

МАМАНДАРДЫ
КӘСІБИ
ДАЙЫНДАУДАҒЫ
ПСИХОЛОГИЯЛЫҚ-
ПЕДАГОГИКАЛЫҚ
МӘСЕЛЕЛЕР

ПСИХОЛОГО-
ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКИЕ
ПРОБЛЕМЫ
ПРОФЕССИОНАЛЬНОЙ
ПОДГОТОВКИ
СПЕЦИАЛИСТОВ

PSYCHOLOGICAL
AND
PEDAGOGICAL
PROBLEMS OF
PROFESSIONAL
EDUCATION

UDK 378.048.2

¹Alison Taysum, ²V.A. Pogosian*, ²S.Yu. Trapitsin

¹University of Leicester, Leicester, UK

²Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia, Russia, Saint-Petersburg

*E-mail: pogosian@mail.ru

**The role of dialogue and modes
of study educational leaders engage with on
a Masters degree provided by
a UK and a Russian Higher Education Institution**

The purpose of this research is to further understanding of educational leaders' preferred modes of study of an English and Russian Masters-level module in Educational Leadership. We present perceptions of educational leaders' from Schools, Colleges, Universities and a Ministry of Education regarding one module of the degree, gathered through semi-structured interviews from four different iterations of the course module in England and Russia. Findings reveal that educational leaders identified lectures, presentations, workshops, and distance learning as modes of study that offered opportunities to examine alternative ways of knowing, acting and being. Reading the evidence through Dimmock and Walker's (2008) six dimensions society/regional/local culture. The evidence revealed that the Russian and International educational leaders from the four iterations of the module preferred didactic pedagogies where they took a more passive role in the communication. Power was concentrated in the few pedagogues and the leaders potentially replicated these kinds of pedagogies in their professional practice. English educational leaders preferred a more pro-active role in the dialogue where the power was more distributed between the pedagogue and the leaders. These findings have implications for first, the design and provision of international multi-cultural educational leadership programmes within international spaces and frameworks such as the Bologna process, and second, how educational leaders are inducted into the programmes.

Key words: higher education, dialogue, modes of study, educational leadership, cultural dimensions, knowledge transfer, knowledge co-construction.

Элисон Тайсум, В. Погосян, С.Ю. Трапицын

**Оқыту формалары мен диалогтың білім беру саласының басшыларын
Ресей-Британ бірлескен бағдарламасы бойынша магистрлік дайындаудағы рөлі**

Бұл зерттеудің мақсаты білім беруді басқару өкілдерінің Ресей-Британ бірлескен бағдарламасы бойынша «Білім беруді басқару» (магистратура деңгейі) модулінде қандай оқыту формалары мен әдістерін таңдайтынын терең зерттеу болып табылады. Мақалада мектепті, колледжді, университеттерді және Білім министрлігін басқару қызметкерлерін магистрлік дайындаудың бір модулін қабылдау туралы айтылады. Зерттеу материалдарына Ұлыбританияда және Ресейде төрт мәрте жүргізіл-

ген модульдің іске асырылуындағы жарты құрылымды сауалдар негіз болды. Зерттеу нәтижелері білім беруді басқару өкілдерінің дәрістер, презентациялар, семинарлар және қашықтықтан оқыту-ды таным мен болмысты ұғынудағы әрекет түрлерін түсініп оқуға мүмкіндік беретін оқыту формаларының альтернативті әдістері деп санайтынын көрсетті. Диммока және Уолкердің (2008) қоғамдық / аймақтық / локальдық мәдениеттің алты өлшемдік теорияларының негізінде модуль бойынша білім алушы Ресей білім беру басқармасының және шетел өкілдерінің дидактикадағы педагогикалық тұрғыларды қалайтыны және олардың қарым-қатынаста пассивті рөл атқаратыны айқындалды.

Бұл қалаулар сабақта билік педагогтың ықпалында болатынын, ал білім алушы басшылар мұндай педагогиканы сосын өз кәсіби қызметінде қайталап жасайтынын көрсетеді. Британдық білім беруді басқару өкілдері оқыту үдерісінде диалогтық қарым-қатынастағы белсенділікті алға шығара отырып, биліктің білім алушы басшылары мен педагогтары арасындағы теңдікке құрылуына мән берді. Тұжырымдардың практикалық маңыздылығы біріншіден, білім беруді басқарудың халықаралық кеңістік пен құрылымындағы, атап айтқанда: Болон процесі халықаралық полимәдениетті білім беру бағдарламаларын жасау, екіншіден, басқару ұйымдарына арналған білім беруді магистрлік бағдарламалар бойынша ұйымдастырудан көрінеді. Аталған зерттеу нәтижелері бойынша білім беруді басқару өкілдерін, әртүрлі мәдениеттердің өкілдерін оқытатын осындай бағдарламаларды ұйымдастыру және дайындаудың педагогикалық аспектілерін оқып үйренуде маңызды болып табылатын жаңа білімдер алынған.

Түйін сөздер: жоғары білім, диалог, оқыту формалары, білім беруді басқару, мәдени өлшемдер, білімді тарату, білім беруді бірлесе жобалау.

Элисон Тайсум, В. Погосян, С.Ю. Трапицын

**Роль диалога и форм обучения
по совместной российско-британской программе
магистерской подготовки руководителей в сфере образования**

Целью данного исследования является углубленное изучение того, какие формы обучения предпочитают представители управления образованием в процессе освоения совместного российско-британского модуля «Управление образованием» (уровень магистратуры). В статье представлено восприятие сотрудниками управления школ, колледжей, университетов и Министерства образования одного из модулей программы магистерской подготовки. Материалом исследования послужили полуструктурированные опросы, проведенные в процессе четырехкратной реализации модуля в Великобритании и России. Результаты исследования показывают, что представители управления образованием считают, что лекции, презентации, семинары и дистанционное обучение являются формами обучения, открывающими возможности для изучения альтернативных способов познания, действий и бытия. На основе теории Диммока и Уолкера (2008) о шести измерениях общественной/региональной/локальной культуры выявлено, что представители российского управления образованием, а также представители зарубежных стран, обучавшиеся по модулю, предпочитают дидактический подход к педагогике и принимают более пассивную роль в общении. Это предпочтение свидетельствует о том, на занятиях власть сконцентрирована у педагога, а обучающиеся руководители воспроизводят такую педагогику в своей профессиональной деятельности. Британские представители управления образованием в процессе обучения предпочитали более активную роль в диалогическом общении, где власть была более распределена между педагогами и обучающимися руководителями. Выводы имеют практическое значение, во-первых, для разработки международных поликультурных образовательных программ по управлению образованием в рамках международных пространств и структур, таких, как Болонский процесс; во-вторых, для организации программ магистерской подготовки для руководителей образования. В результате данного исследования получены новые знания, значимые для изучения педагогических аспектов программ подготовки представителей управления образованием, по которым обучаются представители различных культур, а также для организации таких программ.

