

DOI <https://doi.org/10.51647/kelm.2026.3.2>

PODMIOTY PARTNERSTWA W NOWOCZESNEJ EDUKACJI PODSTAWOWEJ

Maryna Yepikhina

*kandydat nauk pedagogicznych, docent,
docent na Katedrze Rozwoju Dziecka w Wiek Wczesnym i Przedszkolnym Wydziału Pedagogiki i
Psychologii Państwowej Uczelni „Uniwersytet Narodowy im. Tarasa Szewczenki w Ługansku”
(Łubny, Ukraina)
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-0199-8186
dewdrop@ukr.net*

Viktoriia Zhelanova

*doktor nauk pedagogicznych, profesor,
profesor Katedry Edukologii oraz Nauk Psychologiczno-Pedagogicznych Wydziału Kształcenia
Pedagogicznego Uniwersytetu Stołecznego im. Borisa Grinchenka w Kijowie (Kijów, Ukraina)
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-9467-1080
vic.zhelanova@gmail.com*

Adnotacja. Artykuł przedstawia teoretyczne rozumienie podmiotów interakcji partnerskich we współczesnej edukacji wczesnoszkolnej. Analizuje naukowe podejścia do interpretacji pojęć „podmiot” i „podmiotowość” oraz uzasadnia ich znaczenie dla zrozumienia procesu edukacyjnego. Wyjaśnia istotę interakcji partnerskich jako szczególnego rodzaju relacji podmiotowo-podmiotowych opartych na równości, wspólnych celach i wzajemnej odpowiedzialności. Proponuje zróżnicowanie podmiotów interakcji partnerskich na bezpośrednie (uczeń, nauczyciel, rodzice) i pośrednie (administracja, instytucje społeczne) w zależności od stopnia ich włączenia w proces edukacyjny. Ujawnia funkcjonalne i rolowe cechy podmiotów w komunikacyjnych, interaktywnych i percepcyjnych aspektach interakcji. Udowodniono, że spójność ról i funkcji podmiotów zapewnia skuteczność procesu edukacyjnego w szkole podstawowej.

Słowa kluczowe: interakcja partnerska, podmiot, podmiotowość, edukacja wczesnoszkolna, uczestnicy procesu edukacyjnego, pedagogika partnerska, proces edukacyjny, funkcje podmiotów.

PARTICIPANTS IN PARTNERSHIP-BASED INTERACTION IN CONTEMPORARY PRIMARY EDUCATION

Maryna Yepikhina

*Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor of the Department of Early and
Preschool Child Development,
Faculty of Pedagogy and Psychology,
State Institution «Luhansk Taras Shevchenko National University»
(Lubny, Ukraine)
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-0199-8186
dewdrop@ukr.net*

Viktoriia Zhelanova

*Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor,
Professor of the Department of Educology and Psychological and
Pedagogical Sciences,
Faculty of Pedagogical Education,
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University
(Kyiv, Ukraine)
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-9467-1080
vic.zhelanova@gmail.com*

Abstract. The article provides a theoretical analysis of the subjects of partnership interaction in the contemporary primary education. It examines scholarly approaches to the interpretation of the concepts of “subject” and “subjectivity” and substantiates their significance for understanding the educational process. The essence of partnership interaction is clarified as a specific type of subject–subject relationship based on parity, shared goals, and mutual responsibility.

A differentiation of the subjects of partnership interaction into direct (students, teachers, parents) and indirect (school administration, social institutions) participants is proposed according to the degree of their involvement in the educational process. The functional and role-based characteristics of these subjects are revealed within the communicative, interactive, and perceptual dimensions of interaction. It is demonstrated that the coordination of roles and functions of the subjects ensures the effectiveness of the educational process in primary school.

Key words: partnership interaction, subject; subjectivity, primary education, participants in the educational process, partnership pedagogy, educational process, subject functions.

