



REVISTA INCLUSIONES

HOMENAJE A ROSA MARÍA VALLES RUIZ

Revista de Humanidades y Ciencias Sociales

Volumen 7 . Número Especial

Abri/ Junio

2020

ISSN 0719-4706

**REVISTA
INCLUSIONES**
REVISTA DE HUMANIDADES
Y CIENCIAS SOCIALES

CUERPO DIRECTIVO

Directores

Dr. Juan Guillermo Mansilla Sepúlveda

Universidad Católica de Temuco, Chile

Dr. Francisco Ganga Contreras

Universidad de Tarapacá, Chile

Subdirectores

Mg © Carolina Cabezas Cáceres

Universidad de Las Américas, Chile

Dr. Andrea Mutolo

Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad de México, México

Editor

Drdo. Juan Guillermo Estay Sepúlveda

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Editor Científico

Dr. Luiz Alberto David Araujo

Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo, Brasil

Editor Brasil

Drdo. Maicon Herverton Lino Ferreira da Silva

Universidade da Pernambuco, Brasil

Editor Europa del Este

Dr. Aleksandar Ivanov Katrandzhiev

Universidad Suroeste "Neofit Rilski", Bulgaria

Cuerpo Asistente

Traductora: Inglés

Lic. Pauline Corthorn Escudero

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Traductora: Portugués

Lic. Elaine Cristina Pereira Menegón

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Portada

Lic. Graciela Pantigoso de Los Santos

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

COMITÉ EDITORIAL

Dra. Carolina Aroca Toloza

Universidad de Chile, Chile

Dr. Jaime Bassa Mercado

Universidad de Valparaíso, Chile

Dra. Heloísa Bellotto

Universidad de São Paulo, Brasil

**CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA
EDITORIAL**

Dra. Nidia Burgos

Universidad Nacional del Sur, Argentina

Mg. María Eugenia Campos

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Francisco José Francisco Carrera

Universidad de Valladolid, España

Mg. Keri González

Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad de México, México

Dr. Pablo Guadarrama González

Universidad Central de Las Villas, Cuba

Mg. Amelia Herrera Lavanchy

Universidad de La Serena, Chile

Mg. Cecilia Jofré Muñoz

Universidad San Sebastián, Chile

Mg. Mario Lagomarsino Montoya

Universidad Adventista de Chile, Chile

Dr. Claudio Llanos Reyes

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile

Dr. Werner Mackenbach

Universidad de Potsdam, Alemania

Universidad de Costa Rica, Costa Rica

Mg. Rocío del Pilar Martínez Marín

Universidad de Santander, Colombia

Ph. D. Natalia Milanesio

Universidad de Houston, Estados Unidos

Dra. Patricia Virginia Moggia Münchmeyer

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile

Ph. D. Maritza Montero

Universidad Central de Venezuela, Venezuela

Dra. Eleonora Pencheva

Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Dra. Rosa María Regueiro Ferreira

Universidad de La Coruña, España

Mg. David Ruete Zúñiga

Universidad Nacional Andrés Bello, Chile

Dr. Andrés Saavedra Barahona

Universidad San Clemente de Oírid de Sofía, Bulgaria

**REVISTA
INCLUSIONES**

REVISTA DE HUMANIDADES
Y CIENCIAS SOCIALES

Dr. Efraín Sánchez Cabra
Academia Colombiana de Historia, Colombia

Dra. Mirka Seitz
Universidad del Salvador, Argentina

Ph. D. Stefan Todorov Kapralov
South West University, Bulgaria

COMITÉ CIENTÍFICO INTERNACIONAL

Comité Científico Internacional de Honor

Dr. Adolfo A. Abadía
Universidad ICESI, Colombia

Dr. Carlos Antonio Aguirre Rojas
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Martino Contu
Universidad de Sassari, Italia

Dr. Luiz Alberto David Araujo
Pontifícia Universidad Católica de São Paulo, Brasil

Dra. Patricia Brogna
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Horacio Capel Sáez
Universidad de Barcelona, España

Dr. Javier Carreón Guillén
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Lancelot Cowie
Universidad West Indies, Trinidad y Tobago

Dra. Isabel Cruz Ovalle de Amenabar
Universidad de Los Andes, Chile

Dr. Rodolfo Cruz Vadillo
Universidad Popular Autónoma del Estado de Puebla, México

Dr. Adolfo Omar Cueto
Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, Argentina

Dr. Miguel Ángel de Marco
Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Emma de Ramón Acevedo
Universidad de Chile, Chile

**CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA
EDITORIAL**

Dr. Gerardo Echeita Sarrionandia
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, España

Dr. Antonio Hermosa Andújar
Universidad de Sevilla, España

Dra. Patricia Galeana
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dra. Manuela Garau
Centro Studi Sea, Italia

Dr. Carlo Ginzburg Ginzburg
Scuola Normale Superiore de Pisa, Italia
Universidad de California Los Ángeles, Estados Unidos

Dr. Francisco Luis Girardo Gutiérrez
Instituto Tecnológico Metropolitano, Colombia

José Manuel González Freire
Universidad de Colima, México

Dra. Antonia Heredia Herrera
Universidad Internacional de Andalucía, España

Dr. Eduardo Gomes Onofre
Universidade Estadual da Paraíba, Brasil

Dr. Miguel León-Portilla
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Miguel Ángel Mateo Saura
*Instituto de Estudios Albacetenses "Don Juan Manuel",
España*

Dr. Carlos Tulio da Silva Medeiros
Diálogos em MERCOSUR, Brasil

+ Dr. Álvaro Márquez-Fernández
Universidad del Zulia, Venezuela

Dr. Oscar Ortega Arango
Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán, México

Dr. Antonio-Carlos Pereira Menaut
Universidad Santiago de Compostela, España

Dr. José Sergio Puig Espinosa
Dilemas Contemporáneos, México

Dra. Francesca Randazzo
*Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Honduras,
Honduras*

REVISTA INCLUSIONES

REVISTA DE HUMANIDADES
Y CIENCIAS SOCIALES

Dra. Yolando Ricardo
Universidad de La Habana, Cuba

Dr. Manuel Alves da Rocha
Universidade Católica de Angola Angola

Mg. Arnaldo Rodríguez Espinoza
Universidad Estatal a Distancia, Costa Rica

Dr. Miguel Rojas Mix
Coordinador la Cumbre de Rectores Universidades Estatales América Latina y el Caribe

Dr. Luis Alberto Romero
CONICET / Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Maura de la Caridad Salabarría Roig
Dilemas Contemporáneos, México

Dr. Adalberto Santana Hernández
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Juan Antonio Seda
Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dr. Saulo Cesar Paulino e Silva
Universidad de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dr. Miguel Ángel Verdugo Alonso
Universidad de Salamanca, España

Dr. Josep Vives Rego
Universidad de Barcelona, España

Dr. Eugenio Raúl Zaffaroni
Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Blanca Estela Zardel Jacobo
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Comité Científico Internacional

Mg. Paola Aceituno
Universidad Tecnológica Metropolitana, Chile

Ph. D. María José Aguilar Idañez
Universidad Castilla-La Mancha, España

Dra. Elian Araujo
Universidad de Mackenzie, Brasil

Mg. Rumyana Atanasova Popova
Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA EDITORIAL

Dra. Ana Bénard da Costa
Instituto Universitario de Lisboa, Portugal
Centro de Estudios Africanos, Portugal

Dra. Alina Bestard Revilla
Universidad de Ciencias de la Cultura Física y el Deporte, Cuba

Dra. Noemí Brenta
Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Ph. D. Juan R. Coca
Universidad de Valladolid, España

Dr. Antonio Colomer Vialdel
Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, España

Dr. Christian Daniel Cwik
Universidad de Colonia, Alemania

Dr. Eric de Léséulec
INS HEA, Francia

Dr. Andrés Di Masso Tarditti
Universidad de Barcelona, España

Ph. D. Mauricio Dimant
Universidad Hebreo de Jerusalén, Israel

Dr. Jorge Enrique Elías Caro
Universidad de Magdalena, Colombia

Dra. Claudia Lorena Fonseca
Universidad Federal de Pelotas, Brasil

Dra. Ada Gallegos Ruiz Conejo
Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos, Perú

Dra. Carmen González y González de Mesa
Universidad de Oviedo, España

Ph. D. Valentin Kitanov
Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Mg. Luis Oporto Ordóñez
Universidad Mayor San Andrés, Bolivia

Dr. Patricio Quiroga
Universidad de Valparaíso, Chile

Dr. Gino Ríos Patio
Universidad de San Martín de Porres, Perú

**REVISTA
INCLUSIONES**
REVISTA DE HUMANIDADES
Y CIENCIAS SOCIALES

Dr. Carlos Manuel Rodríguez Arrechavaleta
Universidad Iberoamericana Ciudad de México, México

