О. В. Рогач, Т. М. Рябова, Е. В. Фролова

Оценка инновационного потенциала московских школ: ограничения и ресурсы развития

Актуальность оценки инновационного потенциала российских школ связана с новыми вызовами, стоящими перед школьным образованием сегодня. Усиление тенденций цифровизации, переход на дистанционное обучение, а также сохраняющаяся необходимость выявления и поддержания талантливой молодежи вызвало необходимость изучения ограничений и ресурсов инновационного развития школьного образования.

Методы исследования. В анкетном опросе приняли участие учителя московских школ (N=325) и родительская общественность (N=790), что позволило представить комплексную оценку инновационного потенциала столичных школ. В целях верификации полученных данных, результаты исследования подкреплены материалами фокус-групп.

В результате проведенного исследования установлено, что отсутствие научной проработки внедряемых инноваций (47,2%), что определило необходимость создания «научных сетей» (78,3%). Для 57,2% учителей участие в реализации инноваций рассматривается как механизм их личностного и профессионального развития, который вместе с тем сопровождается усилением отчетности (53,8%), существенным увеличением нагрузки (54,6%). 49,2% учителей видят прямую зависимость между развитием рыночных отношений в сфере образования и развитием инновационного потенциала московских школ, что рассматривается учителями в позитивном ключе. В свою очередь, родители московских школьников неоднозначно оценивают инновационный потенциал школьного образования: 64,2% – выражают настороженное отношение к инновациям, 41,1% – считают, что внедрение инноваций увеличивает загруженность учащихся. По мнению 60,1% родителей, школьные инновации не формируют стремление к творчеству и знаниям. Решением возникших дисфункций, по мнению родителей, может стать расширения форм участия общественности в определении стратегических точек роста в рамках инновационного потенциала образовательных учреждений (52,7%), применение механизма социального партнерства (46,6%).

Ключевые слова: инновационный потенциал, школа, инновационное развитие, образование, родительская общественность

Ссылка для цитирования:

Рогач О. В., Рябова Т. М., Фролова Е. В. Оценка инновационного потенциала московских школ: ограничения и ресурсы развития // Перспективы науки и образования. 2020. № 4 (46). С. 126-137. doi: 10.32744/pse.2020.4.8

O. V. ROGACH, T. M. RYABOVA, E. V. FROLOVA

Assessment of the innovative potential of Moscow schools: limitations and development resources

The relevance of assessing the innovative potential of Russian schools is related to the new challenges facing school education today. Increasing trends in digitalization, the transition to distance learning, as well as the continuing need to identify and support talented young people have led to the need to study the limitations and resources of innovative development of school education.

Method of research. Moscow school teachers (N=325) and the parent community (N=790) took part in the questionnaire survey, which allowed us to present a comprehensive assessment of the innovative potential of the capital's schools. In order to verify the data obtained, the results of the study are supported by materials from focus groups.

As a result of the research, it was found that the lack of scientific study of the implemented innovations (47.2%), which determined the need to create "scientific networks" (78.3%). For 57.2% of teachers, participation in the implementation of innovations is considered as a mechanism for their personal and professional development, which is accompanied by increased accountability (53.8%), a significant increase in workload (54.6%). 49.2% of teachers see a direct relationship between the development of market relations in the field of education and the development of innovative potential of Moscow schools, which is viewed by teachers in a positive way. In turn, parents of Moscow school children have an ambiguous assessment of the innovative potential of school education: 64.2% – Express a wary attitude to innovation, 41.1% – believe that the introduction of innovations increases the workload of students. According to 60.1% of parents, school innovations do not form the desire for creativity and knowledge. The solution to these dysfunctions, according to parents, can be the expansion of forms of public participation in determining strategic growth points within the innovative potential of educational institutions (52.7%), the use of a social partnership mechanism (46.6%).

Keywords: innovative potential, school, innovative development, education, the parent community

For Reference:

Rogach, O. V., Ryabova, T. M., & Frolova, E. V. (2020). Assessment of the innovative potential of Moscow schools: limitations and development resources. *Perspektivy nauki i obrazovaniya – Perspectives of Science and Education*, 46 (4), 126-137. doi: 10.32744/pse.2020.4.8

Introduction

Recently, school education has become one of the priority interests of state development, which is the leading institution of sociocultural and intellectual development of any society [1]. New civilizational challenges provoke "educational boom", a wave of profound reforms in education systems of many countries [2]. European countries highly appreciate educational innovations. Innovations are seen as the factor of the pedagogical system modernization [3].

