

Alexandre Bermous¹

Southern Federal University, Department of Education and Pedagogical Sciences, Russia

The Project of the Research Master's Degree Program in the Education Sphere

Abstract. The focus of the project undertaken is to comprehend, what is the research magistracy in education in the twenty-first century. Since the 1990s, when the master's level of training first appeared in the Russian education system, a search was made for its place and role in the system of training highly qualified personnel for the education system. The central problem of the current stage of the master education development is a triple conjunction: understanding the relationship between research and educational activities; the reflection of the contexts, conditions and limitations of research activity in the field of education; and the creation of new research programs based on humanitarian discourses in the second half of the twentieth century. The conceptual foundations of the project were built in connection with the ideas of T. Kuhn's "scientific paradigms" and I. Lakatos's "research programs", which made it possible to establish a correspondence between different educational values and the type of research practices; the field approach of P. Bourdieu, which allows the models and resources of research activity to be structured; and structural psychoanalysis by J. Lacan, which provides a new look at research activity. As a result of the article, a generalized image of the developed master's program "Interdisciplinary Studies in Education" is formulated.

Keywords: master degree program, research magistracy in education, scientific paradigms, research programs, field approach, structural psychoanalysis, interdisciplinary studies in education

Introduction and Literature Review

The history of master's education in Russia, of course, is much shorter than in European countries and is about three decades old; however, even during this

1 D.Sc. in Education, Professor, Head of the Department of Education and Pedagogical Sciences at the Southern Federal University (Rostov-on-Don, Russia). ORCID: 0000-0002-9342-6339. E-mail:bermous@sfnu.ru.

period of time, there have been several shifts that determined the current state and development trends of this system.

As it is known from a fundamental article on the history of changes in perceptions of the magistracy (Nikulina, 2014), the approval of the magistracy as an independent level of education was associated with essential changes in the social structure and the construction of a post-industrial society. In this context, new program documents were developed, such as the “Concept for the Long-Term Development of Russia for the Period to 2020” (2008), the “Strategy of innovative development of the Russian Federation for the period to 2020” (2011) etc.

Since then, a master’s graduate was considered primarily as a “change agent” or “a person whose presence, thought processes and activities cause a change in the traditional way of solving or understanding a problem” (Friedman, 2000). In the field of education, this meant that a researcher with a willingness and ability to transform activities, that is, consent and a desire to promote change should be the “agent of change” (Fielding, 2001; Kay et al., 2010).

As a result, E.G. Nikulina distinguishes two stages in the development of master’s education, differing in their meanings, goals, and issues of discussion. The beginning of the first period is connected with the Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation No.13 “On the introduction of a multilevel structure of higher education in the Russian Federation” (1992). This decree gave universities the right to train bachelors and masters along with graduates. The purpose of the master’s program was defined as the training of masters of sciences, whose future activities should be primarily of a research nature. As V. Senashenko noted, “Master’s programs within the framework of a multi-level system are an integral element of higher education, professionally oriented to scientific research; this is the educational link where education and creative [research] activity come together” (Senashenko, 1993, p. 94).

In order to ensure the implementation of Decree No. 13 on August 10, 1993, the “Regulation on Master’s Training (Master) in the System of Multilevel Higher Education of the Russian Federation” (1993) was approved. In accordance with this provision, master’s educational programs were associated with bachelor’s programs in relevant areas and were considered as “add-ons” for bachelor’s programs, which allowed them to master the chosen field of study in a larger volume and with a greater degree of depth. This position consolidated the orientation of master’s training exclusively on research and scientific-pedagogical activity.

According to the Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation of August 12, 1994 N 940 “On approval of the state educational standard of higher professional education” (1994), the magistracy was assigned to be the third level of higher education, and consisted of a bachelor’s program in a relevant area and at least two-year specialized training focused on science – research and (or) scientific and pedagogical activity of the graduate.

Thus, 50% of the master's professional educational program curriculum was research, and the goal of the master's program was "training specialists capable of independent research activity" (Senashenko & Komissarova, 1995, p. 107).

This implied strict requirements for the level of scientific equipment of magistracy: the availability of scientific schools, the high personnel potential of the university (70% of the faculty are doctors and candidates of science) and the presence of postgraduate studies: at least 50% of the master's programs in this field should be provided by related graduate studies (Senashenko & Komissarova, 1995, p. 108).

The second stage in the development of master's education is associated with Russia's entry into the Bologna process, and therefore, the main problems were associated with the implementation of the principles of the Bologna process in the domestic education system. Among them were the transition to two-cycle training, the introduction of the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) and the differentiation of "scientific" and "applied" magistracy. At the same time, the range of magistracy areas was expanding. According to order No.62 of the Russian Ministry of Education and Science "On the educational program of higher professional education of specialized training for masters" (2006), master's programs could be focused not only on research and scientific-pedagogical activity, but also on design, managerial, cultural or educational activities.

The Federal State Educational Standard of Higher Professional Education defined the master's degree as a higher advanced professional education that allows the graduate to successfully work in the chosen field of activity and to possess universal and subject-specific competencies that contribute to his social mobility and stability in the labour market. In particular, the following competencies became priorities of master's training (Bajdenko, 2009a, 2009b, 2009c): systematic understanding of the field of study and possession of skills and research methods related to this field; the ability to plan, implement and apply research with criteria of scientific certainty; as well as the ability to critically analyse, synthesize and evaluate new and complex ideas.

The implementation of these priorities meant, in practical terms, the inclusion in the educational system of universities of various kinds of business incubators, "remote departments" (the university's subdivisions established in other institutions); the development of network training programs with the participation of foreign universities and scientific institutions of the Russian Academy of Sciences and the Russian Academy of Education, the individualization and profiling of student training, and modern educational technologies.

At the same time, the main change in the development priorities of the magistracy at the second stage was the focus not only on the preparation of a research scientist (especially since this task is more or less successfully solved in postgraduate studies) but on a professional innovator who is ready for research and subsequent

reconstruction of his professional practice (Churkin & Churkina, 2018; Guseva, 2012; Sinicyna & Churkina, 2015).

At the institutional level, the second stage is also characterized by a large-scale transformation of the magistracy in pedagogical areas and profiles in connection with the inclusion of most pedagogical universities in the composition of research and federal universities, which creates some conditions for interaction in the cooperation of the “classical” university and “psychological and pedagogical” tradition in master’s education, which expands international contacts of pedagogical magistrates, provides access to a modern scientific infrastructure, and introduces modern forms of design and research activities.

