

# NORMAL UNIVERSITY AND LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATION

---

УДК 378.637(470.5)  
ББК 4448.94

ГРНТИ 14.01.11

Код ВАК 13.00.08

## **Rubina Lyudmila Yakovlevna,**

Doctor of Philosophy, Professor, Ural State Pedagogical University; 620017, Ekaterinburg, Cosmonauts Ave, 26, Office 230;  
e-mail: rubina@uspu.me.

### **HUMANIZATION AND TECHNOLOGIZATION OF LEADERSHIP IN PEDAGOGICAL EDUCATION: DILEMMA OR DICHOTOMY?**

**KEYWORDS:** pedagogical education; leadership; leadership properties; leadership culture; dichotomy of humanization; dichotomy of technologization.

**ABSTRACT.** The article deals with peculiarities of leadership in pedagogical education in the unity of two processes – humanization and technologization of education. Its aim is to show that their unity cannot be a dilemma, the same as the relationship between upbringing and education cannot be a dilemma either. This relationship is basically a dichotomy. It is revealed in the complex controversial unity of two aspects of the common process of development aimed at establishment of the leading status of pedagogical education.

In contrast to the traditional approaches, the leadership of this education is considered in the framework of a cluster model of its functioning and is described on the experience of the USPU activity as the center of the Regional pedagogical cluster. *This position of the University rests on its self-efficiency, concentration on its site of the components of the system of training specialists for all levels of education and all types of schools. It is the main goal of the basic and additional education, various forms of professional advancement of pedagogues, and continuing education.*

The institutional approach to leadership is accompanied by the analysis of the problems under study on the personality level. Here, the dichotomy of interaction between humanization and technologization in pedagogical education is revealed via the activity of its subjects. The personality of the administrator of the leading industrial higher education institution should combine administrative and professional leadership. The notion of the “modern leader” is further specified; we also determine the peculiarities of his/her role behavior associated with decision making and goal achievement. The problems of revealing and developing the leadership properties of future teachers are looked upon from the point of view their interests and readiness to carry out professional activity presupposing the need to discover and use the leadership potential of their future pupils. The contemporary graduates of pedagogical higher education institutions face future work with a generation far from being simple, who do not only master new knowledge and technologies in a different manner but also possess a different set of life values. The practice of realization of leadership programs, organization of pedagogical classes and pedagogical internship enhances interest towards the pedagogical profession and reinforces the corresponding motivation.

## **Рубина Людмила Яковлевна,**

доктор философских наук, профессор, Уральский государственный педагогический университет; 620017, г. Екатеринбург, пр-т Космонавтов, 26, к. 230; e-mail: rubina@uspu.me.

### **ГУМАНИЗАЦИЯ И ТЕХНОЛОГИЗАЦИЯ ЛИДЕРСТВА В ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКОМ ОБРАЗОВАНИИ: ДИЛЕММА ИЛИ ДИХОТОМИЯ?**

**КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА:** педагогическое образование; лидерство; лидерские качества; культура лидерства; дихотомия гуманизации; дихотомия технологизации.

**АННОТАЦИЯ.** В статье рассматриваются особенности лидерства в педагогическом образовании в единстве двух процессов – гуманизации и технологизации образования. Ее цель – показать, что их связь не может быть дилеммой, как не может быть таковой связь воспитания и обучения. Это взаимосвязь по своему характеру является дихотомической. Она проявляется в сложном, противоречивом единстве двух сторон единого процесса развития, направленного на утверждение лидерского статуса педагогического образования.

В отличие от традиционных подходов лидерство этого образования рассматривается в рамках кластерной модели его функционирования и раскрывается на опыте деятельности УрГПУ в качестве центра регионального педагогического кластера. *Эта позиция университета обеспечивается его самостоятельностью, сосредоточением на своей площадке компонентов системы подготовки кадров для всех уровней образования и всех типов школ. На это направлены основное и дополнительное образование, разнообразные формы повышения квалификации педагогических работников, непрерывное образование.*

Институциональный подход к лидерству дополняется анализом выделенных проблем на личностном уровне. Здесь дихотомическое взаимодействие гуманизации и технологизации в педагогическом образовании раскрывается через деятельность его субъектов. В личности руководителя отраслевого вуза сочетаются лидерство административное и профессиональное. Уточняется содержание

понятия «современный лидер», выделены особенности его ролевого поведения, связанного с принятием и реализацией решений. Проблемы выявления и развития лидерских качеств студентов педагогического вуза рассматриваются с точки зрения их интереса и готовности к специфическому виду труда, частью которого является необходимость выявлять и использовать лидерский потенциал своих воспитанников. Нынешним выпускникам педагогического вуза предстоит работа с непростым поколением, которое не только по-иному овладевает новыми знаниями и технологиями, но отличается иной совокупностью жизненных ценностей. Практика реализации лидерских программ, организации педагогических классов, педагогической интернатуры повышает интерес к профессии педагога, учителя, усиливает соответствующую мотивацию.

There is not a single sphere of the life of society or form of social activity in which the phenomenon of leadership would be missing. And there is no area of humanitarian and scientific knowledge in which its various manifestations would fail to attract attention as an object of theoretical and, more often than not, applied research. Their results are demonstrated by a broad source study database.