Dra. Vivian Romeu
Universidad Iberoamericana Ciudad de México, México

Dra. María Laura Salinas
Universidad Nacional del Nordeste, Argentina

Dr. Stefano Santasilia
Universidad della Calabria, Italia

Mg. Silvia Laura Vargas López
Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Morelos, México

**CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA
EDITORIAL**

Dra. Jaqueline Vassallo
Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Argentina

Dr. Evandro Viera Ouriques
Universidad Federal de Río de Janeiro, Brasil

Dra. María Luisa Zagalaz Sánchez
Universidad de Jaén, España

Dra. Maja Zawierzeniec
Universidad Wszechnica Polska, Polonia

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía
Santiago – Chile
Representante Legal
Juan Guillermo Estay Sepúlveda Editorial

Indización, Repositorios y Bases de Datos Académicas

Revista Inclusiones, se encuentra indizada en:



CATÁLOGO



CiteFactor
Academic Scientific Journals



Stanford University
LIBRARIES



Bibliothèque
Library



WZB
Berlin Social Science Center



Vancouver Public Library





Universidad
de Concepción

BIBLIOTECA UNIVERSIDAD DE CONCEPCIÓN



**THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE CATEGORIES “EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT” AND
“EDUCATIONAL SPACE” IN RUSSIAN PSYCHOLOGICAL AND PEDAGOGICAL SCIENCE**

Dr. (C) Natalia Valentinovna Ivanova

Minin Nizhny Novgorod State Pedagogical University, Russia

ORCID: 0000-0001-6500-7295

ivanova30nv@yandex.ru

Dr. Tatiana Mikhailovna Sorokina

Minin Nizhny Novgorod State Pedagogical University, Russia

ORCID: 0000-0003-1743-8730

foxsd@list.ru

Fecha de Recepción: 13 de enero de 2020 – **Fecha Revisión:** 05 de febrero de 2020

Fecha de Aceptación: 14 de marzo de 2020 – **Fecha de Publicación:** 01 de abril de 2020

Abstract

The article presents the results of theoretical research aimed at studying the correlation between the semantics of the terms “educational space” and “educational environment” in Russian scientific publications. The relevance of the differentiation of these terms is determined by their introduction into the regulatory documents governing Russian education, the variability of their interpretations in the scientific literature, and their insufficient understanding by practicing teachers. Theoretical analysis is used as the primary research method. It is determined that a number of scholars define the concept “educational space” through the concept “educational environment” and some Russian researchers use these concepts as synonymous. The conducted analysis allows identifying a number of significant similarities in said categories: focus on the educational objectives, translation of social experience, systemic structure, irreducibility to the social aspect alone, dynamism and variability, ability to act as an object of modeling, presence of various levels of functioning, ability to serve a developmental function under certain conditions.

Keywords

Space – Environment – Educational space – Learning environment

Para Citar este Artículo:

Ivanova, Natalia Valentinovna y Sorokina, Tatiana Mikhailovna. The relationship between The categories “Educational environment” and “Educational space” in Russian Psychological and Pedagogical Science. Revista Inclusiones Vol: 7 num Especial (2020): 100-118.

Licencia Creative Commons Atribution Non-Comercial 3.0 Unported

(CC BY-NC 3.0)

Licencia Internacional



DR. (C) NATALIA VALENTINOVNA IVANOVA / DR. TATIANA MIKHAILOVNA SOROKINA

Introduction

The psychological and pedagogical scientific glossary is constantly enriched with new terms and concepts, which is associated with the continuous development of scientific thought and educational practice. In the last few decades, the terms “educational space” and “educational environment” have started being used more often in Russian scientific publications (articles, monographs, dissertations) and normative documents on education (texts of laws, educational standards). These concepts have variable, often diffusive, and sometimes conflicting definitions and some authors refer to them as identical or synonymous. This situation consequentially leads to incorrect statements of methodological questions and research objectives and to errors and limitations in the search for its solutions. Moreover, the precise understanding of the concepts “educational space” and “educational environment” and their relation to each other directly influence the introduction and comprehension of derivative terms, for example, development-inducing educational environment, adaptive educational environment, multicultural educational space, and unified educational space.

It should be noted that at present, the terms “educational space” and “educational environment” and their derivatives are included in a number of normative documents. The term “educational space” is used in the federal law “On Education in the Russian Federation” № 273-FZ¹ in articles 3 and 11. The principle of “educational space unification” is mentioned in article 3. Article 11 states that federal state educational standards and federal state requirements ensure “the unity of the educational space of the Russian Federation”. However, the thesaurus presenting the definitions of the main concepts in the law (article 2) lacks a definition of the educational space.

The concept “educational environment” is implemented in the current federal state educational standards for various levels of education. The text of the “Federal state educational standard of general elementary education” signifies the need to create a “comfortable development-inducing educational environment” for elementary school students². It is evident that practicing specialists (teachers and managers) need a clear understanding of the semantics of the concepts “educational space” and “educational environment” to implement the provisions of the education law and standards. However, research conducted by us on the basis of a pedagogical university and schools in Nizhny Novgorod, Russia in 2016³ and in an institute for the development of education in Nizhny Novgorod in 2019 (sample of 500 teachers with 1 to 30 years of working experience) is evident of limited and incorrect understanding of the terms “educational space” and “educational environment” by many of the teachers in elementary and high school. We can, therefore, indicate an acute contradiction between the need to implement the provisions of the educational law and the requirements of educational standards that indicate the categories “educational space” and “educational environment”, on the one hand, and the insufficient understanding of these categories by the teaching staff, as well as the lack of uniformity in scientific interpretation and relation of these concepts, on the other.

¹ Federal Law of the Russian Federation No. 273-FZ “On Education in the Russian Federation” (Rossiiskaia gazeta, December 29, 2012).

² Federalnyi gosudarstvennyi obrazovatelnyi standart nachalnogo obshchego obrazovaniia, (Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 2011).

³ N. V. Ivanova y E. V. Minaeva, “Predstavleniya uchitelei nachalnykh klassov o sushchnosti poniatiiia “obrazovatelnaia sreda”, European Social Science Journal Vol: 12 num 1 (2016): 260-265.

The identified contradiction makes it important and relevant to summarize and compare the definitions of the terms “educational space” and “educational environment” existing in Russian psychological and pedagogical science. This constitutes the goal of our work.

It should be noted that individual attempts to correlate the concepts “educational space” and “educational environment” have already been made⁴. However, the scholars themselves indicate that the works only consider some of the aspects of the problem. Therefore, the content of these publications needs critical analysis and additions.

Materials and Methods

In accordance with the research objective, theoretical analysis was the predominant method of work. The materials for the analysis included scientific publications in psychological and pedagogical periodicals, dissertational research, and monographs of Russian authors, as well as dictionaries.

It should be noted that we did not set a goal of a detailed comparison of the “space” and “environment” categories as the basis for the concepts of interest. In our opinion, this undeniably important issue has been carefully considered in a sufficient number of works in historical and philosophical retrospective and modern scientific literature.

The difficulty of comparing the terms “educational space” and “educational environment” is determined by the pronounced variability of their interpretations in psychological and pedagogical science. We, therefore, analyzed the definitions of educational space and educational environment separately in order to clarify and systematize their content for accurate further comparison.

Theoretical analysis of the term “educational space”

The first use of the concept “educational space” in Russian scientific psychological and pedagogical literature is associated with the publication by I.D. Frumin and B.D. Elkonin entitled “Educational space as a place of development (‘The School of growing up’)” and published in 1993⁵. According to the figurative expression of Iu.S. Manuilov, “the concept “educational space” <...> has not yet grown past its childhood”⁶.

⁴ N. I. Evsikova y R. A. Kurbanov, “Nekotorye aspekty sootnosheniiia poniatii “Obrazovatelnaia sreda” i “Obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo” v usloviakh sovremennoi reformy otechestvennogo obrazovaniia”, Sovremennaia nauka num 2 (2015): 67-72; L. S. Kolodkina, “Poniatiiia “situatsiiia”, “sreda”, “okrug”, “prostranstvo” v kontekste pedagogicheskogo issledovaniia”, Pedagogicheskoe obrazovanie v Rossii num 6 (2012): 90–93; N. A. Kudriashova; A. V. Novikov y D. N. Slabkaia, “Obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo i obrazovatelnaia sreda kak sfery samoaktualizatsii lichnosti v usloviyah sovremenennogo obshchestva”, Pedagogicheskii zhurnal Vol: 8 num 1A (2018): 311-317 y M. S. Iakushkina, “Obrazovatelnaia sreda i obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo kak poniatiiia sovremennoi pedagogicheskoi nauki”, Chelovek i obrazovanie num 2 Vol: 35 (2013): 66–69.

⁵ I. D. Frumin y D. B. Elkonin, “Obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo kak prostranstvo razvitiia (“Shkola vzrosleniiia”)”, Voprosy psichologii num 1 (1993): 24–33.