Various studies made the conclusion about the need to orient educational systems on public participation in the management of innovative changes [4]. This means that the modern educational policy of the leading countries is aimed at the delegation of some powers of the parental community in the process of making management decisions [5; 6]. At the same time, "collegial forms of school management with the participation of the public allow to overcome the alienation of school from society" [7].

This setting is traced in the studies that justify the need for a more active role of key participants in the decision-making process [8]. It is concluded that feedback is important not only for trivial issues, but also for the development of the educational system as a whole, including the content and the trend of innovative educational projects [9]. This approach is designed to improve the quality of educational services, and, accordingly, the performance of schoolchildren [10].

Literature Review

The analysis of the educational systems of developed countries has revealed the dependence of the school community quality on innovative approaches to educational technologies [11]. The results of the study illustrate the students' perception of cooperation "interactivity" as an innovative approach to teaching and learning [12].

In developed countries, educational innovations are considered as the resource for the socio-economic development of the state. In the opinion of European experts, genuine reforms and innovations can be implemented only if the philosophy of teaching changes and the educational paradigm is revised [13]. Innovations should not be superficial, but rather involve more fundamental foundations and learning principles [14]. It is necessary to move away from rigid curricula to the training program, which contains the answers to questions that concern modern students. Studying the world around through the question "why?" is an opportunity to involve students in their own innovative work pattern development [15].

Recently, much attention has been paid to the nature and the scope of the labor market needs and the production relation impact on the content of school education [16]. The innovative potential of school education should be formed taking into account the social demand of the society and labor market needs.

In developing countries, innovations are regarded as the factor of children performance improvement and the development of the necessary competencies. Schools must develop, introduce innovations to ensure their effectiveness [17]. The role of a teacher, his training activity of younger generation, and the personal and professional characteristics of the educational corps are of particular importance. In developing countries, the effectiveness of innovation is largely determined by the level of innovation support from the leadership

of educational institutions, by situational factors, such as team cohesion and organizational culture [18].

In modern conditions, educational reforms are oriented to the current and future needs of society, an effective use of resources [19]. At the same time, developing countries are characterized by fragmentation in the process of innovation introduction, focusing on certain aspects of the educational process. In developed countries, the problems of innovation in education are considered from two perspectives: the increase of teaching technology innovative component and the establishment of the feedback from educational service consumers on the issues of education system innovative potential management. The strengthening of social development pace guides developed countries to develop an innovative model of school education that would harmoniously combine three leading components of innovative development: innovations in educational programs, innovations in technologies and learning conditions.

The state policy of education development in Russia is consonant with global trends. Innovations in education are defined as a key factor in its quality, accessibility improvement, and, the socio-economic development of the state in general. However, the implementation of the state program for the development of education in Russia is reduced to the introduction of a multitude of disparate innovations that are mutually uncoordinated in their social and psychological consequences [20]. The awareness of the need to innovate the educational process, taking into account the needs of the modern labor market, encounters the lack of adequate methods to identify the educational order of business structures. In Russia, the process of innovation introduction is more typical for higher education, which is considered a key element in the preparation of a competitive personality.

Materials and Methods

1 Objective of study

The purpose of the study is to assess the innovative potential of the capital's schools, including the analysis of resources and limitations of innovative development of school education in modern conditions. In the course of the research, the authors used theoretical research methods-analysis, synthesis, generalization of scientific sources on the research problem; as well as empirical methods – a questionnaire survey of Moscow school teachers (N=325) and the parent community (N=790). The research hypothesis is based on the assumption that the low level of innovative potential of school education is associated with insufficient innovative activity of teachers.