Theoretical, methodological and practical issues in general, and in education in particular, have been studied in detail. The scholars have worked out model and leadership style typologies, determined leadership functions, roles and personality traits, put forward their possible classifications in accordance with the leader's status in a certain community, the content and nature of activity, its orientation and other parameters. And different conceptual-theoretical approaches often contradicting each other and involving choice have been used. There is no use trying to reproduce the whole conceptual fund because any aspect of leadership already described may be further characterized by a new set of properties, roles, styles and functions the necessity of which can be easily proved.

This fund was on demand and thoroughly investigated by a creative group of scholars and pedagogues of the Ural State Pedagogical University (USPU) in the early 90s of the 20<sup>th</sup> century who showed interest towards the problems of leadership in education and realized it in cooperation with the colleagues from the USA *Northeastern Illinois University* [11]. The results of the activities undertaken by the cohort of scholars are still urgent; and it seems strange at times that the contradictions, problems and programs of development of the leadership potential in education necessary for their solution outlined a quarter of a century back in time, should be urgent now.

It is worthwhile to mention that during the first stage of our partnership with foreign colleagues, we had to explain why our higher education institution is called a pedagogical university. The USA, the same as many European countries, realize an academic model of training pedagogues on the basis of education the students get while doing bachelor or master's degree courses. The Russian industrial model of education has deep historical roots and is

predominant. In the last third of the 19<sup>th</sup> century Europe, say in Germany and France, there were pedagogical colleges or lyceums which were either reorganized into professional universities or closed and then reopened after some time when practically needed.

The issues of leadership which have been looked at over the last decades of reformation and modernization of education in our country include those which are actualized by the modern stage of development of the sphere in question. Pedagogical education has not been placed in the focus of attention accidentally. The level of development of education on the whole depends on its quality, which determines the total index of the human potential.

One of such problems consists in the fact that the development of pedagogical education itself is connected with the perspectives and the corresponding development strategy of the Russian society in general. At least four scenarios have been "made public": "stable development", "catch-up development", "leadership in development" and "particular way development".

Stability and constancy are still on the level of hopes and aspirations. The conception of a particular way development originates from our belief in our singularity (uniqueness), especially when something planned goes wrong. The variant of the leading position in the progress towards the common future has been voiced by the public authorities but is subject to doubt in public opinion and in various discourses, including scholarly ones. The reason lies in the degree of our lagging behind which is not only due to the amount of problems of the past but also depends on their accumulation in the present: lagging behind in the new fields (nanotechnologies, nanocomposites, gene engineering), in the sphere of information technologies and in the infrastructural organization of everyday life and social sphere.

The remaining way – that of catch-up development – is more probable; many countries such as Japan, Singapore, South Korea, Thailand and China passed through this stage in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century borrowing scientific and technological experience from most developed states, attracting investment capital and transforming the whole infrastructure. This more preferable variant does not mean simple imita-

tion of what others have done. It needs new research, invitation of the leading specialists from other countries and does not exclude the chance to take these countries over in the areas where there are resources, real novelty and “breakthrough into the future”.

Should we regard pedagogical education in the context of the future, we believe that it is this branch of education that presupposes *the development on the model of leadership*. In the field of education, it functions as a leader – as a locomotive that *pulls*, as a compass that *shows the way*, and as a barometer that *predicts*.

Another problem is connected with the degree to which this very model of development of pedagogical education is efficient and supported by real experience. We proceed from the assumption that industrial specificity exists in the functioning of leadership. In the given case it is salient in the meanings, content purpose of activity on the institutional and personal levels.

This specificity has been covered in psychopedagogical literature [3; 12; 24], philosophy and sociology of education, culturology and law studies [5; 6; 7; 11; 14; 16; 23] at length.

The specificity of the institute of pedagogical education consists in the fact that it trains pedagogical personnel for the system of general and professional education, including higher education, for other segments of social sphere, as well as pedagogues for itself; i.e. “it may be rightfully termed a rare case of self-regenerating system” [6; p. 60]. Such education is early to demonstrate new approaches and technologies in education and development of young generations, and the new scientific knowledge is matched to the new school demands and the pupils’ age peculiarities and turns into “educational knowledge” [6; p. 60].

More and more often, culture becomes the key word for understanding and settlement of disputes about the priority of education, development, upbringing, formation and maturation of personality. It is the culture of leadership, the culture of university environment that characterizes its industrial specificity and makes it possible to avoid both professional amateurishness (knowing something about everything) and excessive pedagogization in and out of class, which may result in “professional tunnel vision”.

It should be noted that we are not speaking about culture in the broad sense of the word – not about everything created by man’s thought and labor, not about everything “cultivated” by him. According to the modern and classical dictionaries, the term “*vozdelivat’* – cultivate” is not used with reference to man. Vladimir Dal’s dictionary has other words – “*vzrastit’*, *vzrashchivat’* – grow” [V. 3; p. 200], used about the stages of development, growth

and maturity of man. It means literally “to grow in one’s youth, to reach gradually full height, strength, and maturity, get close to complete physical development ...”; and in order to achieve it, it is necessary to “take pains to bring up the child, to satisfy the needs of the young immature human being, to teach him and to imbue him with moral properties and to reinforce them [Ibid.]”.

Hence comes the idea about the *synthesis of upbringing and teaching at various stages* of personal phylogenesis from infancy to old age. Modern scholars single out from five to a dozen such stages. And hence comes the conclusion about the institute of pedagogical education as a specific form of organization of activity aimed at training workers for all levels and forms of education capable of shaping human personality.

Not only pedagogical colleges, lyceums, institutes and universities but also classical universities and higher education institutions of non-pedagogical profile realizing general education programs and modules take part in the regional system of training such specialists. Thus, *the regional cluster* of pedagogical education is formed [9; 13; 19].