⁶ Iu. S. Manuilov, “Sootnoshenie poniatii prostranstvo i sreda v kontekste upravlencheskoi praktiki”, Vestnik of the Kostroma State University. Series: Pedagogika. Psichologija. Sotsiokinetika Vol: 15 num 5 (2009): 83-84.

At present, some experience in analyzing the category of educational space has been accumulated by Russian scholars: the essence of the concept⁷; the history of its emergence⁸; its structure⁹; its properties¹⁰. Researchers, however, indicate that the content of the “educational space” concept cannot be recognized as fully comprehended and well-established. This statement is evidenced by the absence of the term in many modern pedagogical dictionaries.

Among numerous interpretations of the essence of the educational space in Russian psychology and pedagogics, we should first note that in a number of publications, the concept “educational space” is interpreted through the concept “environment”. For example, according to M.S. Iakushkina, “space can be viewed as a pedagogized environment”¹¹. A similar viewpoint is presented in T.V. Kruzhilina’s dissertational study which presents a theoretical characteristic of the educational space as “the environment of pedagogization of the subjects’ consciousness”¹². While stating the existence of such definitions, we cannot agree with them considering the classical construction of a concept definition through genus and types differences to be logically true and, therefore, quoting the words of R.E. Ponomarev, “educational space is, first of all, space!”¹³. Moreover, we consider educational space to be a wider concept in terms of its content, which will be examined in more detail further on.

⁷ A. A. Veriaev y I. K. Shalaev, “Ot obrazovatelnykh sred k obrazovatelnому prostranstvu: poniatie, formirovanie, svoistva”, Pedagog num 4 (1998). Available at: http://www.altspu.ru/Journal/pedagog/pedagog_4/articl_1.html; M. Ia. Vilenskii y E. V. Meshcheriakova, “Obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo kak pedagogicheskaiia kategoriiia”, Pedagogicheskoe obrazovanie i nauka num 2 (2002): 8–12; I. V. Marichev y E. G. Malinochka, “Sushchnost poniatiiia “Obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo”, Vestnik of the Adygea State University. Series 3: Pedagogika i psichologija num 5 Vol: 11 (2001): 11–16; R. E. Ponomarev, Obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo: monografiia (Moscow: MAKS Press, 2014); I. G. Shendrik, “Obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo: teoretiko-metodologicheskii aspect”, Obrazovanie i nauka: Izvestiia Uralskogo otdeleniia RAO. Zhurnal teoreticheskikh i prikladnykh issledovanii num 5 Vol: 11 (2001): 38–54 y E. K. Samerkhanova, “Logiko-soderzhatelnaia kharakteristika obrazovatelnogo prostranstva kak pedagogicheskogo poniatiiia”, Obrazovanie i nauka num 4 (2006): 20–26.

⁸ E. A. Chekunova, Formirovanie obrazovatelnogo prostranstva sovremennoi shkoly v kontekste sociokulturnykh i pedagogicheskikh innovatsii. Diss doctor of pedagogical science (Stavropol, 2012).

⁹ E. I. Isaev y V. I. Slobodchikov, Psichologija obrazovaniia cheloveka: Stanovlenie subektnosti v obrazovatelnykh protsessakh: uchebnoe posobie (Moscow: St. Tikhon Orthodox University publishing house, 2013); L. S. Kolodkina, “Poniatiiia “situatsiia”, “sreda”, “okrug”, “prostranstvo” v kontekste pedagogicheskogo issledovaniia”, Pedagogicheskoe obrazovanie v Rossii num 6 (2012): 90–93 y R. E. Ponomarev, Obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo: monografiia (Moscow: MAKS Press, 2014).

¹⁰ D. V. Grekhovodova y N. M. Sazhina, “Sushchnost, struktura, svoistva obrazovatelnogo prostranstva”, Istoricheskaia i sotsialno-obrazovatelnaia mysl num 1 (2016): 53–58 y A. A. Shogenov, Integratsionnye protsessy kak faktor razvitiia obrazovatelnogo prostranstva polikulturalnogo regiona. Diss doctor of pedagogical science. (Moscow: Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, 2008).

¹¹ M. S. Iakushkina, “Obrazovatelnaia sreda i obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo kak poniatiiia sovremennoi pedagogicheskoi nauki”, Chelovek i obrazovanie num 2 Vol: 35 (2013): 66–69.

¹² T. V. Kruzhilina, Pedagogizatsiia soznaniia subektov obrazovatelnogo prostranstva kak osnova preodoleniia otchuzhdeniia mezhdu pokoleniiami, Diss doctor of pedagogical science (Magnitogorsk, 2002), 160.

¹³ R. E. Ponomarev, Obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo: monografiia...

In a broad sense, the educational space refers to the type of space that exists in society as a place (“arena”, “territory”) where special activities of various (state, public, and mixed) systems aimed at the education and socialization of an individual are carried out. As R.E. Ponomarev states, “in relation to the category of space, educational space carries the essential characteristics of education as a type-related attribute which manifests in the increment of individual culture”¹⁴.

Almost every author emphasizes the multicomponent and systemic nature of the educational space, but many definitions are devoid of specificity and do not reflect the structural components of the category. For example, D.V. Grekhovodova and N.M. Sazhina view the educational space as “a complex integral holistic system consisting of heterogeneous subsystems that perform the function of education (upbringing, training, and development) of an individual”¹⁵. However, the subsystems themselves are not disclosed by the authors.

Let us dwell on the analysis of various interpretations of the structure of educational space. In an array of works, the primary and only components of the educational space are the educational environments of various modalities and levels. According to N.I. Evsikova and R.A. Kurbanova, the structure of the educational space presents “a complex of educational environments of various levels that arise as a result of educational institutions’ functioning within the framework of a uniform regulatory field created by the state in the general sociocultural context”¹⁶. However, the majority of authors interpret the structure of the educational space more broadly. For example, S.V. Krivykh defines the educational space as “a complex of educational institutions, processes, and environments functioning in a specific territory”¹⁷. A similar educational space structure is described by E.I. Isaev and V.I. Slobodchikov¹⁸. In a publication by L.S. Kolodkina, institutions of the education system and non-formal education and the educational environment are named as the components of educational space¹⁹.

It should also be noted that many modern authors list the person as a separate component of the educational space, therefore, accentuating the subjective component. S.N. Gorshenina, I.A. Neiasova, and L.A. Serikova present the educational space as an integral whole consisting of educational environments (spheres, areas) and the inner world of the individual²⁰. In the monograph by R.E. Ponomarev, the person, the educational environment, and their interaction are identified as the basic elements of the educational space structure²¹. In our opinion, one of the most comprehensive and accurate definitions

¹⁴ R. E. Ponomarev, *Obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo: monografiiia...*

¹⁵ D. V. Grekhovodova y N. M. Sazhina, “Sushchnost, struktura, svoistva obrazovatelnogo prostranstva”, *Istoricheskaiia i sotsialno-obrazovatelnaiia mysl* num 1 (2016): 53-58.

¹⁶ N. I. Evsikova y R. A. Kurbanov, “Nekotorye aspekyt sootnosheniia poniatii “Obrazovatelnaiia sreda” i “Obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo” v usloviakh sovremennoi reformy otechestvennogo obrazovaniia”, *Sovremennaia nauka* num 2 (2015): 67-72.

¹⁷ S. V. Krivykh, “Sootnoshenie ponyatiu “sreda” i “prostranstvo” v sotsiokulturnom i obrazovatelnom aspektakh”, *Mir nauki, kultury, obrazovaniia* num 2 (2011): 14–18.

¹⁸ E. I. Isaev y V. I. Slobodchikov, *Psichologiiia obrazovaniia cheloveka: Stanovlenie subektnosti v obrazovatelnykh protsessakh: uchebnoe posobie* (Moscow: St. Tikhon Orthodox University publishing house, 2013).

¹⁹ L. S. Kolodkina, *Poniatiiia “situatsiiia”, “sreda”, “okrug”...*

²⁰ S. N. Gorshenina; I. A. Neiasova y L. A. Serikova, “Polikturnoe obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo kak pedagogicheskii fenomen”, *Istoricheskaiia i sotsialno-obrazovatelnaiia mysl* num 6 (2013): 64–69.

²¹ R. E. Ponomarev. *Obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo: monografiiia...*

of educational space considering its structure and content is suggested by E.K. Samerkhanova. According to the author, the educational space is “a continuum including the education system, the whole variety of connections and relations between the subjects of education, the conditions of their interaction, as well as values, ideas, attitudes, and informational fields”²².

In all the definitions we examined, the educational environment serves as a structural component of the educational space and is, therefore, considered to be more of a narrow category. However, this is only one of the existing viewpoints on the relationship between the concepts “educational space” and “educational environment”. A different position will be examined further.

