Victoria Humeniuk

FOSTERING LEARNER AGENCY IN UKRAINIAN INNOVATIVE SCHOOLS: PRIORITIZING FACTORS OF INNOVATIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

The objective of this article is to present and deliberate upon the initial phase of research outcomes obtained from an online survey involving 22 founders/directors of private innovative and alternative schools in Ukraine. By employing a scaling instrument research participants evaluated the importance of innovative learning environment (ILE) factors. The outcomes of this assessment serve a dual purpose: they elucidate the precedence of innovative endeavors aligned with a strong learner agency development and provide methodological guidance for subsequent in-depth interviews.

The research has yielded three key findings. Firstly, a common understanding of the peculiarities of a learning process among the professionals, who work with the learners in school, supersedes structural elements, emphasizing cultural values. Secondly, the exploration of learner identity emerges as a critical facet. This finding accentuates the indispensable need to accompany learners through identity exploration and regular self-reflection in order to empower subjectivity within the learning process. Lastly, the research underscores the multidimensional nature of crucial ILE factors, implying an effective learning process with a strong learner agency as one of its results should not be misconstrued as synonymous with teaching. Yet, the pivotal role of teachers and their professional readiness to be the "conductors" of innovative learning experiences remains paramount, as vividly evidenced by the prioritization.

Keywords: learner agency, innovative Ukrainian schools, innovative learning environment (ILE), learner agency enablement, critical realist perspective, structure/culture-agency interaction, identity search, learner's self-exploration, New Ukrainian School.

The present study's contextual framework is underpinned by two issues. The first is a pervasive global demand for innovations in the sphere of school education, and Ukraine goes in line with its ambitious **New Ukrainian School (NUS) reform initiative.** The second pertains to the high significance of **strong learner agency**, particularly evident in light of the amplified role that learners now play in the educational process (OECD, 2015). Learner agency being perceived as both a learning goal and a learning process (OECD, 2019) serves as a pivotal indicator of innovative practices being in place. Moreover, as a component of a learning process evaluation, the learner agency holds paramount importance in effectuating the transformation of a conventional school learning environment into the innovative one (Charteris & Thomas, 2016).

The innovative learning environment (ILE) project research results (OECD, 2015, 2017) depict the complexity and multidimensional nature of this notion. While suggesting an array of innovations applicable at diverse levels, it does not, however, provide any prioritization. A relational approach towards learner agency, coupled with a sociological stance on its definition (Humeniuk, 2020) integrates the learning environment as an active and full-fledged participant in the development of strong learner agency.

The overarching research objective was to ascertain and elucidate the most important ILE factors within the context of fostering strong learner agency in Ukrainian private innovative and alternative schools. Identification of the critical factors facilitates the initiation of the school transformation process towards innovative learning environments by providing clear starting points for educational innovators. Furthermore, the outcomes of this research hold the potential to contribute to the ongoing discourse on school education policy reform, offering valuable reference markers for consideration.

This article is dedicated to the presentation and discussion of a subset of research findings, specifically the assessment of the **importance of ILE factors**, garnered from the online survey. Additionally, the analysis of responses to an open-ended question of the questionnaire is also within the scope of this article. The remaining facet of the research endeavor, encompassing the analysis of materials derived from semi-structured in-depth interviews, will be expounded upon in forthcoming publications.

The deliberate choice to focus on **Ukrainian private alternative and innovative schools** emanates from their capacity to echo the principles of the nature of learning as advocated by the OECD (2013). These principles encompass a strong emphasis on engagement, social learning, emotions, individualized differentiation, and holistic interconnectedness. Furthermore, these schools serve as agents of broader reform within mainstream public education, aligning with Sliwka emphasizing (OECD, 2013) that "their [alternative schools'] influence may be far more widespread than generally acknowledged, illustrating how fluid is the boundary between the "mainstream" and "alternative" in a rapidly-changing world that becomes ever more demanding of the learning taking place within its schools" (p. 23).