The cluster model ensures:

1) leadership in educational programs (it is the educational programs which are more adequate to the modern requirements, meet the expectations of employers and the needs of regional development and are based on the systemic analysis of the demand of pedagogical personnel in the region that are offered);

2) leadership in scientific programs (the research orientation and the activity of scientific schools realize the tasks of implementation of innovations in education);

3) leadership in socio-cultural programs (enhances integration and interaction between agencies for the development of the cultural-educational space of a city/region/country);

4) leadership in professional programs (guarantees training students in pedagogical areas for higher education institutions of non-pedagogical profiles realizing the tasks of the professional standard of the secondary school or higher education institution pedagogue).

What makes it possible for an industrial pedagogical higher education institution to be the leader and the focus of such a cluster? The USPU experience of activity as the regional site on the topic “Innovative Cluster Models of development of Pedagogical Education” showed that it became possible only due to the fact that for the 80 years of its history the university has always been consistent in its pursuit of the strategy of development under the *modern conditions which are far from being simple*:

a) ensures the cluster functioning as a special medium for interaction and cooperation on

its site of education institutions of various levels and pedagogues for realization of the ideas of innovative development of the territory;

б) guarantees continuity in the systemic functioning of the education levels “school – secondary professional education – higher education institution – post-graduate education” on the basis of new models and networking;

в) allows solving organization problems of interaction inside the education system embracing all its levels from career education at schools and in mass media, pedagogical classes, pedagogical internship, professional advancement courses to post-graduate training and retraining;

г) makes it possible to use the uniform information environment in the field of education and upbringing on the basis of the modern level of technologization and digitalization of this sphere;

д) makes a considerable contribution to formation of the modern regional elite – intellectual, informational, cultural and political.

The sum total of all opportunities mentioned above and realized in practice is not a simple declaration. It is treated in the life of the USPU as a condition of realization of the ideas built in the strategy of development of Sverdlovsk Oblast and has a general bias towards improving efficiency of the system of training pedagogues with a stable motivation to pedagogical activity and self-realization in the sphere of education.

Pedagogical classes, pedagogical internship and the resource center “Civil-patriotic Education of Students” have become elements of such system. The structural divisions of the Office of the First Deputy Rector – Deputy Rector for Academic Activity, Prof. S.A. Minurova and, in particular, the Laboratory of Regional Educational Projects headed by Prof. I.Y. Murzina supervise and expand this sphere of activity [see the section “Open Pedagogical University” on the site *ural-patrius.ru*].

**Pedagogical classes** are part of the program of additional education for schoolchildren motivating them towards further self-realization in the pedagogical profession.

These graduate classes or forms are targeted at support of the purposive pedagogical orientation of the pupils and formation of stable interest to this activity. They also reveal the degree of suitability for such activity with the help of modern techniques and technologies. The work in this direction needs expansion of partner relationships with municipal bodies. It would not have been possible to open about ten such classes on commercial basis in such a short time without their support. The given form demonstrates once again that the development of communication and other leadership properties urgent for self-realization in the system “man – man” should be stimulated at an earlier age.

The degree of formation of not only interest and preparation but also of capability to work in the profession after graduation may be evaluated by **pedagogical internship**. The term is clear enough, though it is conventional to some extent: in is not contained in the Law on Education, and post-graduate medical internship as an on-the-job practice is well in the past. At our university it is an educational program including a system of practices (on-the-job training) on the base of partner-schools for third-year bachelors in the educational field of “Education and Pedagogical Sciences”.

The goal of the project is to bring the structure, content and training technologies into compliance with the adopted standard of the pedagogue and the new federal standards of school education. It is being realized in the format of the basic educational program – an optional theoretical course and the alternative form of live practice during the school year. A parallel model of theoretical and practical training at the place of work allows forming professional thinking and professional competences in the unity of knowledge (university competence) and process-based (school competence) components of education. So to speak, each student can try out the way he feels in the school situation and see if he will succeed in it. The relationships with tutors and colleagues will help him also in his future employment.

These examples are not meant to demonstrate our victories and achievements but to show heuristic opportunities of using modern technologies in the practice of pedagogical education taking into account not only their novelty but also their variability.

The cluster model of organization of educational space allows building interaction between its subjects of various levels and evaluating the process of its development in terms of humanization and technologization. Understanding these processes often needs avoiding simplified thinking on the principle of **dilemma – the choice** of the kind “*either...or*” between opposites. The public opinion is demonstrated this style in numerous debates, talk shows and discourses via mass media in which we are sure to see character oppositions like *own – alien, kind – vicious, patriot – calumniator, retrograde – modernist*, etc.

**Technologization** of education inevitable in the information society has been added to the tasks of its **humanization** and **humanitarianization** (in terms of in-depth training in the study of man and society, and development of moral, historical, linguistic and communicative culture) in discussions about reformation and modernization of education; they often began to be compared and opposed on the principle of dilemma.

As the country enters market economy and education is more and more often treated as a service, there appeared a dilemma “*humanization or commercialization*”. Ever new choices are talked about: “*humanization or cyborgization*” and “*humanization or digitalization*”.

There can be no simplifications in pedagogical education by definition, because teaching and upbringing (let us remember “cultivation of personality”) are two aspects of the united educational process. Even super modern technological means necessary for its optimization can have goals other than a little or grown up person, fully valuable, self-valuable and free personality. They are connected with each other in a dichotomy of goals and means or content and form: as bifurcation of one whole when one aspect is impossible without the other one. They must be balanced and harmonized. The same as technologization has no right to become inhuman, humanization, in its turn, cannot be abstract and technologically unsupported.

