, self-determination; to provide children with pedagogical support in their own comprehension of the surrounding world; to recognize the value of childhood enough for not trying to design the system of nurture beyond the dialog with a child; to listen to the child; to follow him/her, trusting his/her interests and demands.

Let us consider the experience of realization of the nurture component of the FGOS OO, designing and realization of the programmes of nurture. As the result of the research, a variety of alarming tendencies, that allow characterizing the state of the nurture in the educational organizations as the contradictory one, has been found out. Some of those alarming trends are the efforts to standardize the results of nurture on the personality level and the domination of the control functions in managing the process of nurture. 65% of the pedagogues declare their desire to get the instruments for the “evaluation of civility” to present to the authorities the reports on the results of nurture activity. It is significant that in our interviews with the pedagogues more than 70% of them express the sureness that FGOS OO does not offer a standard for personality. The majority of the pedagogues (85%) declare the unacceptability of the ideas of the “evaluation of the spiritual-moral nurture”, “evaluation of patriotism” (such absurd wording has appeared in mass-media). Alongside with that, 85% of pedagogues express the demand of indicators for the analysis of the results of nurture activity in order to present the reports to the educational authorities. The volume of materials connected with diagnostics, evaluation of effectiveness of the nurture process in the programmes of nurture often exceeds the volume of the essential part. Still, in the 70% of the cases the participation of children in evaluation activity is not supposed. Unacceptability of designing (programming and modelling) personality, inadmissibility of any kind of standardization of personality has to be a pedagogical axiom. A child cannot be an object for measuring - a subject only. The evaluation of the results of the programme should be performed by the child and by adults from the position of a child. Does the programme correspond to his/her demands? Is it interesting to participate in the programme? Is there an opportunity to choose roles, kind, ways and forms of the activity? Those are the questions to be answered by the child only and they should be defining in recognition of the results of the programme realization and designing. It is necessary to consider the evaluation as a part of the nurture process and the child – as a subject of the evaluation activity, to build in the evaluation component in the programme of nurture and we have proposed to include it in the new version of the FGOS OO.

There is a range of other alarming symptoms of the development of nurture activity in the conditions of realization the FGOS OO. The performed expertise shows that in general the nurture

programs of the educational organizations correspond to the demands of the FGOS OO, but the necessity of improving their quality by the enhancement of the role of children in their designing and realization is obvious and these are the children who should make the decisions. The programme should exist for the children instead of a formal presence in the school documentation. The typical problems of modern nurture programmes are their stereotyped character, absence of the specifics conditioned by the characteristics of the social-cultural space of the region, the interests and demands of the subjects of nurture. Obviously, the pedagogues cannot or do not dare to use a creative approach in designing the programmes, systematically change them considering the specifics of the region, interests and demands of the children. That conclusion is confirmed by the fact that a “creative part” in general presents shy additions to the texts copied from the FGOS OO or goes out in the appendixes in a form of a schedule. The stereotypes prevent pedagogues from providing the correspondence of the programme to the age characteristics of the children, finding a game arrangement, creating the space for children’s initiatives, self-determination and self-realization.

Overcoming the above mentioned phenomena lies in the sphere of management of the nurture activity. To create the conditions for development and realization of subjective position of a child it is necessary to change the mechanisms of managing nurture process completely.

Basing on the research results we have formulated the following recommendations:

1. The authorities should motivate the leaders of educational organizations and the pedagogues to perform designing the nurture process in the dialog with children, basing on the subjective approach and forming the space for the children’s initiatives, choice, decision making.

2. The leaders and the pedagogues of the educational organizations have to:

2.1. Include in the structure of a programme an introductory analytical part, containing the description of the nurture situation, characteristics of the students, their demands and particularities of the life experience of the children etc.

2.2. Include in the programme changeable units to be designed by the school community of the children and adults;

2.3. Enhance the game arrangement of the programmes, realize them in a form of a prolonged game; present the changeable units in an accessible and interesting for the children form to make the programme the real road map for the mutual activity of a certain group of children and adults in a certain time period.

3. It is necessary to revise the approaches to forming the nurture component of the FGOS OO. The nurture situation is a dynamic one and the contents of nurture included in the standard demands system updating. The programme included in the FGOS OO should not look as a completed document; it has to include a set of units and to be open for a creative update by the subjects of nurture and the educational organization, to take into account interests, demands of the subjects of nurture. The FGOS OO itself should include the mechanism of updating, which provide the subject format of nurture.

## **7. Conclusion**

The nurture development in the beginning of the 2020s should be conditioned by the full-fledged conceptions of the transformation of the phenomenon of childhood. Designing new nurture and

socialization models should be carried out considering the fact that the portrait of the modern childhood is getting renewed considerably. The information space and the volume of information stream available for the children are broadened considerably; the intensity of the accumulation of the social-cultural experience and its variety are increasing; the new generation answers the challenges of time with the mobility, initiative, readiness to self-development, the increasing involvement in the process of creating culture. In nurture and socialization as the processes of the translating culture to the growing generations a dramatic change of mechanism of the social inheritance takes place: not only the transfer of the experience from generation to generation, but the mutual creating culture, building up the new social-cultural experience in the global scale and in the personal level appear. The growing generation forms their own social-cultural experience and more pronouncedly proclaim themselves as the subjects of creating culture. The axiological basis of the new nurture models should become recognition of the value of childhood, value attitude to childhood. The condition of providing positive socialization of children becomes the nurture development in the subject format. The education development should be carried out in the dialog with children, in the interests of children and reflecting their demands for the socialization space; offering choice, self-determination, making responsible decisions, role interaction, social probes, initiatives; making their own routs of social development, self-realization in the social practice. Having passed the milestone of the 2020, the social institute of nurture should be considered as the institute of childhood and new nurture models should be created in the dialog, in the alliance with children, together.