Ключевые слова: высшее образование, диалог, формы обучения, управление образованием, культурные измерения, передача знаний, совместное конструирование знаний.

Introduction

The rising trend for part-time students to enter Higher Education (HE) is established and numbers

of part-time students are expanding rapidly. In England in 1995-1996 there were 196,452 part-time students and in 2004-2005 this number had increased to 256,780 (HESA, 2005). This increase

is not restricted to the teaching professions and has arguably occurred due to a strategy of widening access to HE. Part-time study has long featured in professional educationalists' Continuing Professional Development (Wikely and Muschamp, 2004). Farley-Ripple et al (2012) argue that as the understanding of the importance of administrative leadership develops the role recruiting, developing, supporting and retaining quality leaders is vital to educational reforms at both local and national level. Giles and Smith (2010) argue that educative processes need to prioritise being critical and the experiential element of leadership needs to be modeled in Masters courses where the humanity of leadership is brought to the fore. The significance of leadership development is the basis upon which educational professionals undertake part-time courses such as postgraduate courses in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). It is important to gather and further understand the leaders' perceptions of their learning and modes of study to inform the improvement of educational leadership development programmes. Giles and Smith (2010) suggest there is growing international interest in the reform and development of such programmes that are professionally transforming for educational leaders. This paper contributes to the research literature about how programme providers might develop postgraduate programmes to enable educational leaders to gain the thinking tools to improve work for social justice in their local communities. It is important to work for change and social justice in educational institutions. Educational leaders engaging in such civic work need to operationalize educational policies that are sustainable (Moos and Kofod, 2009). In Russia and England two such educational policies that educational leaders are operationalizing are the 'Russian Education – 2020: A Model of Education for an Economy based on Knowledge' (2008), and 'The Education Act 2011' policy agenda. However, it is important to note that educational leaders in this study operate within their own national and local policy agendas.

The current tendencies in higher education with the increased number of international joint study programmes and student mobility, pose questions about the influence of students' cultural background on the quality of their learning. This is emphasized if the learning takes place in new educational settings where students are exposed to new modes of study, teaching styles, methods, tools, and new learning activities. Such questions give rise to explorations of various issues related to cultural differences

in teaching and learning. A recent investigation conducted by Bartram and Bailey (2009) explored the extent to which differences in understandings and expectations of 'effective teaching' might impede successful induction of international students into academic life in the UK. The findings of this study indicated that UK and international students, despite some differences in emphasis, share similar views. However, the findings of another recent research devoted to cross-cultural investigation of students' perceptions of the effectiveness of pedagogical tools demonstrate that students from the Middle East, the UK and the USA have a different opinion regarding the impact of various teaching tools on their learning outcomes (Mahrous and Ahmed, 2009). Students from the US and UK had previously engaged with interactive modes of study, whereas those from the Middle East expected their teachers to be absolute authorities and to tell them what to study. These differences can be read through Hofstede (1997) 'power distant' and 'power distributed' cultural dimensions. The US and the UK students represent a power distributed system that addresses a desire for equity. The Middle East students represent power distance where the less powerful members of organisations or institutions accept and expect that power is distributed unequally. Power distance represents inequality that is endorsed by the followers and the leaders (Hofstede, 1997). This paper reveals that there is a difference in power distance index between England and Russia in educational contexts. According to Hofstede, there are several differences in terms of teaching/learning between small and large power distance societies (Hofstede, 1986). This research generates new knowledge about preferred modes of study for students doing a dual Russian UK British Degree in Russia (BRDIGE) Masters module. A sharp focus is on the dialogic power share between the teacher and students in different modes of study.

The project is a British initiative sponsored by the Department of Innovation, Universities and Skills, and administered by the British Council. BRIDGE project funds enabled Russian and UK academics to develop a dual-award Masters in Educational Leadership, which was the focus of joint research. The sample is made up of four groups of educational leaders engaging with the dual award BRIDGE Masters module. Three of the groups were studying part-time with two of these groups located in England and one group located in Russia. The fourth group was studying full time in England and made up of international students

who were predominantly from Asian nation states. However due to issues of confidentiality these cannot be identified which is a limitation of the research. The research seeks to address the following research questions. First, to what extent are different kinds of dialogue found in different modes of study on a multi-cultural BRIDGE dual Masters degree module? Second, to what extent do different kinds of dialogues enable different kinds of pedagogical power sharing between programme providers and educational leaders engaging with the BRIDGE Masters degree? Finally, to what extent can engagement with different modes of study and different dialogic power sharing outside learners' habitual ways of acting and being in the world improve curriculum engagement? When engaging with this research it is important to note that we have tried to objectify what we write in this paper. We have the advantage of coming from different nation states and therefore writing as a team we have a wider range of prior experiences that shape our understandings and explanation of power distribution. However, we are also mindful that the authors that we represent also have positions in their research which influenced their development of a culturally-defined framework. The literature we refer to is fairly diverse and we do not assume that all or the majority of the cited scholars regard the issue within the same framework. We therefore invite readers to think about and challenge the understandings and explanations of power distributions in this paper.

Different kinds of dialogues found in different modes of study

Modes of study are traditionally associated with certain modes of communication. Lectures or presentations may be limited dialogues with the voice of one dominating and transmitting knowledge. Lectures and presentations are basically monologues with a one-way communication pattern. They do not exclude two-way interactions (dialogues), but that primarily depends on the lecturer's intention as to how much feedback, views, opinions, questions he/she would like to take place. In other words, it is the lecturer who decides how much dialogue his/her lecture would involve, which determines, in its turn, the extent and the range of communicative activities of the students. The students may be mainly engaged in perception, listening, comprehending (i.e. receptive communicative activities, the productive one's being limited to note taking). Or

the students maybe more active, engaged also in dialogues: asking questions, expressing opinions, counter-arguments. Seminars and workshops may be dialogues more participatory in nature involving discussions and sharing and recognizing opinions among all present (Taysum, 2010). The dialogue may be face to face and take place in real time in the same room, or education technologies may enable audio telecommunications, video meetings/conferencing, or text dialogues to occur through computer mediated communication (Salmon, 2007). Salmon (2007) argues that computers may facilitate synchronous and a-synchronous dialogue through distance learning. Arguably the kind of dialogue found in a particular mode of study that enables engagement with alternative views is important within postgraduate research programmes that focus on educational leadership (Hall 1998). Dialogue may facilitate thinking critically which is deemed as a requirement of a Masters programme by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) that operates in the UK and internationally. QAA (2010) state at Master level students need to: 'Evaluate critically current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline' (p. 16).