One more problem of leadership may be considered from the point of view of the corresponding potential of representatives of those groups which are subjects of interaction in the institute of pedagogical education: representatives of administration, lecturers, students of all levels, teachers, school headmasters and leaders of the structures interested in the outcomes of this education.

It is easier to start with the university rector whose status presupposes a normative set of functions which is reproduced both from the outside, from the upper structures, and inside the institution, and is connected with the hierarchy of authority. His or her leadership is a synonym of administration and management which needs integration of the leadership functions aimed at creation of interior environment safe in all respects, resource provision, health protection of students and personnel, organization of the working team, stimulation of its activity, etc.

The rector has to carry out a whole list of management practices in order to establish relationships with workers of various categories, to get on with the people no matter how different they might be in disposition and interests. It seems to be common knowledge that the practice of interaction and cooperation is best organized on the mechanism of trust and understanding the urgency of common actions and ability to learn from others.

When conflict situations arise in the process of management of a certain institution due to lack of trust and mutual understanding in its cognitive (knowing who, what and why is to do something) and empathic (“why can’t you put yourself in my place”) meanings, the leaders has to use not only authority but pedagogical resources as well.

The mechanism of trust presupposes the existence of mutual responsibility. Responsibility of the leader of a pedagogical higher education institution is multilevel: he or she is responsible for the fate of other members of the team but also for the fates of “special” learners who are themselves going to educate people, determine the fates of children, learners, students and whole generations entering life. That is why administrative leadership is inevitably associated with professional one, with authority potential and mechanisms of influence – following suit [22].

The sets of leadership properties of a person with administrative functions and a professional without them include many common competences obligatory for both of them, but there are also differing ones. For example, there is a skill of one of them to create a team on the basis of extensive and prospective thinking, and deep involvement in a subject area and creative independence of the other. Nevertheless, the leader of a higher education institution needs a combination of administrative properties with the competence as a specialist in the sphere he manages.

It would be useful to recall that functioning of the USPU in the mode of development, the collective’s work for the future have been possible over many decades because its rectors have always been professional in their fields which allowed them taking and carrying out correct decisions in the whole history of the university. And the leader’s personality in ensuring efficiency has played the decisive role, which was even bigger than that of a well organized structure.

Under contemporary conditions, the university – leader of the cluster of pedagogical education, still manages to be proactive and work for the future realizing the Development Strategy and the Program of Activity up to 2020 supported by a complex of special purpose programs in all areas of activity [8; 10; 15; 20; 21]. The rector has many instruments used for decision making and control of their implementation. First of all, they include clear cut allocation of powers between administrative structures – the academic council, the rector, departments of law, personnel, organization and normative documentation support of administrative activity, general meeting, etc. There is a Road Map that designates the complex of tasks for each stage of the Program implementation up to 2020 and determines resource provision and chances of interior and exterior risks. Annual monitoring the achievement of parameters for each activity area aimed at obligatory correction of current plans is also presupposed and carried out.

For the instrument to be fully operational, it needs the leader’s daily supervision of the

work of the heads of all segments of administration from the point of view of their working capacity, responsibility, initiative and readiness for changes. Without such team it would be next to impossible for the modern leader to carry out any reformation urgent for implementation of new requirements, especially if they concern structural changes the importance of which should be evident to every actor involved in them.

Theoretically, he or she must know how to do everything: predict, design, model, motivate, control, punish and pardon ... Make decisions which would be predictable, balanced, well-grounded, and non-controversial and do it quickly, as the time of high speed demands. It becomes difficult, especially when modernization innovations are incomplete and questionable, and when the normative documentation, standards and regulations treat any change as radical, cardinal, full-scale, etc.

One of such rather pessimistic documents – “Conception of the Federal Special Purpose Program of Development of Education in 2016–2020” [10] contains a warning that if such “cardinal” changes have not been achieved by 2018 and if the project-purpose-based approach does not replace the program-purpose-based one, our education will surprisingly “fall behind the developed countries ...”. It means that it is not yet behind? What does radicalism in changes have to do with it? And what leadership decisions are required to prevent falling behind? What does the rector of such university as USPU where the project approach has become a function of administrative structures, and where there is a laboratory of regional education projects have to do? The university answers all these questions and challenges by its whole activity.

Employing the practice of fast and radical changes, the rector of a university working on the scenario of leadership development and doing it in a proactive, step-by-step manner, nevertheless, runs the risk of turning out not modern enough.

What does it mean “to be modern”, and “modern enough” at that? There is a common belief that it means to take part in continuous modernization of one’s sphere of activity which has lasted for almost two decades. And the *rector of a higher education institution – a locomotive in this process – will always be modern*. Especially so if he manages, for the sake of strengthening the link between science and business, to be both a manager and marketologists without stopping being a scientist. And if he would adopt not only modern vocabulary but also practices and would master hudgeting, targeting, benchmarking, and fundraising, and learn to fight simulacra and simulation, his success is guaranteed.

I beg your pardon for being a little ironical, but let us turn our attention to etymological details and fuzziness of the notion “modern” itself. There are two words to define the types of modern leadership: **modern** (meaning new, other) and **contemporary** (modern, simultaneous, taking place at present). Both terms fail to provide an attributive characteristic of leadership but only denote its connection with an epoch and stages of its development which determine its properties.