Moreover, it is imperative to direct attention (see Table 1 for more details) to the increasing trajectory of the private school education sector within the Ukrainian context, according to data sourced from the State Statistics Committee (Shevchenko, 2021).

An essential surge of 112 % has been observed within the private educational realm, culminating in a pronounced increase from 167 to 354 schools spanning the interval between the 2014–2015 and 2020–2021 academic years. In juxtaposition, the number of state-owned schools has witnessed a notable decline of 16.8 %, experiencing a diminution from the initial quantity of 17,437 to 14,519 in the same period of time. It is noteworthy, however, that while private educational entities presently constitute a modest proportion of the holistic educational panorama – **constituting 2.4 % with one-third subset concentrated in Kyiv** – this undeniable trend of growth persists.

Methodology

The combination of online questionnaires (Google-based) and online in-depth semi-structured interviews served as the dual modalities for data collection within this study. The temporal span of April to August 2022 encompassed the data-gathering phase. The Russian aggression on February 24th, 2022, dictated several methodological adjustments to sustain the research endeavor. And the online Google-based questionnaire was one of them. Initially, exclusive reliance on face-to-face in-depth semi-structured interviews had been envisaged. Yet, in response to the altered circumstances, decisions were taken to embrace a wholly online format of the fieldwork and to incorporate a standalone online questionnaire, an aspect unforeseen prior to the 2022 Russian invasion. The adoption of the online format effectively mitigated geographical constraints, given the displacement of numerous Ukrainian citizens for safety reasons. Simultaneously, the questionnaire acted as a contingency strategy, augmenting the likelihood of securing the data even under circumstances where technical impediments such as power outages or lack of internet connectivity precluded the execution of interviews.

Targeted snowball sampling via the Facebook method was employed for participant selection. This method was chosen to address the intricate research objectives, necessitating subjects possessing specific professional expertise and experiential insights. Indeed, since qualitative research intentions are to "explain, describe and interpret" then "sampling is not the matter of representative opinions, but a matter of information richness" (Guetterman, 2015, p. 3). Aligned with Patton's rationale (2002), purposeful sampling underpins the selection of information-rich cases, allowing in-depth exploration of pivotal aspects central to the inquiry's objectives. This approach was instrumental in applying stringent criteria for participant inclusion, encompassing innovative and/or alternative schools committed to holistic learner-centered approaches, as well as individuals holding the mantle of school founders or CEO/Directors.

One of the virtues of the snowball sampling technique lies in its capacity to establish a network of qualified research subjects through social interactions (Atkinson & Flint, 2001; Faugier & Sargeant, 1997). This approach, wherein participants recommend additional participants, facilitates the incorporation of individuals who might have remained inaccessible via direct outreach, thus effectively leveraging existing networks (Morris, 2006).

Table 1. **Number of state-owned and private schools in Ukraine, 2014–2021**

Number of schools	2014–2015 academic year	2018–2019 academic year	2020–2021 academic year
State-owned schools	17437	15292	14519
Private schools	167	228	354
Total	17604	15520	14873

Source: Statistical information on Ukraine's general secondary and professional (vocational) education in Ukraine in 2020. State Statistics Service in Ukraine (http://www.ukrstat.gov.ua/operativ/operativ2021/osv/osv_rik/zcpho_Ukr_2020.xls) [in Ukrainian].

The result of this targeted snowball sampling approach was the successful recruitment of 22 participants, aligning with the research's methodological aims.

Within the methodological domain, the confluence of the questionnaire and interview methodologies is rationalized by their symbiotic roles. Despite their distinct methodological origins, the research framework judiciously harmonized their disparities, leveraging their interplay for mutual benefit. The questionnaire, characterized by a scaling instrument for ascertaining the importance of ILE factors, yielded a hierarchical delineation of these factors. In contrast, the subsequent semi-structured interviews aimed to glean intricate insights and contextual interpretations of ILE factors' importance, rooted in the participants' experiential engagement with introducing innovations within their respective schools. Although the outcomes of both research phases were distinct yet independent, their congruence was evident. The hierarchy of ILE factors, functioning as a structuring force for ensuing interviews, was enriched by the nuanced perspectives shared during the semi-structured interviews. Notably, this methodological trajectory aligns with Harris and Brown's (2010) findings, underscoring the pitfalls of conflating qualitative data to fortify confirmatory outcomes. Indeed, this direction goes in line with the recommendation to approach qualitative data in a manner distinct from quantitative evidence.