## Acknowledgments

The article is prepared under the government contract № 073-00092-19-00 for 2019 The Federal State Budget Scientific Institution “Institute of Study of Childhood, Family and Education of the Russian Academy of Education” on the project “The scientific base of family and social upbringing of children and youth and the pedagogical support of the development of children’s upbringing and socialization in education system”.

## References

- Borisenkov, V. P., Gukalenko, O. V., & Pustovoytov, V. N. (2018). *Informatsionnaya bezopasnost' molodezhi v polikul'turnom prostranstve Rossii* [Information security of young people in the multicultural space of Russia]. In *Nauchnyye issledovaniya problem detstva, vospitaniya, sotsializatsii: aktual'nyye aspekty, teoreticheskiye i metodicheskiye osnovy Sbornik nauchnykh trudov* (pp. 8-17). Moscow. [in Rus.]
- Feldstein, D. I. (2011). *Glubinnyye izmeneniya sovremennogo detstva i obuslovlennaya imi aktualizatsiya psihologo-pedagogicheskikh problem razvitiya obrazovaniya* [The profound changes of modern childhood and the actualization of the psychological and pedagogical problems of the development of education that they cause]. *Vestnik prakticheskoy psihologii obrazovaniya*, 4, 3-12. [in Rus.]
- Guryanova, M. P. (2018). *Sel'skiy sotsium sovremennoy Rossii kak prostranstvo resursov i riskov sotsializatsii detey* [Rural society of modern Russia as a resource space and risks of socialization of children]. In *Nauchnyye issledovaniya problem detstva, vospitaniya, sotsializatsii: aktual'nyye aspekty, teoreticheskiye i metodicheskiye osnovy Sbornik nauchnykh trudov* (pp.176-184). Moscow. [in Rus.]

- Kaznacheeva, N. N., & Shubina, E. L. (2016). *Razvitie informatsionnykh kompetentnostey obuchayuschihsya (na primere studentov ekonomicheskikh vuzov i shkolnikov obsheobrazovatelnykh uchrezhdeniy)* [Development of information competencies of students (on the example of students of economic universities and schoolchildren of educational institutions)]. *Vestnik Tyumenskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Gumanitarnyye issledovaniya. Humanitates*, 2, 173-183 [in Rus.]
- Lansdown, G. (2001). Promoting children's participation in democratic decision-making. Florence, Italy. United Nation Children's Fund Innocenti Research Centre. p.53 Retrieved from: <https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/pdf/insight6.pdf>
- Miller, J. (2008). *Children as Change Agents: A review of child participation in periodic reporting on the Convention on the Rights of the Child*. Ontario: World Vision.
- Shaw, C., Brady, L. M., & Davey, C. (2011). Guidelines for research with Children and young people, London: National Children's Bureau Research Centre. Retrieved from: <https://www.nfer.ac.uk/nfer/schools/developingyoung-researchers/NCBguidelines.pdf>
- Usoltseva, I. V. (2010). *Informatsionno-kompyuternyye tehnologii i vospitaniye* [Information-computer technologies and education] *Pedagogy*, 2, 44-50 [in Rus.]
- Volosovets, T. V. (2017). *K voprosu o pervykh itogakh vnedreniya federal'nogo gosudarstvennogo standarta doshkol'nogo obrazovaniya* [On the issue of the first results of the introduction of the federal state standard of preschool education]. In *Yazyk i aktual'nyye problemy obrazovaniya Materialy Mezhdunarodnoy nauchno-prakticheskoy konferentsii* (pp. 20-23). Moscow. [in Rus.]
- Volosovets, T. V., & Kirillov, I. L. (2017). *Igrovoye prostranstvo detstva* [Game Space of Childhood]. In *Igrovaya kul'tura sovremennogo detstva Materialy I Mezhdunarodnoy nauchno-prakticheskoy konferentsii*. (pp. 340-343) Moscow. [in Rus.]
- Volosovets, T. V., & Kutepova, E. N. (2014). *Novyy vektor razvitiya spetsial'noy (korrektsionnoy) shkoly* [A new vector of development of a special (correctional) school]. *Upravleniye obrazovaniyem: teoriya i praktika*, 3, 67-70 [in Rus.]
- Wagner, I. V. (2018). *Realizatsiya sub'ektnogo podhoda k proektirovaniyu programmy vospitaniya v obsheobrazovatelnoy organizatsii* [Realization of the subject approach to the design of the educational program in the general educational organization]. *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta*, 1, 77-83, [in Rus.]
- Wagner, I. V., & Volosovets, T. V. (2017) *Razvitie vospitaniya posredstvom realizatsii professionalnogo standarta «Spetsialist v oblasti vospitaniya»* [Development of education through the implementation of the professional standard "Specialist in the field of education"]. *Sibirskiy pedagogicheskiy zhurnal*, 1, 7-11 [in Rus.]