*Leader of the epoch of modernity* meets the requirements of the social system which emerged during the period of construction of national states and industrial culture. Leader-pedagogue in the classical sense of the word is the bearer and translator of knowledge and cultural values and immutable authority; his self-development is determined through self-education in the classical spheres as well. *Leader of the epoch of contemporary* meets the requirements of the “current modernity”, functions as a facilitator ready to listen to and to hear his students; his main assets are self-development and creativity, towards which he also strives in those whose fates are trusted him. They cannot be compared in the dilemma “better – worse” and make a matter of choice; their typology is determined by the epoch.

The dictionary by V. Dal contains no notion of “modern” or “modernism” which are used in modern languages mostly with reference to art, fashion and style. A most brilliant painter-modernist may be called an outstanding creator, or even genius, but not a leader; at best, he may be referred to as Teacher. The notion of “fashion” is found in the classical dictionary of Russian. It is defined as a temporary interest in a certain domain. It also contains the word “contemporary” which is defined as simultaneous; hence “a contemporary” is only a person living at the same time with us [V. 4, p. 256].

In this sense, leaders in the sphere of polity, business, culture and health protection may have reformers and retrogrades, conservatives and reformers, tradition keepers and innovators among their contemporary peers. Their relationships even within one sphere range and are realized from peace to war.

The degree of modernity of a leader is reached when, keeping up with the times, from the height of his status, he heads the process of modernization in the sphere entrusted to him, and realizes innovations as a futurist with a clear image of the future in his head. And he does not throw the traditions which have been formed in the practice of pedagogical education and the efficiency of which has been corroborated by the university’s way of life “overboard from the ship of modernity”.

Let us give an example from the experience of the USPU where the initiative project “Peda-

gological Dynasties” has been worked out and realized over a number of years. It played an important role in terms of continuity of generations in pastoral activity inside the university and in raising the prestige and attractiveness of the pedagogical profession at the time of choice of the way of self-determination by young people after completing secondary education.

It is worthwhile to go back to it and consider the effect of dynasty in a new light – as a social mobility resource and as a means of professional identification, of comparison of the levels of identity of different generations of a dynasty. Identification of oneself as belonging to a group or feeling oneself a part of it depends on the social well-being, on the person’s awareness of his position in the professional group and the place the group itself occupies in society at a given stage of development.

The first evident outcomes of the beginning of the digital era testify to a gap in the continuity of generations because the young people more and more seldom use their parents’ experience, are sure of their uniqueness and selfhood, and look for other means of self-determination and life affirmation. It is possible to check up causative-consecutive links in the current reality and see if these are deeply rooted values or situational responses to reality with help of sociological monitoring the lives of representatives of pedagogical dynasties.

The potential of many other projects that were successfully realized and have not lost their significance may be used in the same manner. And then there will be no grounds to reproach the leader of either forgetting traditions or looking into the future with his head turned to the past. He will be undoubtedly modern in all senses of the word.

The issue of the leadership potential of other subjects if interaction in higher pedagogical education shall not include groups of university lecturers and secondary school teachers as it needs special attention and detailed analysis. Firstly, because the postulate “educator must be educated himself” has never been challenged, and priority among the properties of a pedagogue has always been given to wisdom. Secondly, contemporary scientific and other discussions of the personality of such workers have reached unprecedented intensity of feeling which is accompanied by disciplinary decisions. Thirdly, it is they who have to respond under completely new conditions by way of action before and faster than others – to be a kind of rescue persons. There are also other moments in the issue under consideration.

So let us look at those to whom their learning, developing and upbringing intervention is directed, at the creative aspect of it. The scope of our attention includes pedagogical university students, its graduates who are not only to

possess leadership properties themselves but are expected to reveal and develop them in their pupils.

We can judge about the specificity of these groups on the basis of numerous psychopedagogical, socio-pedagogical, socio-philosophical and sociological researches.

Students studying profile programs as early as at bachelor’s level demonstrate special activity in live communicative practices such as voluntary activity, student construction brigade movement (where there are special pedagogical brigades), various debates, etc. They get to know the peculiarities of professional activity earlier than other students; they see its pros and cons, with the salient example of their tutors before their eyes. Regardless of the academic subject, these students try on the roles prescribed for pedagogue’s status via “participant observation” (as sociologists would say) of their teachers’ behavior; they take over behavioral models in relations with students, colleagues and the leader, and absorb both positive and negative experience. By the way, they shoot the latter one with their gadgets, make videos and upload them on the Internet for discussion.

As a result of realization of the suggested programs even bachelors demonstrate the necessary competences the main ones of which are creativity, critical thinking, communicative ability, authority in task completion, especially in practical activity. According to the opinion of pedagogues and representatives of administrative structures, their complex basically meets the requirements of the standard and is adequate to the needs of the regional labor market both in quantity and quality.

The problem is that it does not always meet the requirements of the employer. Everyone knows that the contemporary school headmaster does not dream about “a grind holding diploma with distinction” but about a specialist capable of operating his knowledge and competences to solve standard and non-standard practical problems, and at the same time possessing good awareness in the modern world and a wide range and conceptuality of thinking. But in real practice, as our research shoed, he is more concrete and laconic: give me the one with such properties as corporate thinking, creativity, has work experience and high quality education. And if the graduate shows that he has the first three of them, he gets the desired job no matter what education institution he has graduated from.