СУБ'ЄКТИ ПАРТНЕРСЬКОЇ ВЗАЄМОДІЇ У СУЧАСНІЙ ПОЧАТКОВІЙ ОСВІТІ

Марина Єніхіна

*кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент,
доцент, кафедри розвитку дитини раннього і дошкільного віку
факультету педагогіки і психології ДЗ «Луганський національний університет
імені Тараса Шевченка» (Лубни, Україна)
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-0199-8186
dewdrop@ukr.net*

Вікторія Желанова

*доктор педагогічних наук, професор,
професор кафедри освітології та психолого-педагогічних наук
факультету педагогічної освіти
Київського столичного університету імені Бориса Грінченка
(Київ, Україна)
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-9467-1080
vic.zhelanova@gmail.com*

Анотація. У статті здійснено теоретичне осмислення суб'єктів партнерської взаємодії в сучасній початковій освіті. Проаналізовано наукові підходи до трактування понять «суб'єкт» і «суб'єктність» та обґрунтовано їх значення для розуміння освітнього процесу. Уточнено сутність партнерської взаємодії як особливого типу суб'єкт-суб'єктних відносин, що ґрунтуються на паритетності, спільності цілей і взаємній відповідальності. Запропоновано диференціацію суб'єктів партнерської взаємодії на безпосередніх (учень, учитель, батьки) та опосередкованих (адміністрація, соціальні інституції) відповідно до ступеня їх включеності в освітній процес. Розкрито функціонально-рольову характеристику суб'єктів у межах комунікативного, інтерактивного та перцептивного аспектів взаємодії. Доведено, що узгодженість ролей і функцій суб'єктів забезпечує ефективність освітнього процесу в початковій школі.

Ключові слова: партнерська взаємодія, суб'єкт, суб'єктність, початкова освіта, учасники освітнього процесу, педагогіка партнерства, освітній процес, функції суб'єктів.

Introduction. The up-to-date modernization of the national education system leads to a reconsideration of the roles of participants in the educational process and the nature of their interaction, which becomes particularly relevant at the level of primary education as a basic stage in the development of a child's personality.

In the international educational discourse, the idea of partnership is considered as an important factor in ensuring the quality of education. International experience demonstrates that effective educational practices are based on the interaction of teachers, students, parents, and the community, implemented through the concepts of collaborative learning, student-centered approach, as well as the school – family – community partnership model. In foreign scholarly literature, the problem of interaction among participants in the educational process is examined from various perspectives, in particular in the context of school–family cooperation, teacher-parent partnership, and the active involvement of students in the educational process. Foreign scholars emphasize that effective interaction between school and family has a positive impact on students' academic achievement, their social development, and the formation of learning motivation (Epstein et al., 2002).

In the context of educational reform in Ukraine, the idea of partnership has acquired a systemic character and is defined as one of the key principles of the modern educational process. The conceptual framework of the New Ukrainian School (Концепція, 2016) emphasizes the implementation of partnership pedagogy, which involves building interaction between teachers, students, and parents on the basis of trust, mutual respect, cooperation, and shared responsibility for learning outcomes.

At the same time, the analysis of scholarly sources indicates that the issue of identifying the subjects of partnership interaction and characterizing their functions within the system of modern primary education requires further theoretical elaboration, which determines the relevance of this study.

Main Part. The aim of the study is to identify the subjects of partnership interaction in modern primary education and to characterize their role in the organization of the educational process.

According to the stated aim, the following research objectives have been defined:

1. To analyze scholarly approaches to understanding partnership interaction in the educational process.
2. To identify the main subjects of partnership interaction in modern primary education.
3. To characterize the roles and functions of the subjects of partnership interaction in the educational process of primary school.

Materials and Methods. To achieve the stated aim, a set of theoretical research methods was employed. In particular, the study applied analysis and synthesis of scholarly literature on the problem of partnership interaction in education, a comparative analysis of scientific approaches to defining the subjects of the educational process, as well as the systematization and generalization of research findings in order to identify the main subjects of partnership interaction in modern primary education.

The application of these methods made it possible to analyze scholarly approaches to understanding partnership interaction in the educational process, to identify the main subjects of partnership interaction in modern primary education, as well as to characterize their roles and functions in the organization of the primary school educational process.

Results and Discussion. The theoretical understanding of the subjects of partnership interaction in modern primary education requires clarification of the content of the concepts of «subject» and «subjectivity», which determine the nature of interaction among participants in the educational process. The analysis of psychological and pedagogical literature provides grounds to assert that the concept of the «subject» is key to understanding the educational process, as it reflects the active role of the individual in activity and cognition. Its use is associated with the establishment of partnership interaction in the primary school educational process, implemented through subject-subject relations based on dialogue and mutual responsibility. In this context, it is important to clarify the essential characteristics of the subject and to distinguish between the concepts of «subject» and «subjectivity» in order to explain the mechanisms of implementing partnership interaction in primary school.