The architecture of innovative learning environment factors

The imperative to undertake an expansive literature review was dictated by the research objectives, necessitating a comprehensive examination due to the fact that the enumerated factors, whose significance was assessed by the respondents, are in themselves outcomes of this endeavor and, therefore, deserve detailed explanations.

The architecture and the logic of ILE factors were informed by two streams of research findings. Primarily, the insights gleaned from the OECD Innovative Learning Environments project (OECD, 2015, 2017), dedicated to unraveling the conditions and dynamics fostering enhanced student learning, exerted a formative influence. By identifying concrete cases of innovative learning environments from all over the world, the ILE project has informed practice, leadership, and reform by generating analysis of innovative and inspiring configurations of learning for children and young people. The distinctive contribution of the ILE project has been to analyze – with numerous international examples – innovative ways of organizing learning at the micro level (learning environment), and how this connects to the meso level (networks and communities of practice) and strategies to implement learning change at the macro level. A second crucial underpinning was the theoretical conceptualization of the learner agency notion.

Resulting from the ILE project's insights, a foundational set of seven key principles for effective learning emerged (OECD, 2017, pp. 22–26):

1. The learning environment recognizes the learners as its core participants, encourages their active engagement, and develops in them an understanding of their own activity as learners.

2. The learning environment is founded on the social nature of learning and actively encourages well-organized cooperative learning.

3. The learning professionals within the learning environment are highly attuned to the learners' motivations and the key role of emotions in achievement.

4. The learning environment is acutely sensitive to the individual differences among the learners in it, including their prior knowledge.

5. The learning environment devises programs that demand hard work and challenge from all without excessive overload.

6. The learning environment operates with clarity of expectations and deploys assessment strategies consistent with these expectations; there is a strong emphasis on formative feedback to support learning.

7. The learning environment strongly promotes "horizontal connectedness" across areas of knowledge and subjects as well as to the community and the wider world.

Obviously, these principles constitute the foundational ethos shaping an optimal school learning environment to be the most conducive to effective learning. Furthermore, a trio of dimensions essential for innovations implementation was determined (OECD, 2017, p. 42):

● The pedagogical core, encompassing its fundamental constituents – learners, educators, content, and learning resources, is woven together through dynamic pedagogical and formative evaluation processes, time utilization, and organizational strategies.

● Learning leadership, constantly informed by evidence-driven insights from diverse strategies and innovations.

● A disposition towards partnerships, involving collaboration with families, communities, higher education, cultural institutions, media, business, and notably, other educational institutions.

These multi-facet dimensions collectively establish a comprehensive framework for cultivating innovative learning environments conducive to strong learner agency development.

There are two important issues with regard to the conceptualization of the notion of learner agency. Firstly, it necessitated the elucidation of foundational theories that serve as theoretical pillars, along with the delineation of their essential components. In this vein, Margaret Archer's critical realist approach (1995, 1996, 2000) and Albert Bandura's socio-cognitive theory (1997, 2001, 2006) emerge as seminal cornerstones. These theories emphasize the mutually-formative influence of structure (*i.e.*, structure and culture) – agency interaction; enriching understanding of agency with a sociological perspective. This infusion puts the notion of learner agency into the procedural dimension of interaction with structural factors (Humeniuk, 2020), further extending the purview to encompass the learning environment (with its structural and cultural factors) as an integral focal point for exploration.