To provide background for these transformations, the Professional Standard “Teacher” (Order, 2013) was approved in 2013, which contains a huge number of new requirements for the teacher, including the implementation of research activities. To ensure the preparation of students for the implementation of this standard in 2014–2017, the Teacher Education Modernization Project (Safronova & Bysik, 2014) was implemented in the Russian system of teacher education. The main goals of which are “radically improving the quality of training of students receiving teacher training; changing the content of teacher training technologies in order to implement a professional standard, new Federal State Educational Standards at school and preschool stages; and improving the effectiveness of universities implementing teacher training programs and teacher training colleges.”

It was assumed that the project was undertaken by 65 educational institutions situated in 51 regions of the Russian Federation which had to develop not only a new model of teacher education but also a new ideology of its development (Margolis & Safronova, 2018).

One of the aspects of the Pedagogical Education Modernization Project was the development of a research master’s model (Vesmanov et al., 2015). At the same time, a significant defect in these searches remains the ambiguity of the concept of research activity in the modern education system as a whole, and, as a result, the lack of certainty regarding the influence of researches over other activities in the field of education.

It seems important to us to review the situation with the research component of teacher training in the world in order to identify the general difficulties, the specifics of the problems of teacher training in the world, and possible solutions. One of the urgent problems remains the relationship between practice-oriented and research training of teachers.

The problem is that even in Finland, known for its successes, the difference between the two concepts of teacher education is almost imperceptible, and the gap between the theory and practice of education, education received and subsequent professional career is a big problem (Puustinen et al., 2018).

Another important factor determining the importance of research experience for the training of teachers is their own orientation to its acquisition and use (Brew & Saunders, 2020). More subtle dependencies of the research approach to teaching are also revealed: it turns out that its success is determined not only by the content of the programs but also by the institutional and social context, and the programs themselves must be internally more consistent: the term “coherent” is often used here (Munte & Rogne, 2015).

At the same time, no one questions the general usefulness of the participation of teachers in research for their professional and personal development, including as part of research teams (Niemi & Nevgi, 2014; Willegems et al., 2018). A similar effect is observed for students and teachers in the system of teacher education: the research activity everywhere becomes an important factor in professional formation and development (Dobber et al., 2012; Yogev & Yogev, 2006).

Meanwhile, the discussion of the research orientation of teacher training, as a rule, ignores many deeper problems associated with qualitative changes in the essence and meaning of scientific and humanitarian knowledge itself and especially research in the field of education in recent decades and the inevitable constant redefinition of values and meanings cognition over time (Afdal & Spernes, 2018; Gitlin et. al., 1999).

Purpose of the Research

In our research we deal with some definite problems and trends in the Russian teacher education, as follows:

First, in Russia and the Russian-speaking scientific and educational space (we note that this is part of the global trend, but in Russia it has manifested itself with greater certainty) in recent decades there has been an “inflation” of research in the field of education, loss of authenticity, the widespread of incorrect borrowings, ghost writing, etc.

Secondly, the mutual alienation of educational, managerial and scientific institutions is intensified; scientific knowledge is not relevant and in demand in the development and implementation of strategic decisions in the field of education.

Thirdly, the younger generation of researchers is in a frustrating situation: the traditional approaches and models of psychological and pedagogical research are irrelevant to the changed reality, and the new realities, for various reasons, have not yet been fully comprehended nor brought into an instrumental and comprehensive form.

Fourthly, we are witnessing a progressive fragmentation of the educational space in many aspects, in connection with which, observers note the inefficiency

and even the impossibility of implementing long-term development projects and programs.

At the same time, conceptualization is continuing in the following areas:

1. Philosophy of master's education (Lebedeva, 2010).
2. Methodologies for the development of master programs (Buntova, 2019; Hajrutdinov, 2019);
3. Organization of research activities in the magistracy (Fedorova & Churkina, 2016; Vaganova et al., 2017).

In these conditions, our purpose is developing the conceptual background, model and content for the research master-degree program in the sphere of teacher education, aimed at preparing educational leaders who have the definite willingness and readiness for changes and have been trained in a variety of research, project, teaching and management methodologies. To do this, we use a complex hypothesis: a research master's project in the field of teacher training can be an effective means of the modernization of teacher education under following conditions:

- The research activities of the students and teaching staff will be implemented in the context of a certain research program developed and implemented in the form of a scientific paradigms and programs (T. Kuhn and I. Lakatos);
- All the research, project, teaching and management activities will be performed in an integrated social field of the educational system (we could also name it as “ecosystems”), as such, and be adjusted to external challenges, internal resources and processes (P. Bourdieu);
- Any kind of research activity will be based on the processes of self-determination, self-identification and sense formation, and, in this aspect, involve the use of tools and concepts of structural psychoanalysis (J. Lacan).

Methodology

The concept of a “paradigm”, proposed in 1962 by Thomas Kuhn (Kuhn, 1977), has in recent years become very widespread in the field of education and many other humanitarian disciplines (Osipov, 2017), but its application is associated with a number of difficulties. In particular, the concept has been successfully used for a retrospective review of models of scientific activity, but it is ineffective in the design of new research. In addition, the definition proposed by T. Kuhn himself contained a certain share of sociological uncertainty (Kuhn, 1977, p. 28): “Their creation (of classical works) was sufficiently unprecedented to attract for a long time a group of supporters from competing areas of scientific research. At the same time, they were open enough so that new generations of scientists could find unresolved problems of any kind for themselves ... Achievements with these two characteristics, I will call further “paradigms” ... ”.

In addition, “The new paradigm also implies a new, clearer definition of the field of study” (Kuhn, 1977, p. 39), however, “... a kind of scientific research is possible without paradigms or, at least, without such definite and mandatory paradigms” (Kuhn, 1977, p. 30). At the same time, “paradigms acquire their status because their use leads to success rather than the use of competing methods to solve some problems ...” (Kuhn, 1977, p. 45). Finally, the paradigm is “what unites the members of the scientific community, and, conversely, the scientific community consists of people who recognize the paradigm” (Kuhn, 1977, p. 229)

All the above aspects of the concept indicate the appropriateness of the concept of “paradigm” in the conditions of the modern Western community of natural scientists; since it significantly involves such concepts as: novelty / unprecedented scientific experience; scientific competition, as the main tool for ensuring the productivity of science, the confrontation of “supporters” and “opponents” of new knowledge, etc.