The Russian system of education from September 1, 2009, started a European model of education (Bachelor-Master) providing further integration of Russia into the European educational space, bringing clarity and comparability of diplomas and degrees. This transition is accompanied with new state standards of education quality. The Federal Service for inspection in the sphere of education (2009) states the Master should demonstrate the following competencies:

'perform a constructive analysis of the content and results of activities, an evaluation of the level of the results of the activities, a development of suggestions for improving of systems and processes of management, to be able to use the methods of evaluating progress and the sphere of improving quality.'

Leal and Saran (2004) argue that the kind of dialogue required to meet QAA and Russian Masters levels needs to focus on deep listening and trying to understand one another. This is important when addressing complex problems in educational contexts. Leal and Saran (2004) suggest that rushing to an answer or 'solution' to relieve a symptom or change a behaviour operates at the surface level and potentially prevents deep listening from occurring. Deep listening may provide opportunities to explore alternative possibilities for addressing the root

cause of a particular kind of problem (Grint, 2010; Bottery, 2012). Addressing root causes of problems requires engagement with values and beliefs systems (Hodgkinson, 1991).

For deep listening all present at the dialogue need to share in the meaning making. Bohm (1996) argues that dialogue implies a stream of meaning flowing among, through and between the participants, it creates a flow of meaning in the entire group so that some new understanding emerges. This in turn creates a 'shared meaning' in the group that can glue the group together (Bohm, 1996). According to Bohm, one of the conditions for dialogue to take place is to learn to listen to what is on someone else's mind and to suspend one's own judgment without coming to a conclusion. On the one hand, dialogue requires listening to the opinions of others, to learn about different perspectives. Here Bohm describes dialogue as a communication system that has a potential for bringing about a new world view. To bring about a new world view dialogic relationships need to be built on a foundation of getting to know people who hold different beliefs, values and understandings who will engage in 'I – you' respectful relationships (Shields, 2010). Arguably at best such relationships need to be founded on an unconditional positive regard for difference that operates within ethical frameworks, and at worst, a tolerance for difference that operates within ethical frameworks (Taysum, 2010). On the other hand dialogue may require 'empty spaces' to give all those present the necessary space to articulate their opinions and be recognized (Bourdieu, 2000; Cribb and Gewirtz, 2003). Thus dialogue has the potential to facilitate cultural change whilst offering the chance to explore a sense of self through dynamic social interaction. Dynamic social interactions enable identities to be performed through social constructivism where the identity of the individual shapes her/his environment which in turn shapes the identity of the individual in an ongoing iterative process (Taysum, 2010). This is in contrast to identities being formed through the passive reception of transmitted knowledge from pedagogues who represent the knowledge in their lectures through limited dialogues or through monologues.

Different kinds of dialogues for different kinds of pedagogical power sharing

Ainscow et al (1999) argue students need to have the pre-dispositions, or a readiness for the kind

of dialogue and modes of study that a particular institution uses for curriculum engagement. The disposition to engage with dynamic social interaction that includes deep listening is important if alternative ways of thinking and doing are to be considered. Dynamic social interaction of dialogue enables educational goals to be achieved using a taxonomy of pedagogical goals (Bloom, 1956; Klarin, 2007). Moreover comparative analysis of various educational models such as social constructivist theory (Vygotsky, 1956), activities approach to teaching (Leontiev, 1975), theory of stage-by-stage development of intellectual actions (Galperin and Talysina, 1985), theory of problem-based teaching (Mahmutov, 1977; Hutorski 1998), and theory of developmental teaching (Zankov, 1957; Davydov, 1995) appear to support an approach to dialogue with Olson and Clarke's (2009) notion of a signature pedagogy of deep listening and being critical. Dimmock and Walker (2008) shed light on this by presenting six dimensions of societal/regional/local culture that draw on Hofstede's (1991) framework. Dimmock and Walker (2008) argue that in some societies:

'power is widely distributed, for example, through decentralization and institutionalized democracy, inequity is treated as undesirable and every effort is made to reduce it where possible' (p. 30).

Understanding the distribution of power in this way illuminates signature pedagogies of critical thinking and deep listening during dialogues. Dialogues of this nature generate new ideas and methods and are located within the generative element of Dimmock and Walker (2008) generative/replicative dimension of their presentation of six dimensions of societal/regional/local culture.

On the other hand, passive modes of study such as a lecture as monologue potentially lead to dependence on the lecturer. Passive modes of study are located within didactic forms of teaching where the learner plays a passive role (Bespalko, 1989). Using Dimmock and Walker (2008) conceptual framework the power is: commonly concentrated in the hands of the few, inequities are often accepted and legitimized. People in high power-concentrated societies tend to accept unequal distributions of power (p. 30).

The lecture mode of study presents a passive position that may affirm stereotype thinking and traditional cultures (Pring, 2007) where the passive learner replicates (Eraut, 1994) with a desire to delegate responsibility. The signature pedagogies within which lecture modes of study

are located affirm a passive learner who replicates the pedagogue. This is located within Dimmock and Walker (2008) replicative dimension of their presentation of six dimensions of societal/regional/local culture. Dimmock and Walker (2008) argue:

‘In replicative cultures, people are more likely to adopt innovations, ideas and inventions developed elsewhere. Whereas these sometimes undergo partial adaptation, they are often replicated in toto, with little consideration of alignment to the indigenous cultural context.’ (p.31)

Thus, one system of training cultivates a community of free, thinking people, the other – a community of people who replicate what is transmitted to them. However, students may engage with passive learning pedagogies and reflect upon these deeply in private and have the opportunity and the rights to associate with the knowledge and co-construct it within open systems that will affect what they can and cannot do and say. For example, during the Soviet period in Russia it was common that what people said openly in public places was absolutely different to what they said in private, «in their kitchens», when only their relatives and friends were around. However, where opportunities to associate with the knowledge do not exist there are potential barriers to participation and what Dimmock and Walker (2008) call a social inequality of individuals and social groups, and a social inequality of countries and nations (Dimmock and Walker, 2008). A system of education reflects specific cultural features, in this case-power distance, one of the five dimensions of culture identified by Hofstede (1997). According to Hofstede, power distance is the extent to which the less powerful members of organisations or institutions accept and expect that power is distributed unequally. Power is concentrated within the few, inequality is defined from below, not from above and a society’s level of inequality is endorsed by the followers as much as by the leaders (Hofstede, 1997). However, if there is not a transmission of knowledge there is a danger that those co-constructing knowledge will be trapped within cycles of knowledge, ways of acting and ways of being without being exposed to different forms of knowledge generated by others beyond the sphere of those co-constructing knowledge. The result of this may be a replication of inequalities within a closed system (Bourdieu, 2000). The argument is presented that there needs to be balance between critiquing received wisdom that is evidence informed (Taysum, 2010) and co-constructing knowledge based on learners’

knowledge, ways of acting and ways of being in the world.