The foundational tenets of the learner agency concept are derived from an extensive overview. This includes an analysis within the socio-ecological developmental approach by Schoon (2018), diverse agency typologies, described by Hitlin and Elder Jr. (2007), and a nuanced typology of learner agency, created by Charteris and Smardon (2018). These diverse strands crystallize three pivotal facets central to the learner agency concept, as underscored within the theoretical inquiry, conducted by the author of this article (Humeniuk, 2022, p. 159):

● Emergent nature: Learner agency materializes as an outcome of the dynamic interplay between agents and structural/cultural elements.

● Temporal dimensions: The multifaceted temporal horizons of learners—comprising past experiences, future aspirations, and current capabilities—stand as vital considerations.

● Agent's identity: forged through introspection and engendered by interactions across three orders of reality, afterward being reflected in his/her plans and future expectations.

Table 2. **The matrix of 26 ILE factors**

MICRO LEVEL (Within the school learning environment)	
Pedagogical core and the connections between its component	
Teacher	**Learner**
– Teachers' professional readiness	– The practice of a learner's experience analysis – The practice of a learner's self-exploration and self-awareness – The usage of results of self-reflection and the learning experience analysis in the further learning process – The goal-setting practice, aimed at alignment of a learner's learning and real-life goals
Content	**Resources**
– The correspondence of the curriculum content to the need for a strong learner agency	– Advanced informational-, computer-, and digital-technologies usage (incl. different online instruments, social media, *etc.*) – A flexible schedule
Connections between the core elements	
– The principles of partnership pedagogy – Formative assessment – Specialized learning groups with learners of different age – The practice of co-teaching, enabling a cross-discipline approach – Communication and collaboration between the teachers	
Learning leadership and management	
– The strategy as a documented vision of the learning process – Common understanding of learning process peculiarities by all school professionals – Harmonized and coordinated the work of all the professionals within a school – The learning information system, enabling qualitative and personalized analysis of a learning process – The possibility to discuss every learner's learning progress with both teachers and parents – Functioning of the feedback system (from parents, teachers, and learners)	
MESO LEVEL (Networks and communities)	MACRO LEVEL (Policy strategies and regulations)
Partnerships	**National policy: regulations and incentives**
– Possibility for learners to get acquainted with the activities of other institutions – Practical out-of-school experience for learners (it might be also a format of volunteering) – Involvement in school teaching activities experts from different professional spheres, parents, other "non-teachers"	– The correspondence of the pedagogical education system to the demand for strong learner agency development – Educational standards (in terms of curriculum) – The system of final standardized tests to graduate school – Education government policy measures, aimed at supporting and/or encouraging innovations in the sphere of school education

In parallel to the contributions of the ILE project in shaping ILE factors, the salient attributes of the learner agency concept precipitate a comprehensive framework of requisites for innovative school learning environments. In this light, the temporal domain within the learner agency concept advocates for the alignment of learning activities with learners' diverse temporal horizons, encompassing their past, present capabilities, and future expectations. This entails the seamless integration of prior experiences into the learning process, considering present capacities, and aligning with aspirations and goals. Similarly, the dimension of learner identity, a product of theoretical refinement, underscores the imperative of fostering self-exploration and self-awareness. Subsequently, this aspect propels the realization of an individual's distinctive inclinations and interests throughout the learning process. This, in turn, harmonizes with the emergent character of learner agency, necessitating a conducive interplay with both structural and cultural dimensions of the school learning environment.

The innovative learning environment factors: matrix and priority setting

The synthesis of the preceding theoretical discourse on the conceptualization of learner agency and the foundational ILE principles serves as a contextual backdrop that converges into the focal point of this discourse: the matrix of 26 ILE factors (see Table 2).

Table 3, delineated herewith, encapsulates a collection of ILE factors that have notably ascended to the maximum of the participants' importance evaluations. This assemblage crystallizes the elements which have garnered preeminence through securing top-three rating positions, as a result of the research participants' assessments.

Semantically, the factors, defined as the importance leaders can be organized into distinct priority settings such as the following.