Some alternative (or rather, an addition) to the views of Thomas Kuhn is the methodology of research programs by Imre Lakatos (2008). In contrast to T. Kuhn, who focused on sociological criteria and aspects of “trust in knowledge”, I. Lakatos, to a greater extent, appealed to the normative side of the cognition process.

In particular, any theories appear, in his system of views, only as elements (stages) of the development of research programs related to constant succession and competition. Accordingly, criticality both internal and external is a necessary condition for the development of this or that knowledge. In general, it is the stereoscopic view of I. Lakatos on any scientific processes due to the identification of intrascientific (internal) and sociocultural (external) reflection (“falsification”) (Lakatos, 2008), which is one of the most attractive aspects of his concept. The very concept of a research program includes four significantly different components:

- “hard core” – a system of fundamental ideas and assumptions that determine the integrity and identity of the research program;
- “protective belt”, consisting of auxiliary hypotheses and ensuring the safety of the “hard core” from refutation; it can be modified, partially or completely replaced in the event of a collision with counterexamples;
- “positive heuristics” or a set of normative methodological rules and regulations setting directions for further search;
- “negative heuristics” – informal prohibitions or restrictions on research directions and ways.

For several decades, the idea of I. Lakatos’s research programs was perceived, to a greater extent, as one of the objects of “philosophy and history of science”, and only in recent years have individual studies begun to actualize the potential of I. Lakatos’s views on the solution of specific philosophical issues (Vorob’ev, 2016).

Meanwhile, the problem of research in the field of education is determined by the fact that the value foundations of these studies are far from the ideals of the natural sciences and are in a complex field defined by elements of scientific knowledge, religious and philosophical values, political and ideological attitudes, as well as ordinary ideas and concepts.

A substantial progress of conceptualization and understanding of the processes and problems in social sphere is due interpretations given by the twentieth century sociologist Pierre Bourdieu and, in particular, his research in the field of the sociology of science and education (Bourdieu, 2001; Bourdieu, 2005; Vakan, 2007; Ivanova, 2012).

At the same time, the following should be noted: until now, the methodological apparatus of research in education, on the one hand, and the conceptual structures of P. Bourdieu, so far, have been in completely different spaces. We believe that our task is to show that the very formulation of the methodological apparatus of research is the very space in which the action of field factors and conditions is manifested with the greatest completeness and obviousness.

The absolutely fundamental fact for constructing any field is its producing character: depending on the context in which this or that field is formed, knowledge, culture, power, etc. can be produced. Moreover, there are no “pure” fields producing only one type of “product”, but a combination of various trends and factors determines the specifics of production.

According to P. Bourdieu, the field of science is “over-determined” that is, it is determined by at least two sets of factors and attitudes – political (gaining power and influence) and epistemological (gaining knowledge in accordance with a certain methodology).

The field ideas of P. Bourdieu perfectly solve another eternal problem of scientific knowledge – the objectivity / subjectivity of scientific creativity. Indeed, we are accustomed to the fact that in the introduction to each scientific work (from term paper to the dissertation), there is always a description of the object and subject of knowledge, which are thought of as a “given” to the researcher. Meanwhile, the field approach distinguishes behind this formality the complex process of objectification and subjectivation, that is, the construction of the subject and the object of cognition through a series of procedures: admission to graduate school, conclusion of contracts between researchers and educational institutions, etc. It is the totality of these procedures, tolerances, conditions and conventions (in the terminology of P. Bourdieu, “habitus”) that sets the field of cognition and, at the same time, is a limiting factor for the research practice itself.

Finally, one cannot fail to note the fundamental role of the procedures for including and excluding acquired knowledge (hierarchy and exclusion). Any acquired knowledge is necessarily evaluated and built into the current social order on the basis of its “community”, “significance”, and “evidence”.

Moreover, any knowledge has a risk, due to various reasons, to be outside the scientific field itself, being recognized as “unscientific” or “unconventional”. It should be noted that the concept of P. Bourdieu’s field gives a lot, from the point of view, of understanding “macro processes” and understanding of scientific “macro politics”, but it is not enough to understand what the individual practice of scientific and pedagogical knowledge and activity is. And here, paradoxically, the psychoanalytic tradition comes to our aid, associated with the tradition of psychoanalysis developed by the philosopher and anthropologist of the twentieth century Jacques Lacan (1901–1981) (Evans, 1996; Naumova, 2015). Let us briefly review the emerging prospects in this regard.

1. Three registers of human being: the Real, the Imaginary, and the Symbolic ones. The starting point for a psychoanalytic interpretation is the understanding that the Reality of education (as, indeed, of any social system) always exceeds the capabilities of our rational consciousness. We are constantly in a stream of unreasonable experiences, events, meetings, emotions, the awareness and comprehension of which would make our life unbearable. That is why they “flow” through us, as a rule, without leaving any traces in the mind (where the name “unconscious” comes from). Another register of our being is the Imaginary, that is, that rather narrow segment of reality that is experienced and recognized as actions, thoughts, and images; it is in this segment that we can talk about our desires, dreams, ways of behaving. Finally, the third, narrowest segment is the normative Symbolic structure that we have, ordering everything that happens through the prism of the demanded or rejected, possible or unnecessary, etc. In fact, this is a set of rules, norms, prohibitions, arguments, justifications that we use in order to regulate our own behaviour or the activities of others.
2. All three registers of human reality are partly combined, partly contradictory to each other, in any case, the total overcoming of splitting is impossible. The conflict generated by these differences can have a very significant effect on behaviour, especially if the Symbolic structure contradicts the imaginary, or the imaginary is in conflict with the real. Accordingly, each educational phenomenon is differentiated: into the Real, the Imaginary and the Symbolic aspects.
3. The basic values of both educational and research activities are not associated with the search for some abstract “absolute truth”, but with the increment of some symbolic capitals – knowledge, fame and scientific authority, financial resources, career opportunities, etc. In this regard, the activities of both the modern representative of educational practice and the research teacher are closer to the activities of the analyst and consultant.

Results

In this part of study, we analyse the major features and peculiarities of the main research master-degree program. Its main purpose is to prepare highly qualified research practitioners in the field of education, ready for comprehensive research, examination of the current state of educational practices and educational systems, as well as to participate in innovative, project, teaching and management activities.

Thus, it can be argued that the program belongs to the mixed type of programs, preparing graduates for several types of activities (including pedagogical, methodological, and managerial) with the leading role of research.

As reference points, four master's programs were already implemented, which are already being implemented at various universities in Russia and the world.