At present, sophistication of admission to professional activity is achieved via a final professional aptitude test. This filter may lead to even greater disbalance between the graduate’s qualification characteristics and the employer’s requirements. There is no doubt what he will prefer: a good test result or the presence of experience in pedagogical profession.

The possibility of accumulating professional experience at the university is rather problematic. A considerable proportion of the full-time students and especially part-time students combine study with work, or work with study; more often than not this work is outside the professional sphere they study. This question is so important for employment that the current Minister of Education and Science asked the employers in education not to use the experience criterion as an indication of the level of preparation of the applicant for specific labor the results of which are postponed and remote rather than situational.

Can a young specialist, even trained along special leadership programs, who has demonstrated the corresponding skills during his study, become a leader in professional activity and feel at ease while seeking a corresponding job?

The issue of employment and professional mobility of future specialists is constantly in the focus of attention at the USPU. We collect information about the spheres of demand of graduates of various institutes and faculties, who have completed different educational programs, their real occupation and place of employment and position. We keep track of their career and realization of the leadership potential. The systemic nature of this university activity yields real results in the graduates' employment. Practically all graduates find suitable jobs; not less than 60% of them work in the profile they have studied. But this does not mean that the risk of unemployment is in the past, and that the students have nothing to worry about in this respect.

With this problem in view, special attention is paid to keeping in touch with the university graduates, giving them a chance to take part in innovative university projects, master related professions and explore spheres of pedagogical activity, to have in-service training at their own site where interaction with professional pedagogical community is ensured.

We had an opportunity to study in detail social potential of the master's degree courses for students diversified in the level and profile of their previous training, motivations and work experience, if any [16, 17].

On completion of a two year study at academic, applied, research or universal master's degree courses terminating in defense of a dissertation, the graduate is entitled to work at school or higher education institution. A small proportion of them can continue education at faculties of training pedagogical staff of highest qualification (the former post-graduate courses) where they will get the status of a highly qualified pedagogue or scientist if they defend now a candidate dissertation.

Both statuses make it possible to use in the future the potential of professional and, if there

is a chance, of administrative leadership and to become authoritative and influential. Not everyone will achieve it, and not all people are eager to become leaders due to various reasons. That is why realization of leadership programs (presidential, industrial, regional or university ones) does not presuppose embracing all students. And the employer does not need a team consisting of leaders only. It would be enough for him if his employees have the properties which would allow them to play their personal part at the necessary moment and show situational leadership.

In conclusion we would like to turn to a serious problem discussed at various level of debate not about variant of development but about general prospects of humanity in connection with transition into a new era – from the information into the digital one. From the time of their discovery, computer-based technologies have gone a miraculous way from innovation to everyday utility, having changed the whole mode of life of the people. Digital technologies are discussed as facts that bring about changes in all spheres of life, beginning with economy.

If in the past, we got information from another person, today he is replaced by a computer program which can do without that other person and provides the information we are looking for. The amount of information is great and it expands with such speed that the need of fast and high quality procession of a large mass of data (Bigdata technology) is becoming more and more urgent. The prophets say that in the future there will be not a single branch of industry that will fail to employ digital technologies.

Digital; economy has a special logistics chain: product movement from the manufacturer to consumer without mediators in the form of infrastructural industries, people and groups. The managers of contemporary advanced industries even now minimize the number of office workers, accountants, supply agents, etc.

Could the pedagogical professions be devoured by new technologies – that is the question: to be or not to be – here is a dilemma for us! The problem is made even more complex by the chances of robotization and cyborgization of education. Modern universities answer this question optimistically, and train specialists in new pedagogical professions taking into account industrial specificity. As experts say, those professions are “devoured” that are based on membered operations with a clear cut algorithm. Such work is easily performed by robots, and artificial intelligence capable of performing simple intellectual tasks and operations is on the threshold.

How can teaching be separated from bringing up – a task with which even the popular on-



line education cannot cope? No one challenges the priority of personality-centered paradigm in education, which is corroborated by the contemporary experience of its realization in the project-recursive education technology [2; 18].

When the teacher stops being a keeper and translator of information he is assigned new roles: instead of being simply a lecturer, he becomes a pedagogue-researcher, pedagogue-iterator, pedagogue-guide, etc. Performing these behavioral models, he is not excluded from the process of interaction with real students or pupils; he follows their progress, takes into account their opinions, wishes and evaluations of their activity and corrects their further actions.

Opening new vacancies for such professions which are on the borderline between IT and education, the modern employer no longer demands, apart from programming skills, such competences of interaction with the students as those which correlate with the competences of professional leadership. This is a typical feature of more futuristic professions such as online platform designer, topical editor of online lessons, school technology manager, coach at mixed (full-time and part-time) education institutions, experimental learning center teacher capable of giving interdisciplinary lessons with a bias towards robotic technology, etc.

Their activity is targeted at a new generation of learners which has come to replace the generations of «X», «Y», «Z» with new methods and speeds of getting information and formation of the personal world. It is hard to influence, especially to be prohibited something, but it is still possible to talk to them, try to persuade and help to evaluate situations, accumulate their resources, look for the methods and value of goal achievement. All this is not a figure of speech but a statement of a real fact in pedagogical education.

The discussion of correlation between humanization and technologization of leadership in pedagogical education, as well as in other “human” spheres of activity, did not aim to demonstrate the results achieved, and did not purport to solve the problems under consideration. It is still incomplete, and we hope that it will be continued.

But we are sure of the dichotomic nature of relationship between these two aspects of one process of education development, and this property guarantees its future due to their unity but not separation.