Common values among school professionals. Foremost among the 26 ILE factors is the common understanding of the peculiarities of the learning process, resonating among all school professionals. This is profoundly logical, particularly when scrutinizing the implications for both learning objectives and the learning process in a context where learner agency is the value in itself. The perspective that places learner agency as an intrinsic value mandates an outlook that deems learners as proactive participants, adept at charting a guiding path and subsequently embarking on actions to realize it. This, in turn, necessitates the acknowledgment of each learner's individuality.

It's worth highlighting that adopting such a perspective is notably transformative within the Ukrainian educational landscape, particularly when considering the deeply ingrained traditional values upheld by conventional schooling systems. Within this context, private schools effectively emerge as pioneering hubs of innovative educational practices, offering a distinct contrast to the ongoing transformation witnessed in state-owned educational institutions under the umbrella of the NUS reform initiative. Furthermore, the prevailing support backdrop is marked by a degree of ambivalence. The evaluation of the NUS reform's impact reflects a mixed sentiment, with 23.3 % of respondents expressing a positive outlook, and 26.3 % voicing a negative stance within the population of Ukraine (Vorona & Shulha, 2019, p. 432).

Exploration of learners' personal identity. Positioned second and third in the hierarchy of importance, two factors pertaining to the exploration of personal identity are detected. Firstly, a learner's practice of self-exploration and self-awareness fosters an understanding and acceptance of their interests and needs. Secondly, a learner's regular analysis of their learning experience. This hierarchy is logical, given the emphasis on individual growth and the indispensable reliance of the learning

Table 3. **TOP 3 ILE factors**

Factor priority position
TOP 1
– Common understanding of the peculiarities of a learning process by all school professionals
TOP 2
– The learner's practice of self-exploration and self-awareness, aimed at understanding and acceptance of his/her interests and needs in the context of strong learner agency development – The harmonious and coordinated work of all the professionals within the school, following a common understanding and acceptance of a particular vision of a learning process – Smooth functioning of the feedback system from parents, teachers, and learners
TOP 3
– The teachers' professional readiness to work with learners in the context of their strong agency development necessity – The correspondence of the system for teachers' professional pedagogical education and the demand to enable learners' agency within the learning process – Learner's regular practice of his/her learning experience analysis – The use of teaching methods, based on the principles of a partnership pedagogy, implying a learner is an active participant in a learning process, being an agent, not a passive object

process on learners' unique passions, requisites, and strengths. It is pivotal to recognize that the process of self-exploration is a deliberate endeavor, constituting a concerted exploration of personal identity. This process requires dedicated efforts, attention, the allocation of time, and qualified professional guidance. Furthermore, the dimension encompassing the exploration of learners' personal identities imposes the need for novel roles within the realm of education, such as personalized tutoring or mentoring. In private educational establishments, these roles are already integrated into the professional cohort, whereas in state-owned learning institutions, there remains considerable ground to cover before such integration is achieved.

Organizational mechanisms and communication system. Two factors – a harmonious and coordinated work of all the professionals within the school, as a consequence of common understanding and acceptance of a particular vision of a learning process, and a smooth functioning of the system of feedback from parents, teachers, and learners – close the second rank of ILE importance rating. These factors represent the group of means, envisaged to realize the concept of innovative learning through enabling coordination of all the efforts of school staff and open horizontal communication between all key participants of a learning process.

The importance of the communication factor finds empirical evidence in the NUS reform monitoring report (Monitoring NUS, 2021). This report reveals that 65 % of school directors would like to modify or enhance certain facets governing the interplay among teachers, school administration, and learners. Furthermore, concerning parent-school communication, a substantial majority of school directors, exceeding two-thirds, express a desire to transform the way of parental involvement in learners' educational process. This transformation seeks to foster a more collaborative partnership, characterized by more active participation in joint projects and events, encompassing non-formal modes of interaction.

Teacher's professional readiness. Three ILE factors, centered around teachers' preparedness to engage with learners in fostering strong learner agency within the learning process, appear as a collective entity, securing the third tier of importance estimation. Essentially, these factors underline the pivotal role of teachers, who serve as conduits, catalyzing the realization of innovative educational paradigms anchored in the reverence for learner agency. Indeed, the viability of innovative learning hinges indispensably upon the emergence of educators of a new format.