Master's program "Measurements in Psychology and Education" at the National Research University "Higher School of Economics"². In contrast to this program, which focuses more on creating tools measurements in the social sciences and business, our program involves the formation of a wider range of competencies related to interdisciplinary research of educational practices and environments, as well as their improvement.

Master's program "Design and evaluation of educational programs and processes" at the Moscow Pedagogical State University³. The program we are developing has a number of common features, but it involves mastering not only project but also research and managerial competencies, including those ones in the educational practices.

The master's program of the same name "Interdisciplinary research in education" at the Moscow Pedagogical State University⁴. As the MPGU program is focused mainly on the psychological and pedagogical support provided by school psychologists and does not imply the formation of research and project competencies, the developing program provides preparation for comprehensive social and pedagogical research and research in the framework of the Strategic Technology Initiative in Russia (so-called, "Edunet").

One of the most interesting precedents of the developed program is the "Mind, Brain and Education" program, implemented at the Harvard School of Education⁵. It should be noted however, unlike the Harvard program, the study of the cognitive

2 Program site <https://www.hse.ru/ma/psyedu/>.

3 Program site: <http://mpgu.su/ob-mpgu/struktura/faculties/institut-vysshaya-shkola-obrazovaniya/magistratura/44-04-01-proektirovanie-i-otsenka-obrazovatelnyih-programm-i-protsesov-pedagogicheskoe-obrazovanie/>.

4 Program site <http://mpgu.su/ob-mpgu/struktura/faculties/institut-vysshaya-shkola-obrazovaniya/magistratura/44-04-02-mezhdistsiplinarnyie-issledovaniya-v-obrazovanii-psihologo-pedagogicheskoe-obrazovanie>.

5 Program site <https://www.gse.harvard.edu/masters/mbe>.

and neuropsychological aspects of educational activity is not an only priority of the program, but it is considered as one of the areas of research along with sociological, psychological and pedagogical methods, quality examination, etc.

Finally, another program similar to the one being developed is the POLS (“Policy, Organization and Leadership Studies”) program, implemented at the Stanford Graduate School of Education⁶. As well as the program at Stanford, emphasizes the formation of undergraduates with a wide range of competencies necessary for a career in education: the use of modern information technologies and the management of educational processes and practices.

Graduates will be able to work:

- in the scientific community as graduate students and teachers; researchers of scientific problems of education;
- in educational authorities, centres for testing and assessing the quality of education – as experts, methodologists, developers of innovative programs and projects;
- in non-governmental organizations (including institutions of additional education, entertainment centres) – as developers of educational programs and fields, experts on the quality and effectiveness of educational activities.

In general, it should be noted that in the Russian education system there is a completely unsatisfied demand for specialists having competences of the twenty-first century in the professional field (critical thinking, creativity, communication and cooperation), as well as research and evaluation of effectiveness, quality examination education, etc.

The program consists of 4 modules:

Research module: the task is to prepare for the solution of research problems both independently and as part of the research team. For this, undergraduates study the disciplines “Modern problems of science and education”, “Methods of sociological research”, “Methods of neuropsychological research in education”, “AI methods in education”, “Quantitative methods of research and processing of experimental information”, “Fundamentals of science.” Under this module, undergraduates undergo research practice.

Pedagogical module. Its task is to prepare students for using modern information and communication technologies; the modernization of their educational activities, the organization of the educational process in modern conditions, the accompaniment of individual educational trajectories of students. For this, undergraduates study “Educational Theories and Systems”, “Modern Educational Technologies” courses “Pedagogical Rhetoric” and “Pedagogical Communication”, and undertake pedagogical practice.

6 Program site <https://ed.stanford.edu/pols>.

Design module. Its goal is to prepare undergraduates for project management at all stages of the life cycle, organize the work of the team, develop and implement additional educational programs and programs for the monitoring and development of educational systems. For this, undergraduates study “Innovative processes in education”, “Workshop on the design of information educational technologies”; “Fundamentals of electronic source”, participate in technological practice.

Management module: its task is to prepare for the organization of the activities of teachers and students, determine the priorities and content of their own activities, design and implement flexible management of the educational system. For this, undergraduates will study “Management of a modern educational organization: political, legal and economic problems”, “Methods and strategies of flexible management in education (Agile, Scrum, Kanban), will undertake management practice.

Discussion and Conclusions

One of the main important controversies existing in Russian education and its studies is a great discrepancy between “traditional” and “progressive” paradigms (also orientations) in education. Due to the T. Kuhn and I. Lakatos ideas we may clarify some basic features, dispositions of the both paradigms and also scientific problems for thorough consideration. The ideas and meanings of the traditional paradigm are quite fully and systematically presented in most courses on the history of pedagogy, and, in an implicit form, they still form the basis of the national education system.

1. The most fundamental fact of traditional paradigm is a belief that the only real agent of educational policy and practice is the Russian state. Unlike Western Europe, where education was a rather complicated conglomerate of various traditions and cultures (ancient, Christian, state, corporative), the history of Russian education is almost entirely determined by state educational policy. Accordingly, the turn of state attention towards schools is clearly associated with the flourishing of education; on the contrary, any attempt to distance education from the state is seen as the beginning of decline and collapse. For the same reason, only the real manifestation of state power play a fundamental role in the history and current state of pedagogy and education: the creation of the Academy of Sciences and the Academic University in 1724, the establishment of the Ministry of Education and University Districts (1804), the establishment of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (RSFSR, in 1943), etc.
2. Despite the fact that the religious component itself, within the framework of traditional paradigm, is not so significant, state participation in education

is in full accordance with the Orthodox triad: mental education (imprinting of the human image), moral education (upbringing of the heart and will) and personal development (the creation of conditions for the formation of psychological and personality abilities).

3. The dominant role of a teacher. The educational process, from the point of view of the traditional paradigm, is always “face to face”, while the role of the teacher cannot be replaced or diminished by anything (including IT-technologies). A teacher simultaneously acts as a carrier of the teaching subject (in this regard, there is a certain hierarchy of subjects studied, the highest levels of which are occupied by mathematics and the native language as the most fully expressing the principles of science and the state nature of education), and, at the same time, as a carrier of the state and political senses in education.
4. The value character of education. The most important value of the traditional paradigm is the coherent system of pedagogical knowledge, which includes historical, philosophical and methodological components, the theory of education (didactics), subject-oriented methods, as well as the theory of education and school science. In fact, it is the science of pedagogy that appears as the unity of knowledge about a child, a teacher, a school, the pedagogical processes, as well as the custodian of the answers to the challenges of the time and the carrier of new knowledge for the future.

