

## The Diversity of Educational Environments in Modern Pedagogy

**Sadulloeva Makhfuza Gaibullovna**

Senior Lecturer at the Department of Pedagogy, BukhGU

**Yusupova Khabiba Isabekovna**

Teacher of the Academic Lyceum of the Bukhara State Medical Institute

**Abstract:** This article explores the educational environment as a form of communicative interaction, in which special types of community emerge between the teacher and the student, as well as among the students themselves. It is through these communities that knowledge, skills, and abilities are transmitted. Such a model represents a form of active collaboration, which creates unique types of community. The foundation of this model of the educational environment is the conditions for the development of the child through joint activities with adults or other participants in the educational process.

**Keywords:** educational environment, types of communication, process, communicative orientation, anthropology, model, influence, condition, development, social environment.



This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license

### Introduction

In the works of psychologist V. I. Panov [1], models of the educational environment developed by various scholars are presented:

1. **"Ecological-personal"** (V. A. Yasvin, S. D. Deryabo)
2. **"Communicative-oriented"** (V. V. Rubtsov, N. I. Polivanov, I. V. Ermakova)
3. **"Anthropological-psychological"** (V. I. Slobodchikov)
4. **"Psychodidactic"** (V. P. Lebedeva, V. A. Orlov, V. A. Yasvin)
5. **"Ecopsychological"** (V. I. Panov)

What is the characteristic of these educational environments? For example, the "ecological-personal" model refers to "a system of influences and conditions for the formation of a personality according to a given pattern, as well as opportunities for its development, contained in the social and spatial-object environment." What is necessary for the developing effect of such an educational environment? The answer is: the ability to provide a complex of opportunities for self-development for all subjects of the educational process—students and teachers. In the structure of the educational environment, the developer of this model, V. Yasvin [2], identifies four components:

- **Spatial-object** — the building of the educational institution and the adjacent territory, individual classrooms, and equipment for lessons;
- **Social** — interpersonal relationships between teachers, students, parents, and school administration;
- **Technological, or psychodidactic** — content and methods of teaching, their correspondence to the psychological, physiological, and age-related features of students;
- **Subjects of the educational process** — teachers and students, parents, and the administration.

### Methodology

The "**communicative-oriented**" educational model was developed by the president of the Moscow State University of Psychology and Education, V. V. Rubtsov [3]. His approach is based on the idea that a necessary condition for the development of a child is their participation in joint activities with other subjects. A significant role in this process is played by the computerization of the educational process. The educational environment, in this case, is a form of communicative interaction, in which special types of communities arise between the teacher and the student, as well as between students themselves. It is through these communities that knowledge, skills, and abilities are transmitted. This model represents a form of active cooperation, which creates special types of communities. The foundation of such a model of the educational environment is the conditions for the child's development in joint activities with adults or other participants in the educational process. The following structural components of the educational environment are highlighted in this model:

- ✓ Internal orientation of the school;
- ✓ Psychological climate;
- ✓ Socio-psychological structure of the group;
- ✓ Psychological organization of knowledge transmission;
- ✓ Psychological characteristics of students, etc.

The Chief Researcher of the Laboratory of Psychological Anthropology and Professional Development of Teachers at the Institute of Child, Family, and Education Studies of the Russian Academy of Education, V. I. Slobodchikov [3], presents the "**anthropological-psychological**" model of the educational environment. This is a system that is created and modified through the interaction of the subjects of educational activity. The author highlights two main parameters of the educational environment: **saturation (resource potential)** and **structuring (the method of its organization)**. The author and supporters emphasize the relativity and mediating nature of the educational environment, namely:

1. The environment as a combination of conditions, circumstances, and the surrounding setting, and, accordingly, the boundary determined by the scale of protection from the environment and its ability to assimilate with other environments.
2. The environment as "middle - this is the core, connection - this is the mediastinum, means - this is intermediation."

As the primary parameters of this educational environment, the scholar proposes considering its resource potential and method of organization. Depending on the type of connections and relationships, the authors distinguish three different principles of its organization: uniformity, diversity, and variability. This highlights the dynamic nature of the educational environment.

### Results and discussion

The **"psychodidactic"** model of differentiation and individualization of the educational environment was developed by V. A. Yasvin [2] and colleagues, where it was implemented in the schools of the Experimental Psychodidactics Center of the Russian Academy of Education. From the title of the model, it is clear that the main focus here is on individual educational trajectories and variability in the content, forms, and methods of teaching. The creators of the model emphasize the importance of integrating digital technologies and developing distance learning. The scholars base their work on the concept of "personalized education," emphasizing the growing role of differentiation and individualization in modern education. What is the main difference between this model and traditional education? In traditional education, the student became a personality through special organization of teaching and upbringing with targeted pedagogical influences. In contrast, this model is focused on recognizing the priority of the student's individuality. Conditions for their development are specially modeled by the educational institution.

The **"ecopsychological"** model was developed by V. I. Panov [1] in accordance with psychodidactic and ecopsychological principles. The main idea of the author is "the mental development of a person during their education, which should be considered in the context of the system 'person — surrounding environment'." The educational environment should take into account the individual characteristics of the student and the values of society, and also comply with the principle of ecological compatibility—i.e., it must correspond to the natural laws of human development. This model creates the necessary conditions for the learner to develop both their obvious abilities and the potential to reveal interests and talents not yet manifested.

A question arises: which model deserves priority? Probably, there is no definite answer to this question. By weighing each model separately, we see that elements of all the presented models find their place (to some extent) in modern educational institutions.