It should also be highlighted that in the analysis of the educational space concept some authors draw attention to its properties and qualities. In particular, according to D.V. Grekhovodova and N.M. Sazhina, the educational space possesses characteristics of cultural conformity, a humanistic orientation, formability (the possibility of creating certain conditions according to the tasks at hand), and polycentricity²³.

A.A. Shogenov's dissertation highlights the following properties of the educational space:

- multifunctionality (the variety of goals, objectives, and activities);
- multidisciplinarity (the varied range of educational services);
- adaptability and variability (rapid response to changing conditions)²⁴.

The marked properties of the educational space (primarily its variability and formability) allow designing, creating, and implementing various educational space models for the optimal fulfillment of the strategic educational objectives²⁵. The question of educational space levels deserves special attention. The analysis of publications demonstrates that the term “educational space” is mostly being considered on global levels: worldwide, federal, regional, municipal²⁶; more rarely – on a local (institutional) level.

²² E. K. Samerkhanova, “Logiko-soderzhatelnaia kharakteristika obrazovatelnogo prostranstva kak pedagogicheskogo poniatia”, *Obrazovanie i nauka* num 4 (2006): 20-26.

²³ D. V. Grekhovodova y N. M. Sazhina, “Sushchnost, struktura, svoistva obrazovatelnogo prostranstva”, *Istoricheskaia i sotsialno-obrazovatelnaia mysl* num 1 (2016): 53-58.

²⁴ A. A. Shogenov, *Integratsionnye protsessy kak faktor razvitiia obrazovatelnogo prostranstva polikulturnogo regiona*. Diss doctor of pedagogical science. (Moscow: Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, 2008).

²⁵ S. K. Gural y O. A. Obdalova, “Sinergeticheskaiia model razvitiia obrazovatelnogo prostranstva”, *Iazik i kultura* num 4 Vol: 12 (2011): 90–94; R. A. Kasimov y I. N. Razvarina, “Aprobatsiia modeli formirovaniia regionalnogo zdorovesberegaiushchego obrazovatelnogo prostranstva na municipalnom urovne”, *Ekonomicheskie i sotsialnye peremeny: fakty, tendentsii, prognoz* num 5 Vol: 35 (2014): 222-237; A. N. Shilman, *Proektirovanie regionalnogo obrazovatelnogo prostranstva s ispolzovaniem geoinformacionnykh tekhnologii*. Diss doctor of pedagogical science (Elets: Voronezh State Pedagogical University, 2006) y E. A. Chekunova, *Formirovanie obrazovatelnogo prostranstva sovremennoi shkoly v kontekste sociokulturnykh i pedagogicheskikh innovatsii*. Diss doctor of pedagogical science (Stavropol, 2012).

²⁶ B. L. Vulfson, *Obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo na rubezhe vekov* (Moscow: Moscow Psychological and Social Institute, 2006); S. N. Gorshenina; I. A. Neiasova y L. A. Serikova,

In order to fulfill the goal of our work, we also consider it crucial to touch upon the problem of the educational space serving a function of development for the subjects included in it. I.D. Frumin and B.D. Elkonin argue that the educational space serves as “a place of development” only if it is organized as a “school of growing up” and ensures the progression of students’ subjectivity and independence²⁷. The authors specify that at the school level this condition can be implemented through a sequential change in the form of educational work organization (“from classroom work, through laboratory and seminar work to lecture and laboratory work”), as well via the differences in the functionality of working premises (in elementary school, a study room is the main one, in middle school, a laboratory and a room for seminars prevail, and in high school, lecture rooms and places for personal studies in the library become most relevant). In the dissertation research by V.M. Stepanov development-inducing educational space is understood as “a specifically modeled place” that provides optimal trajectories for the development and maturation of a person and for “full expression of individual and age-related opportunities”²⁸. According to the author, the organization of a development-inducing educational space in the school is possible if the principle of unity of general and additional education in one space is fulfilled. We can, therefore, conclude that not every educational space is truly development-inducing.

Theoretical analysis of the term “educational environment”

Like the concept “educational space”, the concept “educational environment” in Russian science is quite young and has been actively applied only over the past few decades. The term “educational environment” is most deeply and multidimensionally examined in eco-psychological research²⁹.

Based on J. Gibson’s ecological approach to perception³⁰, V.A. Iasvin interprets the educational environment as “a system of influences and conditions for the formation of

“Polikturnoe obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo kak pedagogicheskii fenomen”, Istoricheskaiia i sotsialno-obrazovatelnaiia mysl num 6 (2013): 64–69; E. A. Igumnova, “Sistemnyi podkhod kak metodologicheskaiia osnova issledovaniia regionalnogo obrazovatelnogo prostranstva”, Voprosy sovremennoi nauki i praktiki num 3 Vol: 34 (2011): 123-130; R. A. Kasimov y I. N. Razvarina, “Aprobatsiia modeli formirovaniia regionalnogo zdorovesberegaiushchego obrazovatelnogo prostranstva na municipalnom urovne”, Ekonomicheskie i sotsialnye peremeny: fakty, tendentsii, prognoz num 5 Vol: 35 (2014): 222-237; A. M. Kondakov, Otechestvennoe i mirovoe obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo: resursnyi podkhod (Saint Petersburg: Spetsialnaia literature, 2004); A. N. Shilman, Proektirovanie regionalnogo obrazovatelnogo prostranstva s ispolzovaniem geoinformacionnykh tekhnologii. Diss doctor of pedagogical science (Elets: Voronezh State Pedagogical University, 2006) y A. A. Shogenov, Integratsionnye protsessy kak faktor razvitiia obrazovatelnogo prostranstva polikulturalnogo regiona. Diss doctor of pedagogical science (Moscow: Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, 2008).

²⁷ I. D. Frumin y D. B. Elkonin, “Obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo kak prostranstvo razvitiia (“Shkola vzrosleniya”)", Voprosy psichologii num 1 (1993): 24–33.

²⁸ M. N. Stepanov, Organizatsiia razvivaiushchego obrazovatelnogo prostranstva v innovatsionnoi shkole. Diss PhD in pedagogics (Irkutsk, 1999).

²⁹ S. D. Deriabo, Uchitelii o diagnostike effektivnosti obrazovatelnoi sredy (Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia, 1997); V. I. Panov, Ekologicheskaiia psikhologija: Opyt postroeniiia metodologii (Moscow: Nauka, 2004); S. V. Tarasov, Obrazovatelnaiia sreda sovremennoi shkoly: problemy i podkhody k izucheniiu. Kulturno-istoricheskie osnovaniia sozdaniia i razvitiia obrazovatelnoi sredy (Saint Petersburg: SPbSUAM, 2002) y V. A. Iasvin, Obrazovateinaya sreda: ot modelirovaniia k proektirovaniu (Moscow: Smysl, 2001).

³⁰ J. Gibson, The ecological approach to visual perception (Moscow: Progress, 1988).

personality in accordance with a given pattern, as well as opportunities for personality development contained in the social and spatial-objective environment"³¹. The understanding of the term "opportunity" based on J. Gibson's theory is fundamentally important for this definition. V.A. Iasvin emphasizes that while "conditions", "influences", and "factors" belong to the system itself and have a one-way effect on the person in it, the "possibility", according to Gibson, presents a unity of qualities of the educational environment and the person themselves. This approach considers the interaction between the person and the educational environment: the environment offers opportunities for personality development, the person acts to use the opportunities that allow satisfying their needs and, thereby, affects the environment. The more actively and fully the person uses the opportunities of the education system, the more successful their self-development is.

Our analysis of dissertational studies on the educational environment³² demonstrated that V.A. Iasvin's definition of the educational environment underlies the definitions provided by many other authors³³. In particular, in I.A. Baeva's doctoral dissertation, educational environment is interpreted as "a psychological and pedagogical reality containing specially organized conditions for the formation of personality and development opportunities included in the social and spatial-objective environment"³⁴.

The works by S.D. Deriabo³⁵, M.V. Grigoreva³⁶, E.B. Laktionova³⁷, and O.I. Leonova³⁸ indicate that the educational environment contains not only positive resources, conditions, and opportunities, but also various physical and psychological obstacles, barriers, and risks for the subjects of the educational process. According to S.D. Deriabo, the educational environment is "the totality of all the opportunities of training, education, and personal development, both positive and negative"³⁹.