It should be noted that the area of the “protective belt” of traditional paradigm (as I. Lakatos would say) also includes ideas about the religious nature of instruction (in some eras, education directly refers to religious, church foundations, in some, the traditional paradigm acts as a relatively autonomous tradition of “social values”); another similar “belt-shaped” concept is the question of the personality of the student: in the era of liberalization, it has become the dominant value, or to cede the primacy of the teacher’s personality, but in any case, the personal nature of education and upbringing may not be questioned.

Positive and negative heuristics are associated with a statement of the crisis of education, caused, from the point of view of pedagogical traditionalism by the rejection of its national roots, the false pursuit of recognition of Russian education abroad and removal of the classics of Russian pedagogy. That is why one may see a decline in the quality of teacher training, and the loss of their authority. The main means of solving these problems seem quite obvious – the rejection of the invention of new terms, forms and methods of control (including educational standards, competency-based approach, variability), and a return to the Soviet model of school, the resumption of Russian pedagogy based on well-known principles and approaches, and strengthening state care for all aspects of education.

The opposite pole of “progressive paradigm” considers the history of the Russian school and pedagogy as, first of all, the history of the struggle of teachers’ personalities against the deadening state system of norms and regulations. Accordingly, the basis of pedagogy is not a public administration system, but an innovative subsystem of society, described by many “innovative” concepts, such as: “The Fourth Industrial Revolution”, “Sixth Technological Order”, “Revolution of Skills Update”, “Innovative Ecosystem”, “National Technological initiative”, etc.

The correlation of this multitude are the concepts of philosophical and pedagogical anthropology, including: “individuality”, “human rights and freedoms”, “independence”, and “cooperation”. It is the child who turns out to be the protagonist and the customer of education – any attempts to transfer responsibility for his education to parents, the school or the state are considered as a violation of the basic rights of the person and an attempt to deprive a person of the dominant gift – freedom. Another important aspect of progressive paradigm is a statement of accelerating changes that make any kind of training on the patterns of the past not only useless, but also harmful, because it accustoms the child to action in conditions that will never occur. The main danger of returning to the unreal past of false uniformity and meaningless repetitions is also connected with this. On the contrary, the variability of school norms and patterns and the orientation to the cultivation of new experience ensures the preservation of children’s health, their psychological and physical well-being.

Many contradictions arise regarding the determination of the place and role of scientific and pedagogical research in education. If we talk about the traditional paradigm, the state is the main customer of scientific activity, and the teacher is the recipient. To the extent that we turn to progressive paradigm, a completely different hierarchy of values and problems arises. The point is that the educational order and need should become the subject of design. This implies a large role and responsibility of pedagogical science; the use of a wide range of research and management methods, which include strategic and innovative management, quality diagnostics, etc.

Regarding the opposition to the traditional and progressive paradigms through the prism of the field approach, we need to question, how political management, practical activity and scientific research determine the subjectivity in education and its dependence of the field, inside which it is being produced. At the same time, judging from the psychoanalytic point of view, the main aspects of cognitive activity are preserved by the orientation to the Symbolic structures (publications in highly rated journals, obtaining recognition), the Imaginary (individual goal-setting, self-determination in the world of education); and the Real (immersion in educational practice).

The new knowledge on education is internally contradictory. On the one hand, scientific activity is initiated by a will “to overcome dependence” on certain restrictions. On the other hand, the result of scientific and pedagogical research

is recognized only to the extent that it can be used to improve and increase the effectiveness of the current system (the so-called criterion of “practical significance of the study”). A similar contradiction exists in the sphere of the scientist’s self-consciousness: personally, he/she is confident about his/her own significance and the importance of the chosen topic, however, recognition of the scientific status may be obtained only through outer recognition given by mentors and competitors.

The most important role in being recognized as a researcher is played by the scientific (sometimes called methodological) apparatus of research. Its main function is the processing of the entire set of the real and the imaginary associated with a specific study, and its presentation in the form of a symbolic structure alienated from the researcher. In this regard, the function of the methodological apparatus is similar to that one in chemical or metallurgical production: it structures the process into a series of successive stages; it provides fragmentation and consolidation of content, prepares it in some standard “blocks” and “products”, ensures “safety” and regularity of scientific production, etc.

Each kind of a scientific activity is placed into a certain “energy relief”. This may be some experience, which is considered worthy, but absent from the researcher himself (research on the description, generalization and dissemination of advanced pedagogical experience), or a gap between certain requirements (standards, norms) and existing resources and the practice of their implementation. Accordingly, the issue rests on the distribution of energies / resources – not only financial. At the same time, this situation questions the existing “apparatuses”: mechanisms of energy distribution (financing, construction of managerial verticals and networks), its blocking (for example, by increasing reporting without changing the resource) or spraying (increasing orders and obligations).

The inner contradictions of research activity are often treated as some rhetorical phenomenon – it refers to documents and declarations of different levels and degrees of validity. Meanwhile, formal logical contradictions constitute only a small part of the internal contradictions that define the subject and problems of scientific research. The contradiction, in this respect, is closer to the concept of conflict that arises between individual processes, trends and is recognised to be something significant. The most significant contradictions arise between different levels of educational reality and the norms that they generate: global (global trends), national (federal legislation and standards) and micro-system standardization levels (individual strategies, personal resources). Another group of contradictions is formed between modernist (oriented to logical universals) and postmodern (oriented to network, project, communication strategies). Finally, there is a contradiction between the systemic (based on the totality of external requirements) and personal (formed in a situation of non-adaptive activity) interpretation of the subject of education.

The objectification of scientific and pedagogical knowledge may be also questioned as a logical and substantial phenomenon. As we have repeatedly noted,

a human reality is split into various aspects. One of the most significant one, in the logic of scientific and pedagogical research, is split along the lines of the “external” and “internal” objects. The research practice itself becomes possible only at the point of conjunction of these two images: the study should be initially interesting to its subject and be in some “internal” plane of motives, but its practical implementation becomes possible only as it is recognized as significant for the whole systems of the process documented by programs, contracts, grants. The tension between these two objects (more precisely, ‘objectivization’), in a positive sense, is understood as “interest”, but in the case of adverse conditions, it can lead to a rupture of the internal and external objects and have adverse consequences.