The dilemma of pedagogical education is still present in the need to choose between love and non-love, interest and indifference, humaneness and inhumaneness.

#### ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. Афанасьева В. Пять причин, по которым не следует становиться профессором [Электронный ресурс]. – Режим доступа: <https://newizv.ru/news/society/16-03-2017/vera-afanasieva-nyneshniy-professor-prebyvaet-v-postoyannom-strahе>.
2. Баженова И. В., Пак Н. И. Проективно-рекурсивная технология обучения в личностно-ориентированном образовании // Педагогическое образование в России. – 2016. – № 7. – С. 7–13.
3. Виноградова Н. И., Леснянская Ж. А. Влияние временной перспективы на профессиональное саморазвитие будущего педагога // Ученые записки Забайкальского государственного университета. Серия : Педагогика и психология. – 2014. – № 5. – С. 117–122.
4. Гидденс Э. Судьба, риск и безопасность // Thesis. – 1994. – Вып. 5.
5. Дюркгейм Э. Педагогика и социология // Социология образования / пер. с фр. Т. Г. Астаховой. – М. : ИНТОР. – 1996.
6. Засыпкин В. П. Модернизация педагогического образования в зеркале социологии. – Екатеринбург : Гуманитарный университет, 2010. – 272 с.
7. Засыпкин В. П., Зборовский Г. Е., Шуклина Е. А. Социология педагогического образования. – Екатеринбург : РИО ГУ ; Сургут : РИО СургГПУ, 2011. – 447 с.
8. Комплекс целевых программ по основным направлениям стратегии инновационного развития УрГПУ на 2011–2016 гг. / Ур. гос. пед. ун-т. – Екатеринбург, 2011. – 118 с.
9. Концептуальная модель регионального инновационного кластера педагогического образования (на базе УрГПУ) / под ред. Б. М. Игошева, Л. Я. Рубиной, А. А. Симоновой. – Екатеринбург : Урал. гос. пед. ун-т, 2012. – 43 с.
10. Концепция целевой программы развития образования на 2016–2020 гг. (утверждена распоряжением Правительства РФ от 29.12.2014 № 2765-Р).
11. Лидерство в образовании: теоретические, методологические и практические проблемы // Аналитическая справка по гранту USIA / сост. Г. Н. Бабич, А. С. Белкин, Л. А. Беляева, В. Д. Жаворонков, Л. Я. Рубина. – Екатеринбург : Ур. гос. пед. ун-т, 1994.
12. Мондонен О. Ю. Влияние образовательной среды педагогического колледжа на профессиональное самоопределение студентов // Аналитика культурологии. – 2009. – № 15.
13. Мурзина И. Я., Рубина Л. Я. Региональный кластер педагогического образования // Педагогическое образование в России. – 2013. – № 1. – С. 225–231.
14. Образовательные риски в условиях трансформации системы высшего образования // Социальное пространство современного города / под. ред. Г. Б. Кораблевой, А. В. Меренкова. – Екатеринбург : Изд-во Урал. гос. ун-та, 2015. – 252 с.
15. Программа развития ФГБОУ ВПО «Уральский государственный педагогический университет» на

период 2016–2020 гг.

16. Рубина Л. Я. Повышение роли общественности в модернизации российского образования // Демократизация и перспективы развития международного сотрудничества : Сборник мат-лов междунар. науч.-практ. конф. – Омск, 2003.

17. Рубина Л. Я. Социализационный потенциал магистратуры в институциональном пространстве высшей школы // Педагогическое образование в России. – 2016. – № 7. – С. 254–265.

18. Семенова И. Н. Моделирование расширенной системы методов обучения «Современной» образовательной парадигмы в смешанной модели обучения студентов педагогических специальностей школы // Педагогическое образование в России. – 2016. – № 7. – С. 67–76.

19. Симонова А. А., Минюрова С. А., Рубина Л. Я. Педагогический университет в центре регионально-образовательного кластера // Педагогическое образование в России. – 2014. – № 8. – С. 8–22.

20. Симонова А. А., Рубина Л. Я. Модернизация педагогического образования: обобщение и осмысление опыта // Педагогическое образование в России. – 2015. – № 9. – С. 109–117.

21. Стратегия развития ФГБОУ ВПО «Уральский государственный педагогический университет» 2010–2020 гг.

22. Сухорукова О. Б. Особенности управления образовательными процессами в ВУЗе // Ползуновский альманах. – 2009. – № 1. – С. 171–180.

23. Тихомирова Е. В. Каким должно быть современное образование // Качество образования. – 2011. – № 7–8. – С. 38–43.

24. Трофимова Н. Б., Сезин К. А. Основы профессионального самоопределения студентов – будущих педагогов // Казанский педагогический журнал. – 2015. – № 4.

25. Федеральный закон от 29.12.2012 № 273 –ФЗ «Об образовании в Российской Федерации».

#### REFERENCES

1. Afanas'eva V. Pyat' prichin, po kotorym ne sleduet stanovit'sya professorom [Elektronnyy resurs]. – Rezhim dostupa: <https://newizv.ru/news/society/16-03-2017/vera-afanasieva-nyneshniy-professor-prebivaet-v-postoyannom-strae>.

2. Bazhenova I. V., Pak N. I. Proektivno-rekursivnaya tekhnologiya obucheniya v lichnostno-orientirovannom obrazovanii // Pedagogicheskoe obrazovanie v Rossii. – 2016. – № 7. – С. 7–13.