On the basis of cultural-historical theory in psychology, V.V. Rubtsov and T.G. Ivoshina interpret the educational environment as a special "community" based on cooperation between students and teachers that ensures the transfer of the required

³¹ V. A. Iasvin, *Obrazovateinaya sreda...*

³² N. V. Ivanova, "Psichologo-pedagogicheskie issledovaniia obrazovatelnoi sredy shkoly: napravleniia i perspektivy", Sovremennye problemy nauki i obrazovaniia num 3 (2014). Available at: <http://www.science-education.ru/117-13042>

³³ I. A. Baeva, *Psikhologicheskaiia bezopasnost obrazovatelnoi sredy: teoreticheskie osnovy i tekhnologii sozdaniia*. Diss doctor of psychological sciences (Saint Petersburg, 2002); M. V. Grigoreva, *Psihologicheskaiia struktura i dinamika vzaimodeistvii obrazovatelnoi sredy i uchenika v protsesse ego shkolnoi adaptatsii*. Diss doctor of psychological science (Saratov, 2010); E. B. Laktionova, *Psihologicheskaiia ekspertiza obrazovatelnoi sredy* (Saint Petersburg, 2013) y M. P. Nechaev, *Teoreticheskie osnovaniia razvitiia vospituyushchego potentsiala obrazovatelnoi sredy shkoly*. Diss doctor of pedagogical science (Moscow, 2011).

³⁴ I. A. Baeva, *Psikhologicheskaiia bezopasnost obrazovatelnoi sredy: teoreticheskie osnovy i tekhnologii sozdaniia*. Diss doctor of psychological sciences (Saint Petersburg, 2002).

³⁵ S. D. Deriabo, *Uchitelii o diagnostike effektivnosti obrazovatelnoi sredy* (Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia, 1997).

³⁶ M. V. Grigoreva, *Psihologicheskaiia struktura i dinamika vzaimodeistvii obrazovatelnoi sredy i uchenika v protsesse ego shkolnoi adaptatsii*. Diss doctor of psychological science (Saratov, 2010).

³⁷ E. B. Laktionova, *Psihologicheskaiia ekspertiza obrazovatelnoi sredy*. Diss doctor of psychological science (Saint Petersburg, 2013).

³⁸ O. I. Leonova, *Vliianie psihologicheskikh riskov obrazovatelnoi sredy na emotSIONALNOLICHNOSTNUIU sferu podrostkov*. Diss PhD in psychology (Moscow, 2011).

³⁹ S. D. Deriabo, *Uchitelii o diagnostike effektivnosti obrazovatelnoi sredy* (Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia, 1997).

“standards of living” to school students (knowledge, competencies, educational and communication skills) and creates conditions for solving the problems of age-related development⁴⁰. The importance of communication between the participants of the educational process for understanding the essence of the educational environment is noted by other authors as well. M.V. Naianova and V.I. Panov emphasize that the educational environment arises as a result of the student “meeting” the teacher and the entirety of the educational space which the teacher represents⁴¹. I.A. Baeva notes that it is the totality of relationships and activity and communicative acts of the educational process participants that make up the “psychological essence of the educational environment”⁴².

The analysis of psychological and pedagogical research allows us to state that similarly to the educational space, the educational environment is defined as a complex systemic object, but the allocation and justification of the structural units of the educational environment are both quantitatively and substantially diverse. Most researchers identify spatial-objective, social, and psychodidactic components of the structure of the educational environment.

The spatial-objective component refers to a collection of spatial and object units (buildings, premises, adjoining territories, furniture, appliances, manuals, attributes), their qualitative and functional characteristics (architecture, design, infrastructure, transformability, etc.). This component of the educational environment has different names: physical⁴³; spatially semantic⁴⁴, material⁴⁵. It has been experimentally confirmed that the spatial-objective component has an integral effect on the subject of the educational environment and their emotional, cognitive, and moral development⁴⁶.

As argued by V.A. Iasvin, the social component of the educational environment can not be reduced to the “personnel” of the educational environment and primarily includes “the nature of communication between the subjects of the educational process”⁴⁷. V.V. Rubtsov and T.G. Ivoshina define the social component of the educational environment

⁴⁰ V. V. Rubtsov y T. G. Ivoshina, *Proektirovanie razvivaiushchei obrazovatelnoi sredy shkoly* (Moscow: Moscow State Psychological and Pedagogical University publishing house, 2002).

⁴¹ M. N. Naianova y V. I. Panov, “Dialog kak printsip i uslovie razvivaiushchei obrazovatelnoi sredy”, *Vestnik of the People’s Friendship University of Russia. Series: Psichologija i pedagogika* num 1 (2003): 146-154.

⁴² I. A. Baeva, *Psikhologicheskaja bezopasnost obrazovatelnoi sredy: teoreticheskie osnovy i tekhnologii sozdaniia*. Diss doctor of psychological sciences (Saint Petersburg, 2002).

⁴³ M. V. Grigoreva, *Psihologicheskaja struktura i dinamika vzaimodeistvij obrazovatelnoi sredy i uchenika v protsesse ego shkolnoi adaptatsii*. Diss doctor of psychological science (Saratov, 2010).

⁴⁴ S. V. Tarasov, *Obrazovatelnaia sreda sovremennoi shkoly: problemy i podkhody k izucheniiu. Kulturno-istoricheskie osnovaniia sozdaniia i razvitiia obrazovatelnoi sredy* (Saint Petersburg: SPbSUAM, 2002).

⁴⁵ S. M. Golovleva, “Komponenty obrazovatelnoi sredy subektno-orientirovannogo tipa pedagogicheskogo processa”, *Yaroslavl Pedagogical Bulletin* num 4 (2015): 18–20.

⁴⁶ T. V. Doronina, “Vozrastnye osobennosti vospriятиia prostranstvenno-predmetnogo komponenta obrazovatelnoi sredy”, *Psihologicheskaja nauka i obrazovanie* num 1 (2012). Available at: <http://psyedu.ru/journal/2012/1/2774.phtml>; E. B. Laktionova, *Psihologicheskaja ekspertiza obrazovatelnoi sredy* Diss doctor of psychological science (Saint Petersburg, 2013) y E. A. Soloveva, “Issledovanie roli predmetno-prostranstvennogo komponenta v formirovaniii obrazovatelnoi sredy vuza”, *Izvestiia of the Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia* num 5 Vol: 12 (2005): 83-95.

⁴⁷ V. A. Iasvin, *Obrazovateinaya sreda: ot modelirovaniia k proektirovaniu* (Moscow: Smysl, 2001).

structure as “a form of child-adult community” inherent to a certain type of culture⁴⁸. When disclosing the content of the social component of the educational environment, V.I. Panov focuses on the types of communication between its subjects: students, teachers, and parents. For this reason, the author calls this component of the educational environment a communicative component⁴⁹. Thus, according to Russian researchers, the social component of the educational environment presents a system of interpersonal relationships and interactions of its subjects.

The psychodidactic component, also being called the technological, active, and content-methodical component, includes the content of the training (concepts, programs) and its methods, technologies, and forms determined by the objectives of the educational process and corresponding to the psychological, physiological, and age-related characteristics of child development. V.A. Iasvin notes the particular importance of this component for the entire educational environment since it sets the strategic guidelines for the design of the educational environment as a whole: “in accordance with the key psychodidactic idea, certain requirements are put forward for the design of both social and spatial-objective components of the educational environment”⁵⁰.

The examined components of the educational environment (spatial-objective, social, and psychodidactic) are, in our opinion, invariant for various educational environments. It should be noted that a number of authors identify other components of the educational environment structure. However, the analysis of its content shows these factors to be similar to the ones discussed above. For example, the dissertation research by O.Iu. Mondonen⁵¹ and O.A. Nazarchuk⁵² identifies the information component of the educational environment which refers to study curricula, programs, methodical developments, books, visual and textual information, informational and advertising objects, and Internet sites. We consider it impractical to distinguish the informational component as a separate component of the educational environment since its elements listed by the authors fit the invariant components of the educational environment. The presence of various objects of visual information (stands, scoreboards, announcements) essentially refers to the spatial-objective component and characterizes its informational richness. Visual aids, information sources, and the didactic support used in the educational process are the elements of the psychodidactic component of the educational environment. Thus, it can be stated that the structural aspect of the educational environment is interpreted by Russian authors as a systematic collection of material factors of the educational process, interpersonal relations of various subjects of education, and the psychological and pedagogical conditions of training, upbringing, and personality development.

Similarly to the educational space, the educational environment has various levels of functioning. The vast majority of dissertational research⁵³ is focused on the study of

⁴⁸ V. V. Rubtsov y T. G. Ivoshina, *Proektirovanie razvivaiushchei obrazovatelnoi sredy shkoly* (Moscow: Moscow State Psychological and Pedagogical University publishing house, 2002).

⁴⁹ V. I. Panov, *Ekologicheskaiia psihologiiia: Opyt postroeniia metodologii* (Moscow: Nauka, 2004).

⁵⁰ V. A. Iasvin, *Obrazovateinaya sreda: ot modelirovaniia k proektirovaniu* (Moscow: Smysl, 2001).

⁵¹ O. Lu. Mondonen, *Obrazovatelnaiia sreda pedagogicheskogo kolledzha kak faktor professionalnogo samoopredeleniia studentov*. Diss PhD in pedagogics (Saint Petersburg, 2006).