In this case, the researcher either turns into a controlled robot, incapable of simple independent actions, or a narcissistic closure occurs, replacing objective reality with a set of “self-processes” (self-education, self-education, self-development, self-realization, self-determination, etc.). The presence of “external” and “internal” objects, in a state of tension, determines the complexity of their mutual conversion: when the movement / change of an external object requires adequate conceptualization and understanding in the internal plane (introjection) and, on the opposite side, when changes in the internal mode of action are transformed into a new way thinking, activity or rationing (projection).

New representations and concepts, which arose in the process of research are the juxtaposition of primary and secondary processes and, as a result, of “ideas” and “concepts”. Representations arise internally in a completely intuitive way, as a result of combining two basic mechanisms: reflection (the so-called “mirror stage” by J. Lacan) and fantasy. The first component is the result of assimilating the internal reality – external, the second – arbitrary evasion (“fantasms”). As a result, the emerging ideas combine many observations and arbitrary interpretations, and their dynamics are extremely complex and bizarre (primary processes). Scientific concepts arise externally as a result of a special selection, systematization and construction of primary concepts (secondary processes), taking into account the representations of predecessors objectified in the texts, the focus of the study, etc.

Objectification and research methodology mechanisms should make an object stable and conceivable. Indeed, the ongoing being, in which the internal and external determinants, complex and diverse motives and meanings are interlinked, is extremely unstable. At the same time, we can quite easily imagine two extreme points of this reality: on the one hand, this is the ideal of “human-machine production” (to a large extent, which Soviet pedagogy was oriented to): building a closed set of algorithms that allows each person to form predetermined properties personality and activity; on the other hand, it is an ideal of postmodern arbitrariness, where no action is mandatory and has irreversible consequences, but it is a random game with changing bets and adhering to arbitrary rules. In this regard, there is a certain

set (never articulated and completely unaware) of techniques and mechanisms that ensure the very situation of scientific and pedagogical knowledge.

The following value orientations of the research action can be distinguished:

- Goal setting and reflection. The most important pair of processes, providing, on the one hand, the production of some new (future) content and meaning, and, on the other hand, continuous criticism and formalization of the path travelled in well-known concepts and categories.
- Ensuring the constancy and stability of the facility. The meaning of these procedures is that during the entire research process, the object of cognition does not undergo any spontaneous changes that would affect the results of the study. Incidentally, the same, to a large extent, caused orientation toward the “average” student and the averaging of any indicators, as well as the “averaging” of student results: the more sensitive any system to random deviations and influences (including the student’s personal characteristics or teachers) the less predictable is the result.
- Security. To implement this attitude, the necessary physical and psychological conditions are created, the “borders” are maintained, ethical protocols are followed, and preventive measures against aggressive manifestations are implemented.
- Introjection and projection. Any research involves a combination of methods (mechanisms) of introjection (assimilation and conceptualization in the internal plan of external processes) and projection (transition to the approval and implementation of internal norms and rules).
- Association and separation (isolation). The very formulation of the object of cognition always occurs at the intersection of these two mechanisms: the object of pedagogical knowledge arises only as a result of the generalization of a significant number of representations, elements, images (whether it is a “pedagogical process”, “pedagogical system” or “technology”), but no less important and the opposite mechanism of separation of one object and their subsequent isolation from each other.
- Fantasy and rationalization. There is also a pair of interconnected processes, one of which is the free creation of new ideas, and the second is their criticism, simplification, integration into logical and semantic sequences.

Finally, organizational conditions for the development and implementation of the master’s program involve the creation of multi-level networks. They can be built: at the level of a separate courses (a system of digital resources and communications between participants and partners), at the university level (partnership of faculties and departments in the process of developing and implementing training programs) and at the level of the global educational space (invitation of visiting professors from other countries, inclusion of undergraduates in the system of remote communications).

There are plans to hold annual international conferences with the participation of all undergraduates, teachers and colleagues from other countries; conducting summer schools, internships and practices for teachers and undergraduates, participating in projects of international associations in the field of education: the Association of Education Researchers, the European Association of Education Researchers (EERA), and the International Association of Education Researchers (WERA).

In conclusion, we note that our goal is to create a continuously developing project of research-oriented programs in the sphere of teacher education, which will be capable of focusing on the level of urgent needs of the education system, and ensuring its dynamic development.

REFERENCES

- Afdal, H. W., & Spernes, K. (2018). Designing and redesigning research-based teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education Volume, 74*, 215–228. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.05.011>.
- Bajdenko, V. I. (2009a). Bolonskiye preobrazovaniya: problemy i protivorechiya (stat'ya chetvertaya) [Bologna transformations: problems and contradictions (article four)]. *Vysshee obrazovanie v Rossii, 11*, 26–40. Retrieved from <http://vovr.ru/upload/Baidenko11-09.pdf>.
- Bajdenko, V. I. (2009b). Monitoringovoye issledovaniye Bolonskogo protsessa: nekotoryye rezul'taty i vzglyad v budushcheye [Monitoring study of the Bologna process: some results and a look into the future (article one)]. *Vysshee obrazovanie v Rossii, 7*, 147–155. Retrieved from <http://vovr.ru/upload/Baidenko7-09.pdf>.
- Bajdenko, V. I. (2009c). Mnogoplanovyy i sistemnyy kharakter Bolonskogo protsessa (stat'ya vtoraya) [The multifaceted and systemic nature of the Bologna process (second article)]. *Vysshee obrazovanie v Rossii, 9*, 120–132. Retrieved from <http://vovr.ru/upload/Baidenko9-09.pdf>.
- Bourdieu, P. (2001). Prakticheskiy smysl [Practical meaning]: (A.T. Bikbov, K.D. Voznesenskaya, S.N. Zenkina & N.A. Shmatko, Trans.). St. Petersburg: Aletheia. (Original work published 1980). Retrieved from http://yanko.lib.ru/books/cultur/bourdieu-praktich_smysl-8l.pdf.
- Bourdieu, P. (2005). Pole nauki [Field of science]. In N.A. Shmatko (Ed.), *Sociologos 2005. Sotsiologiya pod voprosom. Sotsial'nyye nauki v poststrukturalistskoy perspektive* [Sociologos 2005. Sociology in doubt. Social sciences in a post-structuralist perspective] (pp. 15–56). Moscow: Praxis, Institute of Experimental Sociology.
- Brew, A., & Saunders, C. (2020). Making sense of research-based learning in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 87*, 102935. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102935>.
- Buntova, E.V. (2019). Sozdaniye uchebnogo kursa programmy magistratury [Creation of a Master's Program Curriculum]. *Bulletin of Kemerovo State University. Series: Humanities and Social Sciences, 3(1)*, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.21603/2542-1840-2019-3-1-1-8>.
- Churkin, M.K., & Churkina, N.I. (2018). Organizatsiya nauchno-issledovatel'skoy deyatel'nosti v magistrature po profilyu "istoricheskoye obrazovaniye": real'nost' i perspektivy [Organization of research activities in the magistracy in the field of "historical education": reality and prospects]. *Gumanitarnyye issledovaniya, 4(21)*, 150–153. Retrieved from

THE PROJECT OF THE RESEARCH MASTER DEGREE PROGRAM...