The analysis of the presented definitions of the concept of «subject» indicates the presence of a common methodological foundation, according to which the subject is understood as an active, conscious individual capable of purposeful activity, interaction, and self-development. In the definition proposed by O. Linnik, emphasis is placed on activity, integrity, and the individual's ability to act as an initiator and organizer of activity and interaction (Ліннік, 2016: 49). V. Andrushchenko considers the subject within the educational process as an agent of activity, emphasizing their role in pedagogical interaction and responsibility for its outcomes (Андрущенко, Линовицька, 2014: 128). L. Skorych presents the subject in the context of interpersonal interaction, focusing on its formation and realization within the system of relationships and communication (Скорич, 2019: 836).

As we can see, the differences between the approaches are primarily related to a shift in research emphasis: from personality characteristics to the educational context and the interactional, communicative dimension, while the common feature remains the understanding of the subject as an active agent of activity and consciousness. In our view, the most comprehensive understanding of the subject is as a bearer of activity, consciousness, and agency, capable of self-regulation, self-development, and self-realization, which ensures the effective performance of activities and the integration of personal resources for solving professional and life tasks (Желанова, 2020: 100).

At the same time, defining the essence of the subject requires clarification through the concept of «subjectivity», which characterizes the level and mode of manifestation of their activity, autonomy, and capacity for self-regulation in activity and interaction. It is precisely the analysis of subjectivity that makes it possible to specify the internal mechanisms for implementing partnership interaction in the primary school educational process.

The generalization of the presented approaches to defining the concept of «subjectivity» allows it to be considered as a multidimensional characteristic of the individual, manifested in the ability for conscious activity, self-regulation, and self-development in activity and interaction. In scholarly interpretations, various semantic emphases in understanding this phenomenon can be observed.

In particular, S. Maksymenko emphasizes the activity-goal aspect of subjectivity, interpreting it as the individual's ability to consciously determine the goals of their activity and responsibly implement them, transforming both themselves and the world (Максименко, 2017). In T. Hurlieva's approach, subjectivity is primarily associated with the process of interaction, acquiring meaning through dialogue and mutual exchange, which ensures the personal development of its participants (Гурлева, 2020: 43). M. Skrypyk interprets subjectivity in the context of social action, emphasizing its connection with self-regulation, goal-setting, and personal authorship in one's own activity (Скрипник, 2017: 14). At the same time, O. Halian proposes an integrative vision of subjectivity as a holistic characteristic of the individual, combining awareness, autonomy, responsibility, reflection, the capacity for self-development, and creative interaction (Галіян, 2017: 65). Thus, the differences in approaches are determined by different theoretical perspectives on understanding subjectivity – activity-based, interactional, social, and integrative – while they are united by the understanding of subjectivity as the individual's ability to be an active and conscious creator of their own activity and development. As can be seen, the generalization of various scholarly approaches provides grounds for considering the individual as a subject of activity and social relations with a formed system of internal values. In this context, subjectivity appears as an inherent, self-caused activity embedded in the child's «self», which ensures the connection between the personal «self» and the surrounding world and serves as the substantive basis for the formation and development of a creative personality. As a subject-based system, a creative personality functions in a dual manner, simultaneously acting as both the condition and the goal of its own self-development (Желанова, 2016: 72).

It should be noted that the subjectivity of the individual manifests not in isolation, but in the process of interaction with other participants in the educational process. It is precisely the nature of this interaction that determines the possibilities for realizing the subject position of each participant. In modern primary education, such interaction acquires the features of partnership, which necessitates clarifying the content of the concept of «partnership interaction». We understand partnership interaction between subjects of the educational process as a new type of interaction based on parity and characterized by shared goals, mutual responsibility of the parties for the outcomes of cooperation, as well as the personal progress of each participant in the process of joint activity. In this context, partners are considered as subjects of the educational process capable of dialogue, group interaction, teamwork, and the joint organization of the educational process in order to achieve a defined goal (Єпіхіна, 2022: 37-38). Within this approach, there is a need to identify the range of subjects of partnership interaction in modern primary education and to clarify their role in the organization of the educational process.

The Law of Ukraine On Education (Section VI, Article 52) defines the participants of the educational process, which include learners, teaching staff, academic and research staff, parents of learners, individuals engaged in educational activities, as well as other persons involved in its implementation in accordance with legislation (Закон України «Про освіту», 2017). However, in our view, this definition is of a generalized nature and does not provide for differentiation of participants in the educational process according to the nature of their participation in partnership interaction. At the same time, it should be noted that the contemporary development of education necessitates a scholarly understanding of the subjects of partnership interaction, taking into account the degree of their involvement in the educational process. In this regard, we consider it appropriate to distinguish the subjects of partnership interaction among the participants in the educational process and to classify them according to their role in the implementation of educational activities.