Taking into account the specifics of the educational system in Moscow, the researchers took 15 educational complexes randomly at the first stage of their work. There were 67 schools providing the training according to the basic general education program. They include 2 lyceums, 10 gymnasiums, 27 schools with the in-depth study of subjects (humanitarian, technical and language profiles) and 28 general schools. We consulted with the heads of educational complexes in order to select the models that illustrate a better understanding of the limitations concerning the formation and resources of school education innovative potential. 35 educational institutions were suitable for us in general, of which 18 agreed to participate in the study. They included 4 gymnasiums, 6 schools with the in-depth study of the profile and 8 general schools. All teachers of selected schools

were invited to give interviews. 325 teachers accepted the invitation. The characteristics of the interviewed teachers are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

The characteristics of teachers who participated in the study

Gymnasium teachers	73
The teachers from the schools with in-depth study of subjects	108
Secondary school teachers	144
Men	39
Women	286

Thus, mostly women teachers were interviewed (88%). The average age of the respondents in the sample was 44.87 years with the range of 32-62 years. The sample subjects were well educated: 3.5% had a bachelor's degree, 57.9% had a master's degree, and 21.6% had academic degrees. 5.7% had the work experience of up to 5 years, 18.9% - 6-10 years of work experience, 29.9% - 11-15 years, and 45.5% - over 16 years of work experience. Of these, 44.3% worked in general education schools, 33.2% worked in the schools with the in-depth study of subjects, and 22.5% of teachers teach in gymnasiums.

In order to achieve the goal of the study, the parents of schoolchildren were identified as the second group of respondents. In order to preserve the research purity, the educational institutions chosen earlier for teachers became the basis for study subject selection. Parents were sent 2,500 questionnaires, while only 790 people took part in the survey. The characteristics of the interviewed parents are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Composition of parents who took part in the study

The parents of children attending gymnasiums	123
The parents of children studying at school with the in-depth study of subjects	309
The parents of children attending secondary school	358
Men	147
Women	643
Higher education	698

Thus, they interviewed mostly female parents (81.4%). The average age of the sample respondents was 40.15 years with the range of 26-46 years. 88.4% of sample parents have higher education: 9.2% have advanced degrees. 22.1% of parents estimate their income as a low one, 65.8% of parents have an average income, and 12.1% have high income.

2 Approach

A weakly structured interview was conducted with the teachers, which took 15-20 minutes. All interviewers had adequate training on the topic of the study. The questionnaire was divided into 4 units: the assessment of innovation implementation conditions; the involvement of teachers in innovation; the evaluation of education management body actions on school education innovative potential development; The participation of teachers in the management education innovation issues. Each included 5 - 10 questions. The part of

the questions regarding the prospective resources for school education innovative potential development had open answers.

The questionnaire was conducted with the parents of schoolchildren. The questionnaire was divided into 2 large units: the assessment of ongoing educational innovations and the participation of parents in innovation management. Each unit included no more than 15 questions. A number of questions about the barriers to school education innovative potential and in respect of public participation practice evaluation increase in management had open answers.

Results and discussion

The analysis of results shows that the innovative potential of school education is characterized by the lack of resource support, a low level of innovation experience continuity. The given problem causes the absence of actions in the majority of general educational institutions directed on development and the introduction of innovations.

Despite the fact that recently there have been increased attempts to update educational programs and teaching technologies in the capital schools, 47.2% of respondents note the lack of scientific study for the innovations being introduced. The obtained data confirm the conclusions about the need to reinforce innovative projects with the work of the relevant "scientific networks" [21].

In earlier studies of the innovative potential of schools, they revealed the need to revise the time and resource provision of innovative processes [12]. The analysis of Russian school teacher opinion allows us to supplement this conclusion with the following conclusion: it is necessary to move away from the fragmented introduction of innovations towards the creation of a resource base for teacher innovative activity support. In particular, according to 78.3% of respondents, the management of school education innovative development requires the state to create a scientific, organizational, resource and personnel base for innovation support.

The results of the research showed a rather low overall level of innovative activity among teachers. The level of a teacher innovative activity largely depends on an educational institution status. So the proportion of teachers, who carry out their professional activities in gymnasiums or under supplementary education programs, has initially high expectations for innovation. For 57.2% of the surveyed teachers, the participation in the implementation of innovations is seen as the factor of their personal and professional quality improvement. In its turn, the teachers employed in ordinary general education institutions and schools with the in-depth study of the training course subjects are mostly not oriented and are not motivated to innovation implementation. 67.4% of teachers answered in the negative to the following question: "Does your institution encourage the activity of teachers in the development and the implementation of innovations?" For most teachers, personal satisfaction from their activities is the decisive factor for the initiative manifestation.