<https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/organizatsiya-nauchno-issledovatel'skoy-deyatelnosti-v-magistrature-po-profilyu-istoricheskoe-obrazovanie-realnosti-i-perspektivy/viewer>.

Dobber, M., Akkerman, S.F., Verloop, N., & Vermunt, J.D. (2012). Student teachers' collaborative research: Small-scale research projects during teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(4), 609–617. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.01.009>.

Evans, D. (1996). *An Introductory Dictionary of Lacanian Psychoanalysis*. London: Tavistock Routledge.

Fedorova, N.M., & Churkina, N.I. (2016). Organizatsiya nauchno-issledovatel'skoy deyatelnosti studentov magistratury v setevom formate [Organization of research activities of graduate students in a network format]. *Vestnik Sibirskogo Instituta Biznesa i Informatsionnykh Tekhnologiy*, 4(20), 161–165. Retrieved from <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/organizatsiya-nauchno-issledovatel'skoy-deyatelnosti-studentov-magistratury-v-setevom-formate>.

Fielding, M. (2001) Students as Radical Agents of Change. *Journal of Educational Change*, 2, 123–141. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1017949213447>.

Friedman, J. (2000). *Dictionary of Business Terms*. Hauppauge, NY: Barron's Educational Series, Inc.

Gitlin, A., Barlow, L., Burbank, M.D., Kauchak, D., & Tracy Stevens. (1999). Pre-service teachers' thinking on research: implications for inquiry oriented teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 15(7), 753–769. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0742-051x\(99\)00015-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0742-051x(99)00015-3).

Gosudarstvennyy Komitet Rossiyskoy Federatsii po Vysshemu Obrazovaniyu Postanovleniye No. 42 "Ob utverzhdenii Polozheniya o masterskoy podgotovke (magistrature) v sisteme mnogourovnevnogo vysshego obrazovaniya Rossiyskoy Federatsii" [Regulation of the State Committee of the Russian Federation on Higher Education No. 42 "On approval of Regulations on Master's training (Master's degree) in the system of multilevel higher education of the Russian Federation"] (1993, August 10).

Guseva, I.A. (2012). Nauchnaya magistratura: mechta ili real'nost'? [Master of Science: Dream or Reality?]. *Vysshee obrazovanie v Rossii*, 2, 9–17. Retrieved from <http://vovr.ru/upload/2-12.pdf>.

Hajrutdinov, R.R. (2019). Pedagogicheskoye proyektirovaniye magistratury v sovremennom vuze [Pedagogical design of a magistracy in a modern university]. *Kontsept, nauchno-metodicheskiy elektronnyy zhurnal*, 5, 1–10 <https://doi.org/10.24411/2304-120X-2019-11033>.

Ivanova, N.A. (2012). P'yer Burd'ye o nauke kak pole simvolicheskogo proizvodstva i roli habitus'a v nem [Pierre Bourdieu on science as a field of symbolic production and the role of habitus in it]. *Vestnik Tomskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta: Filosofiya. Sotsiologiya. Politologiya*, 4-1(20), 206–219. Retrieved from <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/pier-burdie-o-nauke-kak-pole-simvolicheskogo-proizvodstva-i-rol-i-habitus-a-v-nem>.

Kay, J., Dunne, E., & Hutchinson, J. (2010). *Rethinking the Values of Higher Education: Students as Change Agents?* Gloucester, UK: Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education. Retrieved from <https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/1193/1/StudentsChangeAgents.pdf>.

Koncepciya dolgosrochnogo social'no-ekonomicheskogo razvitiya Rossijskoj Federacii na period do 2020 goda. Utverzhdena rasporyazheniem Pravitel'stva Rossiyskoy Federatsii No. 1662-r. [Concept for the Long-Term Development of Russia for the Period to 2020 approved by the order of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 1662-r] (2008, November 17).

- Kuhn, T. (1977). *Struktura nauchnykh revolyutsiy* [The structure of scientific revolutions]. Moskva: Publishing house Progress. Retrieved from <http://www.biometrica.tomsk.ru/Kuhn.pdf>.
- Lakatos, I. (2008). *Izbrannyye proizvedeniya po filosofii i metodologii nauki* [Selected Works on Philosophy and Methodology of Science]. Moscow: Akademicheskiiy Proyekt, Trikska. Retrieved from https://vk.com/doc4605748_437158503.
- Lebedeva, L.I. (2010). Magistratura v sisteme postdiplomnogo obrazovaniya [Master in Postgraduate Education]. *Universum: Vestnik Gercenovskogo universiteta*, 11(85), p. 55. Retrieved from https://lib.herzen.spb.ru/media/magazines/contents/2/2010_11/lebedeva_11_10_55.pdf.
- Margolis, A.A., & Safronova, M.A. (2018). Itogi kompleksnogo proyekta po modernizatsii pedagogicheskogo obrazovaniya v Rossiyskoy Federatsii (2014—2017 gg.) [The Project of Modernization of Teacher Education in the Russian Federation: Outcomes 2014–2017]. *Psikhologicheskaya nauka i obrazovaniye*, 23(1), 5–24. <https://dx.doi.org/10.17759/pse.2018230101>.
- Munte, E., & Rogne, M. (2015). Research based teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education Volume*, 46, 17–24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2014.10.006>.
- Naumova, E.I. (2015). Kontseptsiya diskursov Lakana: znaniye, nauka, universitet [The concept of Lacan's discourses: knowledge, science, university]. *Vestnik Leningradskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta imeni A.S. Pushkina*, 3(2), 36–44. Retrieved from <https://lengu.ru/download/80269>.
- Niemi, H., & Nevgi, A. (2014). Research studies and active learning promoting professional competences in Finnish teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 43, 131–142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2014.07.006>.
- Nikulina, E.G. (2014). Issledovaniye izmeneniy v podgotovke magistrów obrazovaniya v Rossii s 1992 goda po nastoyashcheye vremya [Studies of changes in the preparation of Masters of Education in Russia from 1992 to the present]. *Internet-zhurnal «Naukovedenie»*, 3, 1–22. <https://naukovedenie.ru/PDF/41PVN314.pdf>.
- Osipov, V.S. (2017). Paradigma prava i yuridicheskoye nauchnoye soobshchestvo (na osnove kontseptsii Tomasa Kuna) [The paradigm of law and the legal scientific community (based on the concept of Thomas Kuhn)]. *Vestnik Ekonomicheskoy Bezopasnosti*, 4, 37–45. Retrieved from http://mosumvd.com/izdatelskaya-deyatelnost/periodicheskie-izdaniya/vestnik-ekonomicheskoy-bezopasnosti-mvd-rossii/polnotekstovye-nomera-zhurnalov-s-2014-g-full-text-editions-of-journals-since-2014-/2017-god/2017-04_VEB.pdf.
- Postanovlenie Pravitel'stva Rossiyskoy Federatsii No. 940 "Ob utverzhdenii gosudarstvennogo obrazovatel'nogo standarta vysshego professional'nogo obrazovaniya" [Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 940 "On approval of the state educational standard of higher professional education"] (1994, August 12).
- Postanovleniye Minnauki RF No. 13 "O vvedenii mnogourovnevoy struktury vysshego obrazovaniya v Rossiyskoy Federatsii" [Resolution of the Ministry of Science of the Russian Federation No. 13 "On the introduction of a multilevel structure of higher education in the Russian Federation"] (1992, March 13).
- Prikaz Ministerstva obrazovaniya i nauki Rossiyskoy Federatsii No. 62 "Ob obrazovatel'noj programme vysshego professional'nogo obrazovaniya specializirovannoy podgotovki magistrów" [Order of the Russian Ministry of Education and Science No.62 "On the educational program of higher professional education of specialized training for masters"] (2006, March 22).