The criterion for such differentiation, in our view, is the degree of direct involvement of subjects in the process of partnership interaction. This approach allows for a more accurate reflection of the nature of subjects' participation in partnership interaction compared to the traditional list of participants in the educational process, as it takes into account not only their formal affiliation but also the level of their active engagement in joint activity. In this context, it is appropriate to distinguish between direct and indirect subjects of partnership interaction. We believe that the direct subjects include the learner, the teacher, and the parents, who are directly involved in the educational process, interact with each other on the basis of partnership, and jointly influence the outcomes of the educational process. Indirect subjects include other participants in the educational process, in particular the administration of the educational institution and social institutions, which do not engage in direct interaction within learning activities but provide organizational, managerial, and environmental conditions for its implementation.

The differentiation of the subjects of partnership interaction carried out within the study provides a basis for further analysis of their roles and functions in the primary school educational process.

Previous studies have substantiated that partnership interaction among the subjects of the educational process should be considered through the prism of three interrelated aspects: communicative (exchange of information), interactive (interaction, exchange of knowledge, ideas, and actions), and perceptive (partners' perception and understanding of each other, establishment of mutual understanding) (Єпіхіна, 2023: 25). In view of this, the characterization of the subjects of partnership interaction is carried out with due regard to these aspects, which ensures a comprehensive disclosure of their roles, functions, and features of interaction in the primary school educational process.

The role of the learner in the system of partnership interaction lies in the realization of an active subject position, manifested in joint activity, interaction with other participants in the educational process, and influence on its organization. In the communicative aspect, the learner participates in pedagogical dialogue, engages in the exchange of information, and expresses and substantiates their own position. In the interactive aspect, they are involved in joint activity, cooperate with the teacher and parents, and take part in decision-making regarding the organization of the educational process. In the perceptive aspect, the learner comes to know other participants in the interaction, develops mutual understanding, and fosters empathy as well as the ability to adequately perceive a partner. Such an approach makes it possible to consider the learner as an active subject of partnership interaction, capable of constructive participation in the educational process.

Alongside this, the teacher performs a system-forming role in partnership interaction, ensuring the organization and coordination of the joint activity of its participants. In the communicative aspect, their activity is aimed at implementing pedagogical dialogue, ensuring openness of communication, and creating conditions for the free expression of thoughts and positions of learners and parents. In the interactive aspect, the teacher organizes and facilitates interaction, coordinates joint activity, involves participants in the educational process in decision-making, and contributes to the formation of a partnership community. In the perceptive aspect, the teacher develops a pedagogical understanding of the child's personality, takes into account their individual characteristics, provides support and feedback, and fosters an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect. The implementation of the perceptive aspect is carried out through pedagogical support, reflection, the provision of feedback, and consideration of learners' individual experience, which ensures deeper mutual understanding among participants in the educational process. In this context, the teacher appears not as a dominant subject, but as a coordinator and co-participant in interaction.

An important subject of partnership interaction is the parents, whose participation is associated with ensuring the child's educational activity and personal development. In the communicative aspect, they interact with the teacher and the child on the basis of open dialogue, engaging in the exchange of information regarding educational needs and learning outcomes. In the interactive aspect, parents are involved in joint activity, cooperate with

the educational institution in addressing educational and upbringing tasks, participate in shaping the educational environment, and support the child's learning motivation. In the perceptive aspect, they provide emotional support, contribute to the formation of the child's positive self-esteem, and foster the development of their confidence and readiness for interaction. This makes it possible to consider parents as equal partners in achieving shared educational outcomes.

Indirect subjects of partnership interaction perform a supportive role by creating the organizational, managerial, and social conditions for its implementation. In the communicative aspect, their activity is associated with creating an informational space for interaction, coordinating communications, and ensuring the openness and accessibility of information. In the interactive aspect, they organize and regulate the educational process, providing the normative, organizational, and resource basis for effective cooperation. In the perceptive aspect, indirect subjects contribute to the formation of a favorable socio-psychological climate, supporting trust and mutual understanding among participants in the educational process. In this context, they ensure the integrity and stability of the functioning of the partnership interaction system.