According to the research results, the pedagogical approaches to teaching become the main field of innovation application. The potential of an interactive and a project approach to children teaching is assessed highly enough by teachers. However, the lack of innovation scientific study provokes the emergence of a significant number of errors, which significantly reduce the value of innovation in the eyes of teachers and students. Anna P., 48 years old: "Unsuccessful experience does not allow to talk about the innovation of school education in a positive way."

The obtained data illustrate the lack of "innovation" value recognition for the qualitative growth of children education by most teachers of Moscow schools. Researchers believe that this situation is associated with two important factors. On the one hand, school education is characterized by conservatism, the preservation of strong fundamental foundations. On the other hand, the activity of school teachers is strongly influenced by public opinion, in which negative characteristics often prevail. Under these conditions, the price of an error is very high for a teacher, and the introduction of innovation is seen as a risk, an unnecessary challenge to the fundamentals. A separate barrier is the lack of the necessary temporary, resource, organizational and other support for innovative activities.

The situation is aggravated by increased reporting on the innovations being implemented and by a general increase of teacher workload. This is indicated by 53.8% and 54.6% of teachers, respectively.

In the opinion of teachers, the orientation of educational management structures to the achievement of innovation process formal indicators does not provide a significant impact on the growth of education qualitative characteristics and also negatively affects the content of educational programs. The standardization of educational results adopted in Russian schools nowadays does not allow to develop the creative and intellectual abilities of children fully. According to the opinion of teachers the solution of the situation can be the integration of additional education and general education programs for schoolchildren. 44.8% of teachers consider additional education is very demanded today, as it allows to form the propensities, the abilities and the interests of personal, social and professional self-determination of children. At the same time, a significant proportion of teachers (66.1%) draw attention to the fact that some innovative programs for gifted children, as well as supplementary education programs are not able to cover the entire contingent of students. This is a very important problem, which is related with the mechanism of social inequality reproduction.

Almost half of the teachers interviewed (49.2%) in Moscow schools note that the emergence of market relations in the educational sector left a significant imprint on the development of school education innovative potential. In these conditions, the state gave schools the right to solve their own financial problems by paid service provision, the list of which is determined by each educational institution on its own. For the most part, the pedagogical community tends to view this circumstance in a positive way, as one of the global trends in the development of school education. However, 68.4% of respondents believe that a number of schools are characterized by a "dependent attitude". This attitude, worked out by the principle of full state funding inherited from Soviet socialism, does not allow us to use the entire resource potential of school. Although the state has provided schools with new opportunities in the field of financial security, the management of educational complexes is not ready to fully support the set course for the most part. 68.3% of teachers support this point of view.

We believe that the resulting discrepancy is caused by the exclusion of a number of key provisions from the focus of education authorities. In particular, schooling in Russia, having begun the transition to market relations, does not have either its own economic concept of development or the mechanisms for market relations management in education, and the investment and motivational mechanisms for school financial autonomy provision are absent. In the opinion of 67.2% of teachers, the market of educational services in Russia has not been developed yet, which determines the presence of many "unoccupied niches". Many teachers see this as an opportunity to increase the competitive advantages of an educational institution, and the replication of a positive innovative experience of schools.

According to the results of the study, 65.2% of teachers believe that the pedagogical corps has a key role in decision making on the issues of innovation in education. At the same time, management is viewed by teachers as the activity that is not originally a teacher's responsibility, but they are ready to assume such obligations in order to reduce the negative consequences of educational sector reforming.

The analysis of Russian school teacher opinion allows us to supplement other studies on this issue [8; 12] with the following conclusion: the increase of public participation in management requires the creation of organizational confidence among all participants. This idea correlates with studies of the relationship between the professional community, bureaucratic structures and organizational trust [22]. However, the authors of the article, in view of the high vigilance of Russians to any innovations of government structures, are invited to consider organizational trust through the prism of educational work, a transparent feedback and the participation of teachers in government commissions on education innovation issues.

The results of the second part of the study show that the parents of Russian schoolchildren have an ambivalent position on the development of school innovative potential.

Most parents recognize the need to modernize the existing education system, to increase its innovative capacity. However, parents' expectations remain very traditional, they concentrate on a university education obtaining.

Almost 64.2% of respondents express a cautious attitude to the innovations that are implemented in their educational institution; 41.1% believe that the introduction of innovation increases the workload of students; and 32.5% of respondents note the increased burden on parents due to the need to participate in school innovation projects.