A difference in power distance index between the UK and Russia is evident in educational contexts. According to Hofstede, there are several differences in terms of teaching/learning between small and large power distance societies. Hofstede, (1986) argues in terms of the following nine oppositions. First, that a focus on impersonal truth might be considered as opposed to the personal wisdom of the expert. Second, a teacher might respect the independence of students whilst students respect the expertise of the teacher. Here the teacher may be ‘an expert’ and the student is a novice albeit an independent one. Parkinson (2002) argues that such a dialogic approach has been applied in most American law schools since the 1860s and aims at identifying contradictions within a particular case. Perceiving educational leaders as novices is problematic and potentially limits the democratization of knowledge if educational leaders are not part of the knowledge constructions (2001). Third, there may be student-centred education as opposed to teacher-centred education. Fourth, teachers might expect students to lead communication as opposed to the students expecting the teachers to lead communication. Fifth, teachers may expect students to lead their own learning journeys, whilst students expect teachers to provide a route map for their learning journeys. Sixth, students may speak spontaneously in class as opposed to students being invited to speak by the teacher. Seventh, students may be expected to critique as opposed to students may be expected to accept and not critique. Eighth, excellence of learning may be dependent on two-way communication as opposed to the excellence of learning being dependent on the high quality of the teacher and teaching. Finally, two-way communication may be hallmarked by dialogue that may aim to reach a provisional consensus through democratic processes. Dubravka, et al (2010) draw upon Heckmann, (1981), Kessels (1997), Saran and Niesser (2004) and Brune and Krohn (2005) to provide the following definition of such a dialogue that takes an alternative approach to the dialogue defined by Parkinson (2005). Dubravka et al (2010) state a philosophical group dialogue may be defined as:

‘Participants guided by a facilitator and a number of ground rules striving to reach a consensus in answering a fundamental question on the basis of a real-life example or incident with the purpose of achieving new insights’ (p. 1106).

Such a democratic approach may underpin students and teachers developing pedagogic relationships. However, further research is required to engage with cross-cultural focus groups where students with different preferred learning pedagogies explain how their learning pedagogies influence their relationships within the community and the extent to which these relationships are hierarchical or distributed. When engaging with this research we obtained new knowledge. Further research is recommended to discover more about learning pedagogies and underpinning ideologies and how this knowledge may have the potential to influence building bridges of understanding where there are diverse communities.

Leaders' pre-dispositions for curriculum engagement

The above oppositions are suggestive of the fact that students from lower power distance cultures may be predisposed to a proactive role in the classroom and Dubravka et al (2010) definition of dialogue. Students from a higher power distance culture may be predisposed to experiencing a more passive role with the expert teacher using

limited dialogue that is closer to a monologue to transmit knowledge to novices which ties in with Parkinson's (2002) definition of dialogue. The role the leaders take in the classroom has the potential to influence their knowing, ways of acting and ways of being in the world (Barnett and Coate, 2005). Arguably within multi-cultural programmes such as the BRIDGE Masters degree, programme providers may need to consider the dialogic power sharing in the pedagogic dialogues to enable curriculum engagement. Inductions into new forms of dialogues may be required (Unt, 2003). This is significant because Barnett and Coate (2005) suggest that students may calculate how much intellectual and personal energy to put into a programme of study. If students do not have the predispositions to engage with a particular dominant mode of study of a particular Masters course they may choose to invest less energy into the programme. Barnett and Coate (2005) go on to argue this is important when considering the importance of retention rates on programmes particularly when these programmes provide important learning opportunities for educational leaders to work for sustainable and peaceful economic and cultural justice in and for multi-cultural environments.

Table 1 – Groups of respondents taking part in the research

Group	Mode of Study	Nationality
R group participants R1-R5	Part-time	Russian
UKI group participants	Full-time	International
UKA group participants UKA1-UKA8	Part-time	UK
UKB group participants UKB1-UKB6	Part-time	UK

Research Design

The strategy of the research is that of a survey of four iterations of a British Degrees in Russia (BRIDGE) Masters module that was provided in a HEI in England and a HEI in Russia. In the first iteration of the module there were eight Russian educational leaders engaging with the Masters module on a part-time basis. In the second, were thirteen international students engaging with the Masters module on a full-time basis. In the third iteration of the Masters module there were seven educational leaders studying on a part-time basis. Fourth were a group of eleven educational leaders doing the Masters module on a part-time basis.

Denscombe (2003) suggests to survey is to: 'view comprehensively and in detail...obtaining data for mapping' (p. 6). This paper focuses on qualitative data gathered by interviews. At the beginning of the module students were invited to take part in the research. After six months the programme participants were invited to take part in individual semi-structured interviews using purposive sampling (Cohen et al, 2001). There were twenty-seven interviews held: five with the Russian participants (R1-R5), eight with the International participants (UKI1-UKI8), six with group UK-A participants (UKA1-UKA7) seven with group UKB participants (UKB1-UKB6) (see table 1). Some of the interviews were audio-taped, and some were not as negotiated

between the researcher and the participant. Each interview lasted on average between thirty minutes to sixty minutes. For trustworthiness of the research (Furlong and Oancea, 2005), the data collection tool was piloted, and the UK participants had a formal opportunity for respondent validation to confirm what had been said.

The sample sizes were small with 27 participants in total. Generalisability can therefore be argued to be problematic in this qualitative research. However the approach of this research has been underpinned by different perspectives and recognises that no one view is correct. Further, Donmoyer (1990) suggests that the contribution of qualitative research is becoming immersed in a study that requires passion. The important elements of research Donmoyer argues include passion for understanding people, passion for communication and passion for people and it is this human aspect to research that appears to be missing when issues of generalisability are raised.