The circumstances concerning teachers are intricate and denote a challenging impasse. On one hand, the limited social prestige of the teaching profession results in pedagogical university faculties being inundated with candidates of modest academic aptitude. Conversely, private schools present themselves as offering substantially higher remuneration, thereby amplifying the demand for educational professionals; yet, they struggle with a dearth of educators driven by intrinsic motivation rather than a lack of alternative options.

The responses provided by the research participants to an open-ended question regarding the identification of additional ILE factors not initially listed for importance assessment have yielded valuable research insights about the **factor of learners' parents**. Notably, the readiness of parents to embrace and value strong learner agency emerged as a critically important factor, as highlighted by several respondents. This readiness entails a profound comprehension of the potential of learners' agency within the learning process, as well as its alignment with parents' cultural worldview, which is transferred to children through the cultural codes inherent in the parenting system. Undoubtedly, this research result complements the value-based ILE factors by incorporating parents as significant stakeholders whose perspectives should be acknowledged in the process of schools transitioning to innovative paradigms.

The intricate landscape of parental support for NUS principles and concepts – encompassing learner-centered approaches, the pedagogy of partnership, and values-based education – introduces a degree of confusion regarding parents' preparedness to embrace educational innovation. For instance, an overwhelming 94 % fully concur that teachers should treat children with respect, and 89 % endorse the belief that each child possesses inherent talents and abilities. Furthermore, 86 % hold the view that a child's evaluation should be grounded in their individual progress rather than comparisons with peers. However, concurrently, there are parents, who have more traditional perspectives concerning education and the role of schools. Among them, 75 % think that a child should ask for the teacher's permission to use the restroom during the lesson, 50 % assert that the primary objective of schooling is to impart concrete knowledge about facts and concepts to the child, and 41 % maintain that a child should refrain from questioning a teacher's statements (Monitoring NUS, 2021).

Conclusions

This article aims to present and discuss the outcomes of assessing the importance of ILE factors in Ukrainian innovative and alternative schools. The

questionnaire, comprising the list of ILE factors, was constructed based on a prior conceptualization of learner agency from socio-cognitive and sociological perspectives. Additionally, allowing respondents to suggest missing ILE factors emphasized the **parental role** in fostering strong learner agency. The findings hold key insights into identifying core ILE factors for driving school innovation in the context of learner agency enablement.

From the research findings, the following conclusions emerge:

1) It is imperative to incorporate the dimension of **learner identity exploration** into the process of transforming the learning environment into an innovative one. While the demand for ILE to be adaptable to diverse learners lacks precise directives, it is clear that accommodating individual differences requires an open and flexible approach. Yet, there is another aspect. Recognizing the significance of self-exploration, self-awareness, and ongoing reflection in a learner's personal learning process is crucial. This approach cultivates personal engagement, ownership of learning outcomes, and ultimately, strong learner agency – an insight affirmed by research findings.

2) The pivotal role of cultural context in developing learner agency implies a gradual transformation of the school education system. The survey results underline the paramount importance of a shared **cultural context** in enabling innovative practices that foster strong learner agency. While highlighting the essential nature of common values

as catalysts for transformation, this insight also sheds light on the gradual nature of the transformation process itself. Drawing from Roland's (2004) differentiation between slow-moving and fast-moving institutions, with culture and values belonging to the former category, it becomes evident that the process of educational transformation will be gradual. An illustrative case is Finland's ongoing educational change, initiated in the late 1970s, with an initial phase dedicated to rethinking the theoretical and methodological foundations of teaching and learning, spanned over a decade (Sahlberg, 2015).

The findings of this research hold particular significance within the context of the New Ukrainian School reform implementation, as they delineate pivotal directions that warrant consideration for enhancing innovation within state-owned educational institutions. Notably, Ukraine's innovative and alternative private schools are regarded as pioneers of educational innovation, having already cultivated valuable cases of innovative implementation.