THE PROJECT OF THE RESEARCH MASTER DEGREE PROGRAM...

- Prikaz Ministerstva Truda i Sotsial'noy Zashchity Rossiyskoy Federatsii No. 544n "Ob utverzhdenii professional'nogo standarta" Pedagog (pedagogicheskaya deyatel'nost' v sfere doshkol'nogo, nachal'nogo obshchego, osnovnogo obshchego obshchego obrazovaniya) (vospitatel', uchitel') "(s izmeneniyami i dopolneniyami) [Order of the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of the Russian Federation No. 544n "On the approval of the professional standard" Teacher (pedagogical activity in the field of preschool, primary general, basic general, secondary general education) (educator, teacher) "(as amended)] (2013, October 18).
- Puustinen, M., Sääntti, J., Koski, A., & Tammi, T. (2018). Teaching: A practical or research-based profession? Teacher candidates' approaches to research-based teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education* Volume 74, 170–179. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.05.004>.
- Rasporyazhenie Pravitel'stva RF No.2227-r. "Strategiya innovacionnogo razvitiya Rossijskoj Federacii na period do 2020 goda" [Order of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 2227-r "Strategy of innovative development of the Russian Federation for the period to 2020"] (2011, December 8).
- Safronova, M.A., & Bysik, N.V. (2014). Opisaniye proyekta modernizatsii pedagogicheskogo obrazovaniya [Description of the project for the modernization of teacher education]. *Psihologicheskaya nauka i obrazovanie*, 19(3), 78–86. Retrieved from https://psyjournals.ru/files/71573/pno_3_2014_safronova.pdf.
- Senashenko, V., & Komissarova, N. (1995). Magistratura v Rossiyskikh vuzakh [Master Degree Programs in Russian Higher Schools]. *Vysshee obrazovanie v Rossii*, 2, 103–111. Retrieved from <http://vovr.ru/upload/1995.zip>.
- Senashenko, V.S. (1993). Magistratura: vtoroye rozhdeniye [Master Degree Education: The Second Birth]. *Vysshee obrazovanie v Rossii*, 3, 92–99. Retrieved from <http://vovr.ru/upload/1993.zip>.
- Sinicyna, G.P., & Churkina, N.I. (2015). Issledovatel'skaya deyatel'nost' v magistrature: novyye zadachi, podkhody i soderzhaniye [Research activities in the magistracy: new tasks, approaches and content]. *Sovremennyye problemy nauki i obrazovaniya*, 4. Retrieved from <http://science-education.ru/pdf/2015/4/10.pdf>.
- Vaganova, O.I., Kutepova, L.I., Trutanova, A.V., Gladkova, M.N., & Gladkov, A.V. (2017). Organizatsiya issledovatel'skoy deyatel'nosti magistrantov v elektronnoy sfere [Organization of research activities of undergraduates in the electronic environment]. *Mezhdunarodnyy zhurnal prikladnykh i fundamental'nykh issledovaniy*, 4–2., 429–431; Retrieved from <https://applied-research.ru/pdf/2017/4-2/11487.pdf>.
- Vakan, L. (2007). Sotsiologiya obrazovaniya P. Burd'ye [Sociology of Education P. Bourdieu]. *Sotsiologicheskiye issledovaniya*, 6, 93–101. Retrieved from: http://ecsocman.hse.ru/data/859/634/1219/Vakan_11.pdf.
- Vesmanov, S.V., Vesmanov, D.S., Zhadko, N.V., Akopyan, G.A., Istochnikov, V.V., & Shevchenko, P.V. (2015). Model' issledovatel'skoy magistratury: itogi aprobatsii novykh moduley osnovnykh obrazovatel'nykh programm v Moskovskom gorodskom pedagogicheskom universitete [Model of the research master program: results of testing the new modules of basic educational programs in the Moscow City Teacher Training University]. *Psikhologicheskaya nauka i obrazovaniye*. 7(4), 1–11.
- Vorob'ev, D.V. (2016). Konventsionalizm i instrumentalizm v svete teorii nauchno-issledovatel'skikh programm Imre Lakatosa [Conventionalism and instrumentalism in the light of the theory of research programs by Imre Lacatos]. *Filosofiya nauki i tekhniki*, 21(2). 97–110. <https://doi.org/10.21146/2413-9084-2016-21-2-97-110>.

- Willegems, V., Consuegra, E., Struyven, K., & Engels, N. (2018). Pre-service teachers as members of a collaborative teacher research team: A steady track to extended professionalism? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 76, 126–139. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.08.012>.
- Yogev, S., & Yogev, A. (2006). Teacher educators as researchers: A profile of research in Israeli teacher colleges versus university departments of education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22(1), 32–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2005.07.009>.