All research conformed to the University of Leicester and Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia ethical codes of practice. The respondents were briefed in full as to the purpose and scope of the research. The respondents will remain anonymous and confidentiality is assured. This is problematic however since a quote may be used that may instantly identify the speaker through idioms or by other such means. This brings sharply into focus the clash between responsibility to society and responsibility to confidentiality over the source and content. Pring (2000) says of this: 'and there are no higher level principles to be appealed to for resolving that clash. Such accounts are often obtainable only under conditions of confidentiality' (p. 147). To try to address this important issue, respondents were given the right to withdraw from the research at any time. The research was designed, reviewed and undertaken to ensure integrity and quality and conformed to the Economic and Social, Research Council framework (ESRC, 2010).

The findings of our research will be published in accordance with British Educational Research Association Ethical Guidelines (BERA, 2011): «Educational researchers should aim to report their findings to all relevant stakeholders and so refrain from keeping secret or selectively communicating their findings» (p. 1).

Dialogues, modes of study and power sharing

All groups identified that dialogue was important and facilitated deep listening (Leal and

Saran, 2004). However, respondents articulated that the mode of study that facilitated dialogue, and the amount of dynamic dialogue that existed within the modes of study was different.

The Russian participants R1, R2, and R4 said that lectures were useful. These findings were similar to those found in The UK International students' group (UKI) with UKI13 articulating that lectures were the preferred mode of study. The lecture mode of study has a signature pedagogy of being didactic where the learning is passive which synthesizes with Bepalko (1989) understanding of didactic learning. Moreover, the knowledge is transmitted by the expert teacher where the students are passive novices which affirms Parkinson's (2002) definition of dialogue. Such an approach potentially underpins replication of culture and identity (Bourdieu, 2000) where the locus of power is with the teacher. This synthesizes with Dimmock and Walker (2008) notion of power-concentrated and replication within the six dimensions of society/regional/local culture.

It is interesting that respondents from UKA and UKB did not identify traditional lectures as a mode of study. Rather their interactions took the form of workshops (seminars): 'our classes were workshops: there were few of us and this definitely did not look like lectures' (UKB2). UKB 3 stated: 'I found it useful sharing, being able to talk about the specifics of an individual context'.

UKB6 stated:

'I enjoyed the discussions immensely and I enjoyed the chance to hear other people's points of view. I really enjoyed that part of the course. I enjoyed working with small groups. I enjoyed discussing issues within small groups and hearing other people's points of view as well as giving my own.'

UKA6 stated there were: 'group discussions which were definitely student led and sometimes tutor led'. UKB5 stated the seminars were: 'very discussion based'.

The two English groups found the seminars/workshop dialogues useful where students overtly shared or distributed the power in the discussions. This moves towards Dubravka et al (2010) definition of dialogue though participants were not asked if a provisional consensus was achieved or indeed sought which is distinctively different from Dubravka et al (2010) definition of dialogue. The evidence reveals that signature pedagogies of UK based students in UKA and UKB engaged with the curriculum through power-distributed signature pedagogies. UKA and UKB engaged with the kind of dialogues

that include listening to other's opinions which has the potential to stimulate thinking and generate new ideas and methods (Dimmock and Walker, 2008).

However, there were two interesting exceptions to this within the two English groups. First, UKB5 stated that they felt comfortable contributing to the discussion but preferred to listen and stated: 'I guess I probably found myself learning more from listening to the more experienced staff, so the deputies were saying about the way they approach or the way they've handled things in the past, and their views on things, because they already have that knowledge from the middle management courses that they've done already.'

In this case the power share in the dialogue is concentrated with the 'expert' who is not the pedagogue rather the expert is a leader higher up in the institution's hierarchy. Although there is an 'expert-novice relationship' other participants in the dialogue overtly framed it as being co-constructivist (Dimmock and Walker, 2008) moving towards Dubravka et al (2010) definition of dialogue. However covert hierarchical power structures are at play because one of the participants is choosing to remain silent to defer to the 'expert' senior colleague. It is only through this research that it was possible to shed light on this case where the realized dialogue is nearer to Parkinson's (2002) definition of dialogue. The power structures are located within the leadership structure of the institution. The less experienced educational leader is complying with a novice-expert relationship where a way of thinking and being in the world is subtly transmitted to them. Therefore overt power distributed dialogues contain subtle and covert power concentration located in the few who are higher up the institution's hierarchy. Those in a lower position within that particular hierarchy accept the ways of acting and being in the world (Barnett and Coates, 2005) as inculcated from those higher up in the hierarchy (Hofstede, 1997; Dimmock and Walker, 2008). This is potentially a covert barrier to cultivating a community of free thinking and critical people (Dimmock and Walker, 2008) and is similar to the overt power concentrated relationships found in the Russian and International dialogues where the pedagogue was the expert.

The second exception is where UKB6 stated: 'a particular student was very vociferous in leading sometimes...you need the tutor there.' Here the educational leader identifies that one student intentionally or unintentionally tried to dominate a dialogue and the pedagogue was needed to facilitate or chair the dialogue. Here an educational leader in the group prevented what Bohm (1996)

calls listening to the opinions of others, to learn about different perspectives. The dominant leader intentionally or unintentionally took the role of expert within Parkinson's (2002) definition of dialogue.

Interestingly there were two respondents from the International group that demonstrated a shift in disposition from lectures and passive learning to working with more dynamic dialogues and working in groups. UKI1 argues that various kinds of classes are needed and that different people may perceive the same kinds of classes differently. UKI 4 states: 'Working groups were initially not very comfortable but eventually a very effective way of learning'. This reveals a shift away from power-concentration to power-distribution that occurred during the Masters course. Also R1 from the Russian group stated: 'Probably it should be common discussions' recognizing that more dynamic dialogues may be useful.

There are clear differences in opinions between the Russian and English International Students' Groups who found lectures useful where the students were passive, and the two UKA and UKB groups with English students where the dialogues between the groups and pedagogues were more dynamic. Using Dimmock and Walker's (2008) framework of power/distributed power/concentrated dimension, it is possible to locate the Russian and English International students' Group within the power/concentrated dimension where the pedagogue maintains the control. The UKA and UKB groups are located within the power-distributed dimension of the six dimensions of society/regional/local culture. However there is some indication that students were undergoing a shift in identity as their dispositions adjusted so that they could engage with the curriculum using a wider range of methods.