However, the choice of the educational environment always remains open. Based on the research of Janusz Korczak [2], V. A. Yasvin suggested that the division into types occurs according to two main criteria, namely: how much the educational environment encourages the freedom and activity of the student. Based on this hypothesis, Yasvin developed a methodology for vector modeling of the educational environment. This methodology is fully applicable in pedagogy for forming the educational environment. It represents a special coordinate system with two axes: "freedom—dependence" and "activity—passivity." This approach allows for accurate diagnosis of any educational environment. V. A. Yasvin suggests answering six questions:

## Conclusion

For the axis "freedom—dependence":

1. Whose interests and values are prioritized in this educational environment? a) The individual's. b) The society's (group's).
2. Who adjusts to whom in the process of interaction? a) The educator to the child. b) The child to the educator.
3. What form of education is predominantly practiced in this educational environment? a) Individual. b) Collective (group).

Each answer "a" is marked as one point on the "freedom" scale, and each answer "b" adds a point to the "dependence" scale.

For the axis "activity—passivity": 4. Is the child punished in this educational environment? a) No. b) Yes. 5. Is the child's initiative encouraged in this educational environment? a) Yes. b) No. 6. Are any creative expressions of the child positively received in this educational environment? a) Yes. b) No.

Each answer "a" gives one point on the "activity" scale, and each answer "b" is marked on the "passivity" scale.

Thus, each educational environment can be classified into one of four main types based on this diagnosis:

- ✓ **"Dogmatic"** — dependence and passivity;
- ✓ **"Calm"** — freedom and passivity;
- ✓ **"Career-oriented"** — dependence and activity;
- ✓ **"Creative"** — freedom and activity.

The variability of models of the educational environment is quite high, but the most important thing in any variant of such an environment is its quality, efficiency, and learning outcomes. Referring back to the five types of educational environments described above, it seems that the **ecological-personal** model is the most widespread (basic) model that many educational institutions use.

### References:

1. Панов В. И. Психодидактика образовательных систем: теория и практика. — СПб.: Питер, 2007. — 352 с.
2. Ясвин В.А. Образовательная среда: от моделирования к проектированию. — М.: Смысл, 2001. — 365 с.
3. Рубцов В.В., Поливанова К. Н. Образовательная среда школы как фактор психического развития учащихся.— М.: ИГ-СОЦИН, 2007. - 287 с.
4. Слободчиков В.И. Образовательная среда: реализация целей образования в пространстве культуры // Новые ценности образования: культурные модели школ. Вып. 7. Инноватор Bennet college. М., 1997. -С. 177–184.
5. Садуллоева, М. (2023). ПЛАНИРОВАНИЕ НЕПРЕРЫВНОЙ ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКОЙ ПРАКТИКИ СТУДЕНТА-ПРАКТИКАНТА. *Прикладные науки в современном мире: проблемы и решения*, 2(8), 21-24.
6. Gaybulloevna, S. M. (2023). STRUCTURE AND CONTENT OF PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICE. *INTELLECTUAL EDUCATION TECHNOLOGICAL SOLUTIONS AND INNOVATIVE DIGITAL TOOLS*, 2(14), 22-27.
7. Садуллоева, М. Г. (2022). МЕТОДИКА ОБУЧЕНИЯ РУССКОГО ЯЗЫКА В РЕЧИ УЧАЩИХСЯ. *Scientific Impulse*, 1(5), 717-723.
8. Садуллоева, М. (2023). РУКОВОДСТВО НЕПРЕРЫВНОЙ ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКОЙ ПРАКТИКИ. *Science and innovation in the education system*, 2(9), 39-43.
9. Садуллоева, М. (2023). ПРОГРАММА НЕПРЕРЫВНОЙ ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКОЙ ПРАКТИКИ. *Science and innovation in the education system*, 2(9), 34-38.
10. Садуллоева, М. Г., & Разина, А. (2023). Этимологическое Начало Имен Собственных На Примере Родного Языка И Читательской Грамотности В Начальных Классах. *Academic Integrity and Lifelong Learning (France)*, 223-227.
11. Садуллоева, М. Г. (2023). ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКАЯ ПРАКТИКА В НАЧАЛЬНЫХ КЛАССАХ КАК НЕОТЪЕМЛЕМАЯ ЧАСТЬ ПОДГОТОВКИ ВЫСОКОКВАЛИФИЦИРОВАННЫХ СПЕЦИАЛИСТОВ В ОБЛАСТИ НАЧАЛЬНОГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ (НА ПРИМЕРЕ 4+ 2). *Innovative Society: Problems, Analysis and Development Prospects (Spain)*, 195-200.

12. Sadulloyeva Makhfuza, G. (2022). Organization of Continuous Practice at Higher Education Institutions. *International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development*, 22-24.
13. Садуллоева, М. (2023). ЦЕЛЬ И ЗАДАЧИ НЕПРЕРЫВНОЙ ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКОЙ ПРАКТИКИ НА СОВРЕМЕННОМ ЭТАПЕ ВЫСШЕГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ. *Общественные науки в современном мире: теоретические и практические исследования*, 2(10), 44-46.
14. Sadulloyeva, M. (2023). RESPONSIBILITIES OF A STUDENT INTERN IN ORGANIZING CONTINUOUS TEACHING PRACTICE. *Педагогика и психология в современном мире: теоретические и практические исследования*, 2(12), 31-34.
15. Садуллоева, М. (2023). ПРИМЕРНАЯ СТРУКТУРА ОТЧЕТА О ПРОХОЖДЕНИИ НЕПРЕРЫВНОЙ ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКОЙ ПРАКТИКИ. In *Uz-Conferences* (Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 683-686).
16. Gaybulloyevna, S. M. (2023). Developing Practical Skills During Continuous Teaching Practice. *Journal of Pedagogical Inventions and Practices*, 24, 37-40.