Vera A., 37 years old: "They ask so much that the child is busy with his homework until the evening. If this is an innovative approach to learning, then it is not necessary at all."

The current situation is seen by parents as the result of a low pedagogical control in respect of innovations, which is considered one of the key functions of educational institutions [3]. This circumstance requires the inclusion of a new key participant in the innovation control system i.e. parents.

Diagram 1 The assessment of educational innovation implementation practice by Moscow schoolchildren parents

In the course of the study, they noted the increase of parent expenditures on tutors in connection with the need to "train" for Unified State Exam (USE) test passing. More than two-thirds of the total number of interviewed parents (82.4%) spoke about this. At the

same time, the respondents made a special emphasis on the assertion that the test system becomes the factor of the learning process excessive standardization, the stereotype nature and the averaging of schoolchildren knowledge. In the opinion of 79.6% of respondents, there was the change in the course of the educational policy towards "mass" preparation of schoolchildren, the "training" for the passage of USE tests with the introduction of the USE into school practice. According to the parents, the testing of students' knowledge becomes a formal, a superficial one.

In the opinion of 60.1% of parents, modern school preparation does not take into account the individual characteristics of students, does not form the desire for creativity and knowledge. The consequence of this provision is the decrease of pupils' interest in learning, which is noted today by all aspects of the learning process. It is fair to say that this opinion is less typical for parents whose children are trained in gymnasiums and the schools with in-depth study of subjects. The high weight of the creative component in the educational process and the individual approach to the preparation of students in these educational institutions is supplemented by a significant number of extracurricular work hours (visits to museums, theaters, preparation of projects, etc.). According to the parents, this reduces the negative consequences of the learning process standardization. Despite the increased parental burden with this approach to learning, they recognize the high efficiency of gymnasium training for children. Traditionally, a high competition for the admission to a gymnasium and a lyceum is the confirmation of these findings.

General educational institutions, in view of objective resource constraints and other contingent of students, cannot cope with the manifestations of the Russian education system destabilization so effectively. The introduction of innovations encounters the stereotype that has formed among a significant proportion of parents (52.4%): innovations cannot provide education quality improvement for their children. It is customary to relate this with the distrust of Russians to any government initiatives [23].

In order to refract the current situation, the state educational policy set the course for the inclusion of parents in school education innovative development. This trend of key participant involvement in innovation management is characteristic of modern developed countries [8]. However, according to the results of the study, there is a consistently low participation of parents in this process – less than one third of schoolchildren parents (Diagram 2).

Diagram 2 The reasons of parental public low participation in school education innovative development management

Most often, the participation of parents in the management of an educational institution takes the form of parents' governing councils and school boards. Such participation can be of a formal nature. This makes the parental public the nominal participants in the processes of education innovative development. Most parents cannot participate in the determination of the essence and the content of educational innovations, even at the level of individual schools. This opinion was expressed by 46.9% of parents, emphasizing the imitative nature of their participation. The respondents believe that the leadership of schools seeks to create the "visibility" for the consolidation of joint efforts. Those representatives of the parental community (25.2%) who considered their participation in the management of school education innovative development as an opportunity to adapt the educational environment to the needs of students through innovations, noted the emergence of frustration and disappointment feelings. The obtained results make it possible to consider the issues of public participation increase in a new light, supplementing the performed analysis of educational claims of parents [5; 6].

52.7% of parents note the need to expand the forms of public participation in strategic growth points determination within the innovative potential of educational institutions, and 46.6% of respondents talk about the importance of social partnership mechanism application in the practice of school education innovative potential development. The obtained results can form the basis of a program development to involve parents in the solution of problems on the development of school education innovative potential.

Conclusion

The teachers' and the parents' assessment of school education quality in Russia is at the medium-low range. The parents also assessed the practice of USE conduct quite poorly, which is related to the shortcomings of a formalized approach to educational outcome evaluation. The representatives of educational institutions and the consumers of their educational services focus on schoolchildren interest reduction in successful studies, the increase of the burden on students and their parents. The situation in school education does not allow to reveal the innovative potential of teachers. The main problem is the high workload of teachers, a large number of reports and bureaucratization.