References

Archer, M. (1995). *Realist Social Theory: The Morphogenetic Approach.* Cambridge University Press.

Archer, M. (1996). *Culture and Agency. The place of Culture in Social Theory.* Cambridge University Press.

Archer, M. (2000). *Being Human: The Problem of Agency.* Cambridge University Press.

Archer, M. (2003). *Structure, Agency, and the Internal Conversation.* Cambridge University Press.

Atkinson, R., & Flint, J. (2001). Accessing hidden and hard-to-reach populations: Snowball research strategies. *Social Research Update, 33.*

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* W.H. Freeman and Company.

Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52,* 1–26. https://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.1

Bandura, A. (2006). Towards a psychology of human agency. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 1*(2), 164–180. https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6916.2006.00011.x

Charteris, J., & Thomas, E. (2016). Uncovering "Unwelcome Truths" through Student Voice: Teacher Inquiry into Agency and Student Assessment Literacy. *Teaching Education, 28*(2), 162–177. https://doi.org/10.1080/104762 10.2016.1229291

Charteris, J., & Smardon, D. (2018). A typology of agency in new generation learning environment: Emerging relational, ecological and new material considerations. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 26*(1), 51–68. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14681366.201 7.1345975

Faugier, J., & Sargeant, M. (1997). Sampling hard-to-reach populations. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 26,* 790–797.

Guetterman, T. C. (2015). Descriptions of Sampling Practices Within Five Approaches to Qualitative Research in Education and the Health Sciences. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 16*(2). https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-16.2.2290

Harris, L. R., & Brown, T. L. (2010). Mixing interview and questionnaire methods: Practical problems in aligning data. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation, 15,* article 1. https://doi.org/10.7275/959j-ky83

Hitlin, S., & Elder, G. H., Jr. (2007). Time, self and the curiously abstract concept of agency. *Sociological Theory, 25*(2), 170–191. https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9558.2007.00303.x

Humeniuk, V. (2020). Agency: the plurality of definitions and operationalization in the context of school education. *NaUKMA Research Papers. Sociology, 3,* 27–36. https://doi.org/10.18523/2617-9067.2020.3.27-36 [in Ukrainian].

Humeniuk, V. (2022). Learner agency in the context of innovative learning environment: its conceptualization and theoretical basis. *Sotsiolohiia: teoriia, metody, marketynh* [*Sociology: Theory, Methods, Marketing*], *1,* 144–164. https://doi.org/10.15407/sociology2022.01.144 [in Ukrainian].

Morris, T. (2006). *Social Work Research Methods: Four Alternative Paradigms* (1st ed.). Sage Publications Incorporation.

Monitoring NUS. Results and recommendations. The first stage, 2019–2020. (2021). Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine. https://mon.gov.ua/storage/app/media/nova-ukrainska-shkola/2021/Monitorynh/Monitorynh_vprovadzhennya_reformy_NUSH_rezultaty_ta_rekomendatsiyi_26_02.pdf [in Ukrainian].

OECD. (2013). *Innovative Learning Environments, Educational Research and Innovation.* OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264203488-en

OECD. (2015). *Schooling Redesigned: Towards Innovative Learning Systems, Educational Research and Innovation.* OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264245914-en

OECD. (2017). *The OECD Handbook for Innovative Learning Environments, Educational Research and Innovation.* OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264277274-en

OECD. (2018). *The Future of Education and Skills. Education 2030.* https://www.oecd.org/education/2030/E2030%20Position%20Paper%20(05.04.2018).pdf

OECD. (2019). *Conceptual Learning Framework. Student Agency for 2030.* http://www.oecd.org/education/2030-project/teaching-and-learning/learning/student-agency/Student_Agency_for_2030_concept_note.pdf

Patton, M. Q. (2002). Two decades of developments in qualitative inquiry: A personal, experiential perspective. *Qualitative Social Work, 1*(3), 261–283. https://doi.org/10.1177/1473325002001003636