Discussion

The purpose of the research was to gain a deeper understanding of the preferred modes of study for educational leaders to engage with dialogue to explore different knowledge, ways of acting and ways of being in the world (Barnett, and Coate, 2005) whilst doing their postgraduate Masters degree. The evidence reveals that attitudes of the participants of the programme to face-to-face lectures, presentations, workshops and Distance Learning as modes of study were very different.

The Russian and English International participants found lectures and presentations more

useful than other modes of study. The lectures and presentations are passive modes where the lecture and presentation is a monologue. Such didactic forms of teaching and passive modes of learning potentially lead to dependence on the lecturer or presenter which synthesizes with (Bespalko, 1989). The didactic form of teaching locates the power in the hands of the few which synthesizes with Dimmock and Walker (2008) conceptual framework of power. Dimmock and Walker argue that where the power is located with the few there are unequal distributions of power. Moreover, the lecture mode of study presents a passive position that may affirm stereotype thinking where the passive learner replicates the dominant pedagogy (Eraut, 1994) with a desire to delegate responsibility. The signature pedagogies within which lecture and presentation modes of study are located potentially promote a passive learner who replicates the pedagogue. This is located within Dimmock and Walker (2008) generative/replicative dimensions of their presentation of six dimensions of societal/regional/local culture. Here, innovations, ideas and inventions that have been developed elsewhere are replicated without consideration for the local context (Dimmock and Walker, 2008).

However, the evidence reveals clear shifts emerging in accessing the curriculum through more power-distributed signature pedagogies for the International Students' Group and the group of Russian educational leaders who began accessing the curriculum with more power-concentrated signature pedagogies (Dimmock and Walker, 2008). The evidence suggests that students pre-disposed to passive learning through didactic signature pedagogies were able to begin to gain the kinds of dispositions needed to access the curriculum through more power-distributed signature pedagogies (Dimmock and Walker, 2008).

For the two English groups the evidence reveals that the power was distributed between the pedagogue and students and there does not appear to be examples of modes of study where the learning was passive on the Masters course. However, there were two exceptions where a middle leader preferred to listen to the senior leader which may prevent the development of free thinking and power distribution (Hofstede, 1997; Dimmock and Walker, 2008). A further exceptional barrier to power sharing within a power distributed dialogue in the two English groups was where an educational leader was 'vociferous' and the tutor was required to prevent the leader dominating the dialogue. The

leader was pre-disposed to dominate the dialogue which potentially prevented the development of free thinking (Dimmock and Walker, 2008).

The evidence reveals that students pre-disposed to passively receiving knowledge and power-concentrate signature pedagogies found being introduced to dynamic social interactions at the start of a Masters course challenging. Conversely, students who are pre-disposed to co-constructing knowledge through power-distributed signature pedagogies did not experience dialogues where the pedagogue or expert overtly dominated the dialogue. However, an exception to this was where a student who was a middle leader believed they were engaging with a democratic power distribution within a dialogue. However, they were engaging with power distance ways of acting and being in the world as they took on a novice expert relationship with a leader more senior in the institution's hierarchy. Here the power distance is actualized through the middle leader replicating a senior leader's ways of acting and being in the world. The middle leader may believe themselves to be a novice and the hierarchical leader within the institution's leadership structure the 'expert' but this limits a free space for critiquing and reflecting on ways of acting and knowing in the world (Barnett and Coates, 2005).

Students may choose to co-construct knowledge through dialogue rather than engage with power-concentrated signature pedagogies, or they may believe they are co-constructing knowledge through dialogue when in real terms they are acting as transmitters of inequalities inculcated by hierarchies where power lies with the few. It might be argued that these dispositions may be a conscious or subconscious ways of acting and being. We argue that by sharing these frameworks and this research with educational leaders it may help them begin to reflect about their learning. We argue that when they reflect on their own learning they may begin to think about and their students' learning in new ways.

We argue that a balance is required between power-concentrated and power-distributed pedagogies if engagement with the curriculum is going to enhance the opportunities learners may have of transforming their knowledge, ways of acting and ways of being in the world (Barnett and Coate, 2005). Therefore, we argue that the readiness for particular modes of study may be dependent on the students' prior experience and cultural context. Further, if a student's prior experience and cultural context does not include particular signature pedagogies the tutors/pedagogues of Masters

courses need to make adjustments to the curriculum and the planned engagement with the curriculum. The adjustments need to provide the students with knowledge, ways of acting and ways of being in the world to enable them to fully engage with all parts of the curriculum. Full engagement with the course may enable the student to invest appropriate levels of energy, resources, and time in the programme of study with commitment (Barnett and Coate, 2005). Thus the evidence reveals that readiness for engaging with particular modes of study, or recognition of the importance of induction into unfamiliar modes of study of a postgraduate course is important if students are to fully engage with their Masters course curriculum (Shchedrovitski, 1995; Asmolov, 2002; 2007). We argue that failure to recognize students' pre-dispositions for particular modes of study, coupled with a lack of induction facilities provided by the Higher Education Institution is a barrier to engaging with the curriculum. Further we argue that it is important to explain to educational leaders that there are different modes of knowledge on particular Masters programmes. Further we argue that it is important to reveal to the educational leaders/students the implications of the different modes of knowledge in terms of power concentration and power distribution and to facilitate the educational leaders thinking about their learning and their own pedagogical relationships within the learning communities in light of this knowledge.

The evidence reveals that power within dialogues may contain overt or covert power concentrated and/or power distributed signature pedagogies. Therefore it may be more important that the claims made about particular forms of dialogues, and the actualisation of those dialogues are coherent and consistent. Further it is important that participants are clear about the terms of reference for the particular dialogue they are engaged with so that they recognize what is expected of them in terms of their role being passive or dynamic. We argue that enabling educational leaders to experience a balanced approach to different forms of dialogues transparent and authentic communication system may have the potential for bringing about a new world view (Bohm, 1996).

Finally, we argue that there may be strengths found in a whole school leadership team learning together as a cohort on a Masters programme. However it may be noted that middle leaders may be reluctant to share their concrete experience in dialogues because they perceive themselves to be a 'novice'. Therefore there may be benefits of

having cohorts of educational leaders from different institutions.

Conclusions

In sum the role of dialogue is important as a mode of study for the Masters course here studied. The evidence reveals that International full time, and Russian part time participants were pre-disposed to passive learning through didactic signature pedagogies with a power-concentrated signature pedagogy (Dimmock and Walker, 2008). The evidence also reveals that English participants were pre-disposed to more pro-active learning through didactic signature pedagogies with power-distributed signature pedagogies (Dimmock and Walker, 2008). UKA and UKB groups engaged with the kind of dialogues that include critical thinking and the generation of new ideas and methods (Dimmock and Walker, 2008).