⁵² O. A. Nazarchuk, *Obrazovatelnaiia sreda shkoly kak uslovie formirovaniia grazhdanskoi aktivnosti uchashchihsia*. Diss PhD in pedagogics (Pyatigorsk, 2014).

⁵³ I. A. Baeva, *Psikhologicheskaiia bezopasnost obrazovatelnoi sredy: teoreticheskie osnovy i tekhnologii sozdaniia*. Diss doctor of psychological sciences (Saint Petersburg, 2002); M. V. Grigoreva, *Psihologicheskaiia struktura i dinamika vzaimodeistvii obrazovatelnoi sredy u uchenika v*

local educational environments functioning within a specific institution (school, college, university, preschool institution). At the moment, scholars have developed and tested various models of local educational environments. Some authors also distinguish educational microenvironments organized by specific teachers and educational macroenvironments at the regional and federal levels. However, the latter have been studied to a much lesser extent.

We consider it important to highlight that, according to Russian scholars, not every educational environment promotes development. Educational environments can be indifferent to personality development or suppress personality.

Modern psychological and pedagogical science in Russia presents the following substantial characteristics of a development-inducing educational environment:

- it provides every subject of the educational process (students, teachers, and parents) with self-development opportunities⁵⁴;
- it is psychologically safe⁵⁵,
- it implements the principle of dialogue in content construction, the methods of learning and development, and the socialization of students⁵⁶.

Results and Discussion

Based on the theoretical analysis of the “educational space” and “educational environment” concept semantics in various authors’ definitions, a number of conclusions can be formulated. We should first note that in Russian psychological and pedagogical publications the concepts in question are sometimes perceived as identical and used as synonymous⁵⁷. Along with the majority of authors, we do not stand by this approach. The terms “educational environment” and “educational space” are derived from different categories using the same type-forming distinction (“educational”) and, therefore, cannot be considered identical or synonymous.

prosesse ego shkolnoi adaptatsii. Diss doctor of psychological science (Saratov, 2010); E. B. Laktionova, Psihologicheskaiia ekspertiza obrazovatelnoi sredy. Diss doctor of psychological science (Saint Petersburg, 2013); O. Lu. Mondonen, Obrazovatelnaiia sreda pedagogicheskogo kolledzha kak faktor professionalnogo samoopredeleniia studentov. Diss PhD in pedagogics (Saint Petersburg, 2006); O. A. Nazarchuk, Obrazovatelnaiia sreda shkoly kak uslovie formirovaniia grazhdanskoi aktivnosti uchashchihsia. Diss PhD in pedagogics (Pyatigorsk, 2014) y M. P. Nechaev, Teoreticheskie osnovaniia razvitiia vospituyaiushchego potentsiala obrazovatelnoi sredy shkoly. Diss doctor of pedagogical science (Moscow, 2011).

⁵⁴ V. A. Iasvin, Obrazovateinaya sreda: ot modelirovaniia k proektirovaniu (Moscow: Smysl, 2001).

⁵⁵ I. A. Baeva, Psikhologicheskaiia bezopasnost obrazovatelnoi sredy: teoreticheskie osnovy i tekhnologii sozdaniia. Diss doctor of psychological sciences (Saint Petersburg, 2002).

⁵⁶ M. N. Naianova y V. I. Panov, “Dialog kak printsip i uslovie razvivayushchego obrazovatelnoi sredy”, Vestnik of the People’s Friendship University of Russia. Series: Psihologija i pedagogika num 1 (2003): 146-154.

⁵⁷ I. P. Chepurshkin, “Gumanizatsiia obrazovatelnogo prostranstva (sredy) obrazovatelnogo uchrezhdeniia”, University bulletin num 13 (2011): 133-136 y G. V. Sorina y V. S. Meskov, “Sotsiokulturnoe izmenenie obrazovatelnogo prostranstva”, Tsennosti i smysly num 5 Vol: 27 (2013): 83-99.

Nonetheless, the examined categories definitely have common grounds, similarities, and shared features:

1. Both are characterized by the focus on the objectives of education, being “environments” external to the subject of the educational process.
2. Both are means of transmitting social experience and mastering culture.
3. Both are structurally defined as complex integral holistic systems composed of multiple subsystems.
4. Both are irreducible to the social aspect alone and include physical parameters.
5. Both possess the feature of variability and dynamism.
6. Both can act as an object of pedagogical and psychological modeling aimed at ensuring optimal educational conditions and opportunities.
7. Both have several levels of functioning.
8. Both can promote development under certain conditions.

Despite certain proximity and similarities of the concepts “educational environment” and “educational space”, they present independent categories. Russian authors indicate the following significant differences between the educational space and educational environment:

- 1) while the educational environment is interpreted as a phenomenon lacking clearly fixed spatial limits, the educational space has certain given spatial coordinates, contours, loci, and characteristics⁵⁸.
- 2) locality is more typical of the educational environment and globality in perception and impact is characteristic of the educational space⁵⁹
- 3) in the context of management practice, the educational space serves as a resource (material, tool) for modeling education systems, complexes, and environments and the educational environment is used for constructing optimal conditions for human development and managing the process of personality formation⁶⁰.

⁵⁸ E. A. Chekunova, *Formirovaniye obrazovatel'nogo prostranstva sovremennoi shkoly v kontekste sociokulturnykh i pedagogicheskikh innovatsii*. Diss doctor of pedagogical science (Stavropol, 2012) y M. S. Iakushkina, “Obrazovatel'naya sreda i obrazovatel'noe prostranstvo kak poniatiiia sovremennoi pedagogicheskoi nauki”, *Chelovek i obrazovanie* num 2 Vol: 35 (2013): 66–69.

⁵⁹ A. A. Veriaev y I. K. Shalaev, “Ot obrazovatelnykh sred k obrazovatel'nому prostranstvu: poniatie, formirovaniye, svoistva”, *Pedagog* num 4 (1998). Available at: http://www.altspu.ru/Journal/pedagog/pedagog_4/articl_1.html; E. A. Igumnova, “Sistemnyi podkhod kak metodologicheskaiia osnova issledovaniia regionalnogo obrazovatel'nogo prostranstva”, *Voprosy sovremennoi nauki i praktiki* num 3 Vol: 34 (2011): 123-130 y R. E. Ponomarev. *Obrazovatel'noe prostranstvo: monografiia...*

⁶⁰ Iu. S. Manuilov, “Soothoshenie poniatii prostranstvo i sreda v kontekste upravlencheskoi praktiki”, *Vestnik of the Kostroma State University. Series: Pedagogika. Psichologiya. Sotsiokinetika* Vol: 15

We fundamentally disagree with a number of differences between the educational space and the educational environment identified by Russian authors. For example, A.G. Kornilova claims that the “educational space” presents a category and the concept “educational environment” is “associated with educational situations and activities carried out within an educational institution” and is not a category⁶¹. We believe that the concept “educational environment” in modern pedagogical and psychological science fully acts as a significant generic concept derived from a host of narrower, more specific concepts and can, therefore, be considered and interpreted as a category.

We also do not share the point of view, according to which, the difference between the categories in question is that the educational space does not imply the obligatory inclusion, the presence of a student⁶². In our opinion, the absence of a person in the educational space makes it impossible to implement the educational process and consequentially deprives the educational space of its essential property. We are unanimous with the researchers who distinguish the subject of education as a part of the structure of the educational space⁶³. It should be highlighted as another conclusion that at present, there are two opposing viewpoints regarding the hierarchy of the concepts under consideration in Russian science. The first position argues that the educational space presents a certain part of the educational environment that possesses special qualities and characteristics (Iu.V. Kopylenko, V.G. Kinelev, G.P. Serikov, E.B. Soshneva, L.A. Sankin, R. Everman, etc.). We believe another viewpoint to be constructive and accurate, the one that suggests the educational environment to be a component, a part of the educational space and recognizes the concept of educational space as the wider, more capacious, “integrative educational” one (S.N. Gorshenina, I.A. Neiasova, L.A. Serikova, E.I. Isaev, S.V. Krivykh, L.S. Kolodkina, R.E. Ponomarev, E.K. Samerkhanova, V.I. Slobodchikov). This viewpoint is based on recognizing the concept of space as a “prime phenomenon”⁶⁴, an “absolute abstraction”⁶⁵. According to I.G. Shendrik, the concept of space “is initial, it is

num 5 (2009): 83-84 y V. A. Iasvin, *Obrazovateinaya sreda: ot modelirovaniia k proektirovaniyu* (Moscow: Smysl, 2001).

⁶¹ A. G. Kornilova, “Kontseptualnye osnovy formirovaniia tselostnogo obrazovatelnogo prostranstva vuza”, *Fundamentalnye issledovaniia* num 3 (2012): 595-597.