A narrow pragmatic attitude to school education peculiar to parents develops a dual position in relation to innovative processes. On the one hand, innovations are considered by this group of the public as an opportunity to adapt the educational environment to the needs of students. On the other hand, innovations are seen as a source of the traditional foundation destruction concerning the functioning of school education and a general cause of the educational process destabilization. This position of parents is supported by a weak training and a low level of innovation in Russian education. Despite the fact that parents are interested in school education update, innovations are perceived very cautiously by them. This is due to a low level of trust in Russia for any reforms carried out by the authorities. Most parents do not believe that innovation, indeed, will be able to improve the quality education for their children. Besides, according to parents, their participation in school education innovative development management is a formal one, which does not allow to regulate the content of educational innovations.

The conducted research made it possible to identify other reasons for the low level of the school education innovative potential, namely: the lack of organizational and

human resources for the implementation of innovations in educational institutions, the underdevelopment of the innovative educational environment. The teachers of educational institutions noted the lack of a favorable socio-cultural and psychological-pedagogical environment for the conduct of innovative activities. The preservation of the dependent position of most schools, which does not allow them to use the levers, the advantages of financial autonomy in order to increase their innovative potential deserves a separate attention in new market conditions. A convincing illustration of this circumstance is the quality of educational innovations and the lack of practice of best practice replication that ensure the optimization of learning conditions and technologies.

In the course of the research, the hypothesis was confirmed that the low level of school education innovative potential in Russia is associated with an insufficient innovative activity of teachers. Researchers have proven the following allegations: the unpreparedness of most teachers of Russian schools to a high rate of educational practice renewal and the lack of an appropriate support base for educational innovations. It is necessary to form a unified base for educational innovation support, which includes a scientific, organizational, resource and human resource component. This will make it possible to increase the effectiveness of teacher inclusion in innovation activities.

Based on the research materials, the authors made two important secondary conclusions. First, a formalized quantitative approach to innovation, an excessive standardization of educational outcomes is the factor of the educational system innovative potential reduction. The experience of Russia illustrates that it is impossible to develop fully the creative and intellectual abilities of children in this context. According to teachers, some innovative programs for working with gifted children are not able to cover the entire contingent of students, which reduces the overall quality of school preparation and also acts as the mechanism of social inequality reproduction. Secondly, the example of Russian schools establishes the relationship between the development of school education innovative potential and the level of educational service market development. In particular, the underdevelopment of the mechanism for market relation management entails the lack of investment and motivational mechanisms to increase the innovative potential of educational systems. Recognizing the importance of teacher and parent attraction to the solution of education issues, the authors conclude that this technology for school education innovative potential development will be characterized by a low productivity in the absence of a favorable innovation environment.

REFERENCES

1. Feinberg W. The Idea of a Public Education. *Review of Research in Education*, 2012. vol. 36, 1: pp. 1-22.
2. Zborovsky G.E. Modernization of education through the prism of social policy. *Journal of Social Policy Studies*, 2010. 1 (8), pp. 87-104
3. Mazurkiewicz G., Walczak B. Obedience, Sabotage, Autonomy: Power Games within the Educational System. *Power and Education*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 73-82. 2012. doi: 10.2304/power.2012.4.1.73
4. Mersiyanova I.V., Krasnopol'skaya I.I., Cheshkova A.F. Teaching Communities: Self-Organization and Influence. *Journal of Social Policy Studies*, 2013, no. 3 (11), pp. 321-338
5. Shatkin G., Alec Ian Gershberg. Empowering Parents and Building Communities. The Role of School-Based Councils in Educational Governance and Accountability. *Urban Education*, 2007, vol. 42, no. 6, pp. 582-615. DOI: 10.1177/0042085907305044
6. Shpakovskaya L.L. Parental educational claims as the mechanism for the reproduction of social inequality. *Journal of Social Policy Studies*, 2015, no. 2 (13), pp. 211-224.
7. Farkhatdinov N.G., Evstigneeva N.V., Kurakin D.Yu., Malik V.M. The models of general education organization management in the conditions of reforms: the experience of sociological analysis. *The issues of education*, 2015,