3. Vinogradova N. I., Lesnyanskaya Zh. A. Vliyaniye vremennoy perspektivy na professional'noye samorazvitiye budushchego pedagoga // Uchenye zapiski Zabaykal'skogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya : Pedagogika i psikhologiya. – 2014. – № 5. – С. 117–122.

4. Giddens E. Sud'ba, risk i bezopasnost' // Thesis. – 1994. – Vyp. 5.

5. Dyurkgeym E. Pedagogika i sotsiologiya // Sotsiologiya obrazovaniya / per. s fr. T. G. Astakhovoy. – М. : INTOR. – 1996.

6. Zasyupkin V. P. Modernizatsiya pedagogicheskogo obrazovaniya v zerkale sotsiologii. – Ekaterinburg : Gumanitarnyy universitet, 2010. – 272 s.

7. Zasyupkin V. P., Zborovskiy G. E., Shuklina E. A. Sotsiologiya pedagogicheskogo obrazovaniya. – Ekaterinburg : RIO GU ; Surgut : RIO SurGPU, 2011. – 447 s.

8. Kompleks tselevykh programm po osnovnym napravleniyam strategii innovatsionnogo razvitiya UrGPU na 2011–2016 gg. / Ur. gos. ped. un-t. – Ekaterinburg, 2011. – 118 s.

9. Kontseptual'naya model' regional'nogo innovatsionnogo klastera pedagogicheskogo obrazovaniya (na baze UrGPU) / pod red. B. M. Igosheva, L. Ya. Rubinoy, A. A. Simonovoy. – Ekaterinburg : Ural. gos. ped. un-t, 2012. – 43 s.

10. Kontseptsiya tselevoy programmy razvitiya obrazovaniya na 2016–2020 gg. (utverzhdena rasporyazheniem Pravitel'stva RF ot 29.12.2014 № 2765-R).

11. Liderstvo v obrazovanii: teoreticheskie, metodologicheskie i prakticheskie problemy // Analiticheskaya spravka po grantu USIA / sost. G. N. Babich, A. S. Belkin, L. A. Belyaeva, V. D. Zhavoronkov, L. Ya. Rubina. – Ekaterinburg : Ur. gos. ped. un-t, 1994.

12. Mondonen O. Yu. Vliyaniye obrazovatel'noy sredy pedagogicheskogo kolledzha na professional'noye samoopredeleniye studentov // Analitika kul'turologii. – 2009. – № 15.

13. Murzina I. Ya., Rubina L. Ya. Regional'nyy klaster pedagogicheskogo obrazovaniya // Pedagogicheskoe obrazovanie v Rossii. – 2013. – № 1. – С. 225–231.

14. Obrazovatel'nye riski v usloviyakh transformatsii sistemy vysshego obrazovaniya // Sotsial'noye prostranstvo sovremennogo goroda / pod. red. G. B. Korablevoy, A. V. Merenkova. – Ekaterinburg : Izd-vo Ural. gos. un-ta, 2015. – 252 s.

15. Programma razvitiya FGBOU VPO «Ural'skiy gosudarstvennyy pedagogicheskii universitet» na period 2016–2020 gg.

16. Rubina L. Ya. Povysheniye roli obshchestvennosti v modernizatsii rossiyskogo obrazovaniya // Demokratizatsiya i perspektivy razvitiya mezhdunarodnogo sotrudnichestva : Sbornik mat-lov mezhdunar. nauch.-prakt. konf. – Омск, 2003.

17. Rubina L. Ya. Sotsializatsionnyy potentsial magistratury v institutsional'nom prostranstve vysshey shkoly // Pedagogicheskoe obrazovanie v Rossii. – 2016. – № 7. – С. 254–265.

18. Semenova I. N. Modelirovaniye rasshirennoy sistemy metodov obucheniya «Sovremennoy» obrazovatel'noy paradigmy v smeshannoy modeli obucheniya studentov pedagogicheskikh spetsial'nostey shkoly // Pedagogicheskoe obrazovanie v Rossii. – 2016. – № 7. – С. 67–76.

19. Simonova A. A., Minyurova S. A., Rubina L. Ya. Pedagogicheskii universitet v tsentre regional'nogo obrazovatel'nogo klastera // Pedagogicheskoe obrazovanie v Rossii. – 2014. – № 8. – С. 8–22.

20. Simonova A. A., Rubina L. Ya. Modernizatsiya pedagogicheskogo obrazovaniya: obobshcheniye i osmysleniye opyta // Pedagogicheskoe obrazovanie v Rossii. – 2015. – № 9. – С. 109–117.

21. Strategiya razvitiya FGBOU VPO «Ural'skiy gosudarstvennyy pedagogicheskiy universitet» 2010–2020 gg.
22. Sukhorukova O. B. Osobennosti upravleniya obrazovatel'nymi protsessami v VUZe // Polzunovskiy al'manakh. – 2009. – № 1. – S. 171–180.
23. Tikhomirova E. V. Kakim dolzhno byt' sovremennoe obrazovanie // Kachestvo obrazovaniya. – 2011. – № 7–8. – S. 38–43.
24. Trofimova N. B., Sezin K. A. Osnovy professional'nogo samoopredeleniya studentov – budushchikh pedagogov // Kazanskiy pedagogicheskiy zhurnal. – 2015. – № 4.
25. Federal'nyy zakon ot 29.12.2012 № 273 –FZ «Ob obrazovanii v Rossiyskoy Federatsii».