⁶² E. A. Igumnova, “Sistemnyi podkhod kak metodologicheskaiia osnova issledovaniia regionalnogo obrazovatelnogo prostranstva”, *Voprosy sovremennoi nauki i praktiki* num 3 Vol: 34 (2011): 123-130; N. I. Evsikova y R. A. Kurbanov, “Nekotorye aspekty sootnosheniia poniatii “Obrazovatelnaia sreda” i “Obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo” v usloviakh sovremennoi reformy otechestvennogo obrazovaniia”, *Sovremennaia nauka* num 2 (2015): 67-72; V. A. Kozyrev, *Teoreticheskie osnovy razvitiia gumanitarnoi obrazovatelnoi sredy pedagogicheskogo universiteta: monografiia* (Saint Petersburg: Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia publishing house, 1999) y A. N. Shilman, *Proektirovanie regionalnogo obrazovatelnogo prostranstva s ispolzovaniem geoinformacionnykh tekhnologii*. Diss doctor of pedagogical science (Elets: Voronezh State Pedagogical University, 2006).

⁶³ S. N. Gorshenina; I. A. Neiasova y L. A. Serikova, “Polikulturnoe obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo kak pedagogicheskii fenomen”, *Istoricheskaiia i sotsialno-obrazovatelnaiia mysl* num 6 (2013): 64–69; R. E. Ponomarev. *Obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo: monografiia...* y E. K. Samerkhanova, “Logiko-soderzhatelnaia kharakteristika obrazovatelnogo prostranstva kak pedagogicheskogo poniatiiia”, *Obrazovanie i nauka* num 4 (2006): 20-26.

⁶⁴ I. V. Marichev y E. G. Malinochka, “Sushchnost poniatiiia “Obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo”, *Vestnik of the Adygea State University. Series 3: Pedagogika i psichologiiia* num 5 Vol: 11 (2001): 11–16.

⁶⁵ I. G. Shendrik, “Obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo: teoretko-metodologicheskii aspect”, *Obrazovanie i nauka: Izvestiia Ural'skogo otdeleniiia RAO. Zhurnal teoreticheskikh i prikladnykh issledovanii* num 5 Vol: 11 (2001): 38–54.

possible to fix the unity of diverse phenomena in the integrity of the world⁶⁶ and the definition of the environment in S.I. Ozhegov's explanatory dictionary of the Russian language states that the environment is the exact medium that “fills” space⁶⁷. As was discussed above, the representatives of this viewpoint interpret the educational environment as one of the structural components of the educational space. We consider many authors to be rightful in noting that at present, the category of educational space can be considered a primary concept of the theory of education and “embrace the whole reality of education in its content”⁶⁸. The globality of the “educational space” category is noted in a fundamental work by E.I. Isaev and V.I. Slobodchikov entitled “The psychology of human education”, which presents the model of the entire education system through the structure of educational space⁶⁹.

Conclusions

We emphasize that the goal of our study was not a strict demarcation of the “educational space” and “educational environment” categories but the identification of specifics and similarities in the content of these complex concepts aimed at a deeper understanding of their essence. On the basis of conducted theoretical analysis, we summarize the various approaches to the definition of content, structure, characteristics, and levels of the examined terms in modern Russian scientific publications, including dissertational research.

It was found that the categories of “educational space” and “educational environment” have a number of significant similarities. Making this conclusion, we do not claim it to be new, but significantly expand the list of common features compared to other authors.

We discovered that the contrast between the concepts of interest causes a particularly acute debate in the psychological and pedagogical publications of Russian authors concerning the problems of the educational space and the educational environment. In particular, at the moment, there are two opposing positions regarding the hierarchy of the analyzed concepts. We support the viewpoint arguing that the educational environment serves as a component of the educational space.

In the present article, we express disagreement with the positions of researchers who consider the educational space and the educational environment as synonymous concepts, propose the possibility of the absence of a person in the educational space, and believe that the educational environment cannot be considered as a scientific category. In general, based on the theoretical analysis of Russian scientific research on the phenomenology and the relationship between the concepts “educational space” and

⁶⁶ I. G. Shendrik, “Obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo: teoretiko-metodologicheskii aspect”, *Obrazovanie i nauka: Izvestiya Uralskogo otdeleniya RAO. Zhurnal teoreticheskikh i prikladnykh issledovanii* num 5 Vol: 11 (2001).

⁶⁷ S. I. Ozhegov y N. Lu. Shvedova, *Tolkovyj slovar russkogo jazyka* (Moscow: “ITI TEKHOLOGII” LLC, 2003).

⁶⁸ N. A. Kudriashova; A. V. Novikov y D. N. Slabkaia, “Obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo i obrazovatelnaia sreda kak sfery samoaktualizatsii lichnosti v usloviyakh sovremenennogo obshchestva”, *Pedagogicheskii zhurnal* Vol: 8 num 1A (2018): 311-317.

⁶⁹ E. I. Isaev y V. I. Slobodchikov, *Psichologija obrazovaniia cheloveka: Stanovlenie subektnosti v obrazovatelnykh protsessakh: uchebnoe posobie* (Moscow: St. Tikhon Orthodox University publishing house, 2013).

“educational environment”, we believe that these concepts should be recognized as interrelated but not identical, having a number of fundamental differences, and hierarchically distinguished.

On the basis of the conducted analysis, the need for the introduction of said terms in professional pedagogical and psychological dictionaries and for the expansion of the thesaurus in the text of the “On Education in the Russian Federation” law becomes evident. The next stage of our research is the development and approbation of courses aimed at the mastery of the concepts “educational space” and “educational environment” by practitioners for the system of advanced training and retraining of teachers.

Acknowledgments

The authors express gratitude to Oksana Viacheslavovna Kolesova for organizational assistance in conducting a survey of teachers on the basis of the Nizhny Novgorod Institute for the Development of Education in order to study the knowledge practicing specialists possess on the concepts “educational space” and “educational environment”.

References

- Baeva, I. A. Psichologicheskaiia bezopasnost obrazovatelnoi sredy: teoreticheskie osnovy i tekhnologii sozdaniia. Diss doctor of psychological sciences. Saint Petersburg. 2002.
- Chekunova, E. A. Formirovaniye obrazovatelnogo prostranstva sovremennoi shkoly v kontekste sociokulturnykh i pedagogicheskikh innovatsii. Diss doctor of pedagogical science. Stavropol. 2012.
- Chepurushkin, I. P. “Gumanizatsiia obrazovatelnogo prostranstva (sredy) obrazovatelnogo uchrezhdeniiia”. University bulletin num 13 (2011): 133-136.
- Deriabo, S. D. Uchitelii o diagnostike effektivnosti obrazovatelnoi sredy. Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia. 1997.
- Doronina, T. V. “Vozrastnye osobennosti vospriятия prostranstvenno-predmetnogo komponenta obrazovatelnoi sredy”. Psihologicheskaiia nauka i obrazovanie num 1 (2012). Available at: <http://psyedu.ru/journal/2012/1/2774.phtml>
- Evsikova, N. I. y Kurbanov, R. A. “Nekotorye aspekty sootnosheniiia poniatii “Obrazovatelnaiia sreda” i “Obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo” v usloviiakh sovremennoi reformy otechestvennogo obrazovaniia”. Sovremennaia nauka num 2 (2015): 67-72.
- Federal Law of the Russian Federation No. 273-FZ “On Education in the Russian Federation”. Rossiiskaia gazeta. December 29. 2012.
- Federalnyi gosudarstvennyi obrazovatelnyi standart nachalnogo obshchego obrazovaniia. Moscow: Prosveshchenie. 2011.
- Frumin, I. D. y Elkonin, D. B. “Obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo kak prostranstvo razvitiia (“Shkola vzrosleniia”)”. Voprosy psichologii num 1 (1993): 24–33.