- no. 2, pp. 196-219
8. Harrison K., Taysum A., McNamara G., O'Hara J.. The degree to which students and teachers are involved in second-level school processes and participation in decision-making: an Irish Case Study. *Irish Educational Studies*. 2016, vol. 35 (2), pp. 1-19.
 9. Higdon R. Delta. Employability: The missing voice: How student and graduate views could be used to develop future higher education policy and inform curricula. *Power and Education*, 2016, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 176-195.
 10. Hamlin D., Flessa J. Parental Involvement Initiatives: An Analysis. *Educational Policy*, 2016, vol. 35 (2), pp. 155-173.
 11. Zhelezov B.V., Kudyukin P.M., Shuvalova O.R. Efficiency of the education system: the view of educational service consumer. *The issues of education*, 2009, no. 2, pp. 187-210.
 12. Crawford S. Examining the process of university–school–community collaboration in an Irish Sports Studies and Physical Education context. *Irish Educational Studies*, 2015, vol. 34 (2), pp. 145-163.
 13. Roldan Aurora H. Reforms/Innovations in the Teaching of Reading. Founder-Directress. *Gifted Education International*, 2000, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 97-102.
 14. Barakat S., Boddington M., Vyakarnam S. Measuring entrepreneurial self-efficacy to understand the impact of creative activities for learning innovation. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 2014, vol. 12, issue 3, pp. 456-468. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2014.05.007>
 15. Minchin F. An Innovation Project — Development of P4C and Thinking Skills. *Gifted Education International*, 2009, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 306-317.
 16. Pavlidis P. The Ideal of Education and the Emancipation of Labour. *Policy Futures in Education*. 2013, no. 11, pp. 299-312.
 17. Kursunoglu, A., & Tanriogen, A. The relationship between teachers' perceptions towards instructional leadership behaviors of their principals and teachers' attitudes towards change. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2009, vol. 1(1), pp. 252–258.
 18. Hsi-Chi Hsiao, Jen-Chia Chang, Su-Chang Chen. The Influence of Support for Innovation on Organizational Innovation: Taking Organizational Learning as a Mediator. *Asia-Pacific Edu Res*, 2014, vol. 23(3), no. 463–472.
 19. Rogach O.V., Frolova E.V., Ryabova T.M. Theory of «trust» in the focus of expectation study concerning educational space key actors. *European Journal of Contemporary Education*, 2018, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 392-399
 20. Berezanskaya N.B. Innovations in education or innovative education? *Innovations*, 2008, no. 10, pp. 99-102.
 21. Mueller-Oppliger V. Experiences and Concepts Related to Gifted Education and Talent Development in Switzerland. *Gifted Education International*, 2010, vol. 26, no. 2-3, pp. 219-233.
 22. Kalkan F. Relationship between Professional Learning Community, Bureaucratic Structure and Organisational Trust in Primary Education Schools. *Educational. Sciences-theory & practice*, 2016, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 1619–1637.
 23. Frolova E.V. Interaction of the population and local government: Problems and new opportunities. *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya*, 2016, no. 4, pp. 59-64.

Информация об авторах

Рогач Ольга Владимировна

(Россия, г. Москва)

Доцент, кандидат социологических наук, доцент
кафедры менеджмента и административного
управления

Российский государственный социальный
университет

E-mail: rogach16@mail.ru

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-3031-4575

Рябова Татьяна Михайловна

(Россия, г. Москва)

Доцент, кандидат социологических наук, доцент
кафедры менеджмента и административного
управления

Российский государственный социальный
университет

E-mail: tani-87@inbox.ru

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8204-2412

Фролова Елена Викторовна

(Россия, г. Москва)

Профессор, доктор социологических наук, профессор
кафедры менеджмента и административного
управления

Российский государственный социальный
университет

E-mail: efrolova06@mail.ru

ORCID: 0000-0002-8958-4561

Information about the authors

Olga V. Rogach

(Russia, Moscow)

Associate Professor,

PhD in Sociological Sciences, Associate Professor of
the Department of Management and Administrative
Management

Russian State Social University

E-mail: rogach16@mail.ru

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-3031-4575

Tatiana M. Ryabova

(Russia, Moscow)

Associate Professor,

PhD in Sociological Sciences, Associate Professor of
the Department of Management and Administrative
Management

Russian State Social University

E-mail: tani-87@inbox.ru

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8204-2412

Elena V. Frolova

(Russia, Moscow)

Professor,

Doctor of Sociological Sciences,
Professor of the Department of Management and
Administration

Russian State Social University

E-mail: efrolova06@mail.ru

ORCID: 0000-0002-8958-4561