However, within apparent dynamic power distributed dialogues middle leaders saw senior leaders in the hierarchy as experts and chose to listen rather than contribute to the dialogue which placed the overt power distributed dialogue within the power concentrated dialogue (Dimmock and Walker, 2008). Further one of the English group participants articulated that a leader was vociferous and the tutor had to prevent them from dominating the dialogue which had the potential of moving a power distributed dialogue towards a power concentrated dialogue.

There were two respondents from the International group that demonstrated a shift in disposition from lectures and passive learning to working with more dynamic dialogues and working in groups. The evidence suggests these educational leaders were able to begin to gain the kinds of dispositions needed to access the curriculum through more power-distributed signature pedagogies (Dimmock and Walker, 2008). It is not clear if this occurred through a deliberate induction process offered by programme providers to different modes of study or whether it occurred through the two learners accommodating to new modes of study because their grammar of thinking or dispositions enabled this kind of curriculum engagement. The evidence reveals that inducting international students to different modes of study for curriculum engagement is important. A sharp focus here will be the influence of a cultural change upon educational leaders' committed investment in the programme and the transformation of their

knowledge, professional practice, or actions and their ways of being in the world (Barnett and Coate, 2005).

Therefore the evidence reveals that consideration needs to be given to the pre-dispositions of students to engage with the curriculum using particular modes of study with planned inductions to potentially new modes of study (Unt, 2003). The evidence suggests that modes of study might compliment each other (Novikov, 2007). Thus dialogue as a mode of study might take a mixed methods approach drawing on didactic power-concentrated and social constructivist power-distributed signature pedagogies (Dimmock and Walker, 2008).

The evidence here presented identifies the need to consider dispositions of leaders when designing and providing international postgraduate leadership education programmes for the advancement of learning. Such programmes may then present a balance of modes of study and pedagogies. They may also include induction programmes to these modes

of studies and pedagogies to enable educational leaders to gain the necessary dispositions to engage successfully with their own leadership development. Bringing a balanced approach to modes of study and pedagogies of international educational leadership development Masters programmes has the potential to act as a bridge between existing knowledge and the co-creation of new knowledge. Further educational leaders have the potential to mobilize knowledge across boundaries and disciplines for the benefit of all.

Further research is recommended to examine the quality dimensions of postgraduate research. It is also recommended that this is done through an international network so that societal/regional/local cultures can be considered. These dimensions are important when examining the quality of the postgraduate programmes and the pre-dispositions of educational leaders engaging with particular modes of study found on Masters courses for educational leadership development.

References

- 1 Ainscow, M., Muijs, D., & West, M. (2006) «Collaboration as a strategy for improving schools in challenging circumstances». *Improving Schools*, 9 (3), 192-202.
- 2 Asmolov, A. (2003) «Practical psychology and designing the variant education in Russia: from conflict paradigm to tolerancy paradigm». *Questions to Psychologies*, 4, 3-4.
- 3 Asmolov, A. (2007) *The Psychology to personalities, Cultural-history understanding the development of the person*. Moscow: Moscow Academy.
- 4 Ball, S. (2006) *Education Policy and Social Class*. London: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.
- 5 Barnett, R. (2000) *Realising the university in an age of supercomplexity*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- 6 Barnett, R., Coate, K. (2005) *Engaging the Curriculum in Higher Education*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- 7 Bartram, B., and Bailey, C. (2009) «Different students, same difference?: A comparison of UK and international students' understandings of 'effective teaching'». *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 10, (2), 172-184.
- 8 Bepalko, V. (1989) *Composed pedagogical technologies*. Moscow: Pedagogika.
- 9 Biddle, B., & Saha, L. (2005) *The Untested Accusation*. USA: Scarecrow Education.
- 10 Bloom, B. (1956) *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals: Handbook 1 cognitive domain*. New York: Longman.
- 11 Bohm, D. (1996) *On Dialogue* (ed. By Lee Nichol). London: Routledge.
- 12 Bottery, M. (2012) «Leadership, the logic of sufficiency, and the sustainability of education». *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership* vol. 40, 4: pp. 449-463.
- 13 Bourdieu, P. (2000) *Pascalian Meditations*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- 14 British Educational Research Association (2011) *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research*. Online Retrieved 15.10.2012 Available at: <http://content.yudu.com/Library/Alt9gr/BERAEthicalGuideline/resources/index.htm?referrerUrl=http%25253A%25252F%25252Fwww.yudu.com%25252Fitem%25252Fdetails%25252F375952%25252FBERA-Ethical-Guidelines-2011>.
- 15 Brune, J. P., & Krohn, D. (Eds.) (2005) *Socratic Dialogue and ethics*. Munster: Lit Verlag.
- 16 Central Advisory Council for Education (ACE) (1963) *Half our Future* (The Newsom Report). London: HMSO (Accessed, July 2008).
- 17 Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2001) *Research methods in education*. London: Croom Helm.
- 18 Cribb, A. and Gewirtz, S. (2003) «Towards a sociology of just practices; an analysis of plural conceptions of justice.» In: C. Vincent (ed) *Social Justice Education and Identity*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- 19 Davydov, V. (1995) *The theory of developmental education*. Moscow: Inter.
- 20 Delanty, G. (2001) *Challenging Knowledge The University in the Knowledge Society*. Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