Roland, G. (2004). Understanding institutional change: fast-moving and slow-moving institutions. *Studies in Comparative International Development, 38*(4), 109–131. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02686330

Sahlberg, P. (2015). *Finnish Lessons 2.0: What can the world learn from educational change in Finland?* (2nd ed.). Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Schoon, I. (2018). *Conceptualizing Learner Agency: A Socio-Ecological Developmental Approach.* Centre for Learning and Life Chances in Knowledge Economies and Societies. https://www.llakes.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/LLAKES-Research-Paper-64-Schoon-I.pdf

Shevchenko, S. (2021). Changes in the Ukrainian Educational Field in the Conditions of Social Uncertainty. *Ukrainian Sociological Journal*, (25), 17–36. https://doi.org/10.26565/2077-5105-2021-25-02 [in Ukrainian].

Sztompka, P. (1996). *Sociologija social'nyh izmenenij [The Sociology of Social Change]* (V. Yadov, Ed.). Aspect Press [in Russian].

Vorona, V., & Shulha, M. (Eds.). (2019). *Ukrainske suspilstvo: monitorynh sotsialnych zmin [Ukrainian society: monitoring of social changes], 6* (20). Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. https://i-soc.com.ua/assets/files/monitoring/mon2019.pdf [in Ukrainian].

Вікторія Гуменюк

УМОЖЛИВЛЕННЯ УЧНІВСЬКОЇ АҐЕНТНОСТІ В ІННОВАЦІЙНИХ ШКОЛАХ УКРАЇНИ: ПРІОРИТИЗАЦІЯ ЧИННИКІВ ІННОВАЦІЙНОГО НАВЧАЛЬНОГО СЕРЕДОВИЩА

Цю статтю присвячено презентації та обговоренню першої частини результатів, отриманих під час онлайн-опитування 22 засновників/директорів інноваційних та/або альтернативних шкіл України (2022). Учасники дослідження визначали ступінь важливості низки чинників інноваційного навчального середовища (ІНС), використовуючи шкалу оцінювання важливості для кожного. Набір пріоритетів чинників, що сформувалися в результаті дослідження, виконує два завдання: по-перше, щодо змісту допомагає визначити ядро інноваційних зусиль у контексті необхідності розвивати сильну учнівську аґентність; а по-друге, методологічно слугує елементом, що структурував глибинні інтерв'ю, проведені з учасниками дослідження після анкетування.

Визначення пріоритетних чинників ІНС виконує декілька дослідницьких завдань. По-перше, чинник спільного розуміння особливостей бачення процесу навчання усіма, хто працює з учнями, – абсолютний лідер за важливістю серед чинників ІНС – свідчить про засадничу роль цінностей, які визначають структурну взаємодію. По-друге, важливість групи чинників, що стосуються пізнання учнями самих себе (самопізнання), пошуку власної ідентичності та регулярної практики аналізу навчального досвіду й саморефлексії, акцентує критичну важливість супроводу учнівства в цій роботі, щоб уможливити прояви суб'єктивного в процесі навчання. І, нарешті, по-третє, багатовимірність важливих чинників ІНС натякає на необхідність сприймати процес навчання комплексно, а не таким, що дорівнює викладанню. Хоча роль професійної готовності вчителів як «провідників» інноваційного навчання є дуже важливою, і результати дослідження це підтверджують.

Вимір роботи з учнями в частині їхнього самопізнання та самоідентифікації є знаковим для ІНС, оскільки саме чутливість до індивідуальних особливостей учнів і здатність навчального середовища диференціюватися відповідно до різних потреб учнів становлять сутність його інноваційності.

Ключові слова: учнівська аґентність, інноваційні українські школи, інноваційне навчальне середовище (ІНС), уможливлення учнівської аґентності, теорія критичного реалізму, структурна/культурна – аґентнісна взаємодія, пошук ідентичності, самоідентифікація учнів, «Нова українська школа».