- Gibson, J. The ecological approach to visual perception. Moscow: Progress. 1988.
- Golovleva, S. M. “Komponenty obrazovatelnoi sredy subektno-orientirovannogo tipa pedagogicheskogo processa”. Yaroslavl Pedagogical Bulletin num 4 (2015): 18–20.
- Gorshenina, S. N., Neiasova, I. A., Serikova, L. A. “Polikulturnoe obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo kak pedagogicheskii fenomen”. Istoricheskaiia i sotsialno-obrazovatelnaia mysl num 6 (2013): 64–69.
- Grekhovodova, D. V. y Sazhina, N. M. “Sushchnost, struktura, svoistva obrazovatelnogo prostranstva”. Istoricheskaiia i sotsialno-obrazovatelnaia mysl num 1 (2016): 53-58.
- Grigoreva, M. V. Psihologicheskaiia struktura i dinamika vzaimodeistvii obrazovatelnoi sredy i uchenika v protsesse ego shkolnoi adaptatsii: Diss doctor of psychological science. Saratov. 2010.
- Gural, S. K. y Obdalova, O. A. “Sinergeticheskaiia model razvitiia obrazovatelnogo prostranstva”. Iazik i kultura num 4 Vol: 12 (2011): 90–94.
- Iakushkina, M. S. “Obrazovatelnaia sreda i obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo kak poniatiiia sovremennoi pedagogicheskoi nauki”. Chelovek i obrazovanie num 2 Vol: 35 (2013): 66–69.
- Iasvin, V. A. Obrazovateinaya sreda: ot modelirovaniia k proektirovaniu. Moscow: Smysl. 2001.
- Igumnova, E. A. “Sistemnyi podkhod kak metodologicheskaiia osnova issledovaniia regionalnogo obrazovatelnogo prostranstva”. Voprosy sovremennoi nauki i praktiki num 3 Vol: 34 (2011): 123-130.
- Isaev, E. I. y Slobodchikov, V. I. Psihologiia obrazovaniia cheloveka: Stanovlenie subektnosti v obrazovatelnykh protsessakh: uchebnoe posobie. Moscow: St. Tikhon Orthodox University publishing house. 2013.
- Ivanova, N. V. “Psikhologo-pedagogicheskie issledovaniia obrazovatelnoi sredy shkoly: napravleniia i perspektivy”. Sovremennye problemy nauki i obrazovaniia num 3 (2014). Available at: <http://www.science-education.ru/117-13042>
- Ivanova, N. V. y Minaeva, E. V. “Predstavleniia uchitelei nachalnykh klassov o sushchnosti poniatiiia “obrazovatelnaia sreda”. European Social Science Journal Vol: 12 num 1 (2016): 260-265.
- Kasimov, R. A. y Razvarina, I. N. “Aprobatsiia modeli formirovaniia regionalnogo zdorovesberegaiushchego obrazovatelnogo prostranstva na municipalnom urovne”. Ekonomicheskie i sotsialnye peremeny: fakty, tendentsii, prognoz num 5 Vol: 35 (2014): 222-237.
- Kolodkina, L. S. “Poniatiiia “situatsiia”, “sreda”, “okrug”, “prostranstvo” v kontekste pedagogicheskogo issledovaniia”. Pedagogicheskoe obrazovanie v Rossii num 6 (2012): 90–93.

Kondakov, A. M. Otechestvennoe i mirovoe obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo: resursnyi podkhod. Saint Petersburg: Spetsialnaia literatura. 2004.

Kornilova, A. G. “Kontseptualnye osnovy formirovaniia tselostnogo obrazovatelnogo prostranstva vuza”. Fundamentalnye issledovaniia num 3 (2012): 595-597.

Kozyrev, V. A. Teoreticheskie osnovy razvitiia gumanitarnoi obrazovatelnoi sredy pedagogicheskogo universiteta: monografiiia. Saint Petersburg: Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia publishing house. 1999.

Krivykh, S. V. “Sootnoshenie ponyati “sreda” i “prostranstvo” v sotsiokulturnom i obrazovatelnom aspektakh”. Mir nauki, kultury, obrazovaniia num 2 (2011): 14–18.

Kruzhilina, T. V. “Pedagogizatsiia soznaniiia subektov obrazovatelnogo prostranstva kak osnova preodoleniiia otchuzhdeniiia mezhdu pokoleniiami”. Diss doctor of pedagogical science. Magnitogorsk. 2002.

Kudriashova, N. A.; Novikov, A. V. y Slabkaia, D. N. “Obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo i obrazovatelnaiia sreda kak sfery samoaktualizatsii lichnosti v usloviyakh sovremenennogo obshchestva”. Pedagogicheskii zhurnal Vol: 8 num 1A (2018): 311-317.

Laktionova, E. B. Psihologicheskaiia ekspertiza obrazovatelnoi sredy. Diss doctor of psychological science. Saint Petersburg. 2013.

Leonova, O. I. Vliianie psihologicheskikh riskov obrazovatelnoi sredy na emotsionalno-lichnostnuui sferu podrostkov. Diss PhD in psychology. Moscow. 2011.

Manuilov, Iu. S. “Sootnoshenie ponyati prostranstvo i sreda v kontekste upravlencheskoi praktiki”. Vestnik of the Kostroma State University. Series: Pedagogika. Psikhologija. Sotsiokinetika Vol: 15 num 5 (2009): 83-84.

Marichev, I. V. y Malinochka, E. G. “Sushchnost ponyatiia “Obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo”. Vestnik of the Adygea State University. Series 3: Pedagogika i psikhologija num 5 Vol: 11 (2001): 11–16.

Mondonen, O. Iu. Obrazovatelnaiia sreda pedagogicheskogo kolledzha kak faktor professionalnogo samoopredeleniiia studentov. Diss PhD in pedagogics. Saint Petersburg. 2006.

Naianova, M. V. y Panov, V. I. “Dialog kak printsip i uslovie razvivaiushchei obrazovatelnoi sredy”. Vestnik of the People’s Friendship University of Russia. Series: Psihologija i pedagogika num 1 (2003): 146-154.

Nazarchuk, O. A. Obrazovatelnaiia sreda shkoly kak uslovie formirovaniia grazhdanskoi aktivnosti uchashchihsia. Diss PhD in pedagogics. Pyatigorsk. 2014.

Nechaev, M. P. Teoreticheskie osnovaniia razvitiia vospityvaiushchego potentsiala obrazovatelnoi sredy shkoly. Diss doctor of pedagogical science. Moscow. 2011.

Ozhegov, S. I. y Shvedova, N. Iu. Tolkovyi slovar russkogo. Moscow: “ITI TEKHOLOGII” LLC. 2003.

Panov, V. I. Ekologicheskaiia psikhologiiia: Opyt postroeniia metodologii. Moscow: Nauka. 2004.

Ponomarev, R. E. Obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo: monografiia. Moscow: MAKS Press. 2014.

Rubtsov, V. V. y Ivoshina, T. G. Proektirovanie razvivaiushchhei obrazovatelnoi sredy shkoly. Moscow: Moscow State Psychological and Pedagogical University publishing house. 2002.

Samerkhanova, E. K. “Logiko-soderzhatelnaiia kharakteristika obrazovatelnogo prostranstva kak pedagogicheskogo poniatiiia”. Obrazovanie i nauka num 4 (2006): 20-26.

Shendrik, I. G. “Obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo: teoretiko-metodologicheskii aspect”. Obrazovanie i nauka: Izvestiia Uralskogo otdeleniia RAO. Zhurnal teoreticheskikh i prikladnykh issledovanii num 5 Vol: 11 (2001): 38–54.

Shilman, A. N. Proektirovanie regionalnogo obrazovatelnogo prostranstva s ispolzovaniem geoinformacionnykh tekhnologii. Diss doctor of pedagogical science. Elets: Voronezh State Pedagogical University. 2006.

Shogenov, A. A. Integratsionnye protsessy kak faktor razvitiia obrazovatelnogo prostranstva polikultural'nogo regiona. Diss doctor of pedagogical science. Moscow: Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration. 2008.

Soloveva, E. A. “Issledovanie roli predmetno-prostranstvennogo komponenta v formirovaniis obrazovatelnoi sredy vuza”. Izvestiia of the Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia num 5 Vol: 12 (2005): 83-95.

Sorina, G. V. y Meskov, V. S. “Sotsiokulturnoe izmenenie obrazovatelnogo prostranstva”. Tsennosti i smysly num 5 Vol: 27 (2013): 83-99.

Stepanov, M. V. Organizatsiia razvivaiushchego obrazovatelnogo prostranstva v innovatsionnoi shkole: Diss PhD in pedagogics. Irkutsk. 1999.

Tarasov, S. V. Obrazovatelnaiia sreda sovremennoi shkoly: problemy i podkhody k izucheniiu. Kulturno-istoricheskie osnovaniia sozdaniia i razvitiia obrazovatelnoi sredy. Saint Petersburg: SPbSUAM. 2002.

Veriaeiv, A. A. y Shalaev, I. K. “Ot obrazovatelnikh sred k obrazovatelnomu prostranstvu: poniatie, formirovanie, svoistva”. Pedagog num 4 (1998). Available at: http://www.altspu.ru/Journal/pedagog/pedagog_4/article_1.html

Vilenskii, M. Ia. y Meshcheriakova, E. V. “Obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo kak pedagogicheskaiia kategoriiia”. Pedagogicheskoe obrazovanie i nauka num 2 (2002): 8–12.

The relationship between The categories “Educational environment” and “Educational space” in Russian... pág. 118

Vulfson, B. L. Obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo na rubezhe vekov. Moscow: Moscow Psychological and Social Institute. 2006.

CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA EDITORIAL

Las opiniones, análisis y conclusiones del autor son de su responsabilidad
y no necesariamente reflejan el pensamiento de **Revista Inclusiones**.

La reproducción parcial y/o total de este artículo
debe hacerse con permiso de **Revista Inclusiones**.