- 21 Denscombe, M. (2003) *The Good Research Guide Second Edition for Small Scale Social Research Projects*. Berkshire: Open University Press.
- 22 DfE. (2011) *Education Act*. London: HMSO.
- 23 Dimmock, C., & Walker, A. (2008) *Educational Leadership. Culture and Diversity*. London: Sage.
- 24 Donmoyer, R. (1990) «Generalisability and the single-case study.» In E. Eisner and A. Peskin (Eds) *Qualitative Inquiry in education: The continuing debate*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- 25 Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) (2010) *Framework for Research Ethics (FRE)* [online]. Available at: http://www.esrc.ac.uk/ESRCInfoCentre/Images/ESRC_Re_Ethics_Frame_tcm6-11291.pdf.
- 26 Eraut, M. (1994) *Developing professional knowledge and competence*. Lewes: Falmer Press.
- 27 Farley-Ripple, E., Raffel, J. and Welch, C. (2012), «Administrator career paths and decision processes», *Journal of Educational Administration*, 50 (6), 788 – 816.
- 28 Furlong, J., & Oancea, A. (2005) *Assessing Quality in Applied and Practice-based Educational Research A Framework for Discussion*. Retrieved 4 3, 2006, available at: <http://www.securewebmail.le.ac.uk/Exchange/ast11/Sent%20Items?RE:%20MIE%20article-5.EML/Furlong%20and%20Oancea.pdf/C58EA28C-18C0-4a97-9AF2-036E93/Furlong%20and%20Oancea.pdf?attach=1>
- 29 Galperin, P., & Talysina, N. F. (1985) *Modern Theory of the phased shaping mental destiny*. Moscow: Moscow State University.
- 30 Gibson, W., Hall, A., & Callery, P. (2006) «Topicality and the structure of interactive talk in face-to-face seminar discussions: implications for research in distributed learning media». *British Educational Research Journal*, 32 (1), 77-94.
- 31 Giles, L., and Smith, R. (2012) «Negotiating and constructing an educationally relevant leadership programme», *Journal of Educational Administration*, 50 (2), 231 – 242.
- 32 Grint, K (2010) *Leadership: The Enemy of the People? The International Journal of Leadership in Public Services*.
- 33 Gunter, H. (2005) *Conceptualising research in educational leadership. Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 33 (2), 165-180.
- 34 Hall, V. (1998) «We are all adult educators now: The implications of Adult Learning Theory for the continuing professional development of educational leaders and managers». *ESRC Seminar Series: Redefining Educational Management*. Milton Keynes, England.
- 35 Heckmann, G. (1981) *Das sokratische Gespräch: Erfahrungen in philosophischen Hochschulseminaren*. Hannover: Schroedel.
- 36 HESA. (2005) *Table 0a - All students by institution, mode of study, level of study, gender and domicile*. Retrieved 4 20, 2006, from <http://www.hesa.ac.uk/holidisdoes/pubinfo/student/institution0405.htm>
- 37 Hodgkinson, C. (1991) *Educational Leadership: The moral art*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- 38 Hofstede, G (1986) *Cultural differences in teaching and learning. International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 10 (3), 301-320.
- 39 Hofstede, G. (1991) *Cultures and Organizations*. Berkshire: McGraw-Hill Book Company Europe.
- 40 Hofstede, G. (1997) *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. McGraw Hill: New York.
- 41 Hutorski, A. (1998) *The Competencies in formation: experience of the designing*. Moscow: INEK.
- 42 Jackson, D. (2000) *The School Improvement Journey: perspectives on leadership. School Leadership and Management*, 20 (1), 67-78.
- 43 Kessels, J. (1997) *Socrates op de markt: Filosofie in bedrijf*. Amsterdam: Boom.
- 44 Klarin, M. (2007) *Education to study: model systematic data acceptance, checking the hypotheses. No.1*.
- 45 Kraevski, V. (2008) *Pedagogical Language in the context of the modern scientific knowledge: The materials of methodology conference seminar*. Volgograd: Krasnodar.
- 46 Leal, F., & Saran, R. (2004) *A Dialogue on the Socratic Dialogue, Act Two*. (P. Shipley, Ed.) *Occasional Working Papers in Ethics and Critical Philosophy*, 3.
- 47 Leicester, U. o. (2008). *University of Leicester Ethics Code of Practice*. Leicester: University of Leicester.
- 48 Leontiev, A. (1977) *The Consciousness. The Personality*. Moscow: Politisdat.
- 49 Lerner, I. (1974) *Problem-based education*. Moscow: Knowledge.
- 50 Lunt, I. (2002) *Integrating Academic and Professional Knowledge: Constructing the Practitioner-Researcher*. Retrieved 3 4, 2003, http://www.qut.edu.au/dresa/CPE/ProfDocs/Papers/Scott_paper.doc» Mahmutov, M. (1977) *Organization of problem-solving education in school*. Moscow: Enlightenment.
- 51 Mahrous, A.A., Ahmed, A.A., (2009) «A Cross-Cultural Investigation of Students' Perceptions of the Effectiveness of Pedagogical Tools. The Middle East, the United Kingdom, and the United States». *Journal of Studies in International Education Online First*, published on May 11.
- 52 Moos, L and Kofod, K. (2009) «Sustained successful school leadership in Denmark», *Journal of Educational Administration*, 47 (6), 709 – 718.
- 53 Olson, K., & Clarke, C. (2009) «A Signature Pedagogy in Doctoral Education: The Leader Scholar Community». *Educational Researcher*, 38 (3), 216-221.
- 54 Pring, R. (2000) *Philosophy of Educational Research*. London: Continuum.
- 55 Pring, R. (2007) «The Common School». *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 41 (4) 503–522.
- 56 *Quality Assurance Agency (2010) Master's Degree Characteristics*. Gloucester: Quality Assurance Agency.
- 57 Rayner, S., Gunter, H. M., & Powers, S. (2002) *Professional Development Needs for Leaders in Special Education. Journal of In-Service Education*, 28 (1), 79-93.

- 58 Ribbins, P., & Gunter, H. (2002) «Mapping leadership studies in education: towards a typology of knowledge domains». *Educational Management and Administration*, 30 (4), 359-386.
- 59 Russian Education - 2020: A Model of Education for an Economy based on Knowledge in Russian. (2008). Moscow.
- 60 Salmon, G. (2007) *E-Moderating: the key to teaching and learning online*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- 61 Saran, R., and Neisser, B. (2004) *Enquiring Minds*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.
- 62 Schedrovitski, G. (1995) *Selected Works*. Moscow: Moscow School.
- 63 Schulman, L., Golde, C., Conklin, B., & Garabedian, K. (2006) «Reclaiming Education's Doctorates: A critique and a proposal». *Educational Researcher*, 25, 25-32.
- 64 Shields, C. (2010) «Leading Justly in a Complex World». In Tooms, A., and Boske, C. (eds) *Bridge Leadership*. North Carolina: Information Age Publishing Inc.
- 65 Taysum, A. (2010). *Evidence Informed Leadership*. London: Continuum.
- 66 Thrupp, M. (2005) «The National College for School Leadership a critique». *Management in Education*, 19 (2), 13-19.
- 67 Vygotsky, L. (1956) *Selected Psychological Studies*. Moscow: Moscow.
- 68 Wikeley, F., & Mushamp, Y. (2004) Pedagogical implications of working with doctoral students at a distance. *Distance Education*, 25 (1), 125-142.
- 69 Zankov, L. (1957) *Pedagogika*. Moscow: Moscow.