Thus, the functional and role-based characterization of the subjects of partnership interaction has a complementary nature: the learner realizes an active subject position, the teacher ensures the organization and coordination of interaction, parents act as co-participants in the educational process, and indirect subjects create the conditions for its implementation. The coherence of their functions across the communicative, interactive, and perceptive aspects determines the effectiveness of partnership interaction in primary school. The proposed functional and role-based characterization of the subjects within the communicative, interactive, and perceptive aspects makes it possible to comprehensively present the structure of partnership interaction and to clarify its content in the context of modern primary education.

Conclusions. Thus, the subjects of partnership interaction in modern primary education should be considered in a differentiated manner – as direct and indirect participants in the educational process. Partnership interaction appears as a multidimensional system implemented in the unity of communicative, interactive, and perceptive aspects, ensuring the integrity of interaction among its subjects. The coherence of the roles and functions of the subjects of partnership interaction determines the effectiveness of the educational process, shaping its organization, content, and outcomes in primary school. Further research is required to substantiate the pedagogical conditions for the effective implementation of partnership interaction in the primary school educational process, taking into account contemporary educational transformations.

Список використаних джерел:

1. Epstein J. L., Sanders M. G., Simon B. S., Salinas K. C., Jansorn N. R., Van Voorhis F. L. School, family, and community partnerships: your handbook for action. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press, 2002. 434 p.
2. Концепція Нової української школи від 27.10.2016. URL: <https://nus.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/konczepczyia.pdf> (дата звернення: 06.04.2026).
3. Ліннік О. О. Система підготовки майбутнього вчителя до організації суб'єкт-суб'єктної взаємодії з учнями початкової школи: автореф. дис. ... д-ра пед. наук: 13.00.04 – теорія та методика професійної освіти / ДЗ «Луганський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка». Старобільськ, 2016. 46 с.
4. Андрущенко В. П., Линовицька О. «Суб'єкт» і «об'єкт» освіти в контексті свободи та відповідальності. *Політологічний вісник*. 2014. Вип. 76. С. 121-133.
5. Скорич Л. Суб'єктність в освітньому процесі. *Проблеми сучасної психології*. 2019. Вип. 11. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32626/2227-6246.2011-11>
6. Желанова В. В. Суб'єктний контекст професійної підготовки майбутнього вчителя початкової школи. *Вісник Луганського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка. Педагогічні науки*. 2020. № 2 (333), ч. 1. С. 99-105.
7. Максименко С. Д. Генетична психологія учіння людини: монографія. Київ: Видавничий Дім «Слово», 2017. 206 с.
8. Гурлева Т. С. Суб'єктність як основа особистісного розвитку взаємодіючих учасників освітнього процесу. *Освітній простір в контексті гуманістичної парадигми: психологічні пріоритети сучасності: збірник наукових праць / за ред. С. Д. Максименка*. Київ: Інститут психології імені Г. С. Костюка НАПН України, 2020. С. 40-52. URL: https://lib.iitta.gov.ua/720509/1/Hurleva_%282020%29_SUBIEKTNIST_YAK_OSNOVA_OSOBYSTISNOHO_ROZVYTKU.PDF
9. Скрипник М. Нова українська школа: питання суб'єктності. *Післядипломна освіта в Україні*. 2017. № 2. С. 12-17. URL: http://umo.edu.ua/images/content/nashi_vydanya/pislya_dyplom_osvina/2_2017/ПО_2_2017_Скрипник.pdf
10. Галян О. І. Суб'єктність особистості: ретроспектива поглядів та перспектива втілення в педагогічний процес. *Психологія особистості*. 2017. № 1. С. 59-67. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/По_2017_1_10
11. Желанова В. Суб'єкт-суб'єктна взаємодія вихователя і вихованців як засіб творчої самореалізації особистості. *Педагогічний часопис Волині*. 2016. № 2. С. 71-76. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/pchv_2016_2_16
12. Єпіхіна М. Сутність та структура готовності майбутнього вчителя до партнерської взаємодії в початковій школі. *Педагогічна освіта: теорія і практика. Психологія. Педагогіка*. 2022. Вип. 38 (2). С. 36-43. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.28925/2311-2409.2022.386>
13. Закон України «Про освіту» від 05.09.2017 № 2145-VIII. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2145-19>
14. Єпіхіна М. А. Партнерська взаємодія вчителя початкових класів: системно-структурний аналіз. *Інноваційна педагогіка*. 2023. Вип. 55, т. 1. С. 22-25.

References:

1. Epstein, J. L., Sanders, M. G., Simon, B. S., Salinas, K. C., Jansorn, N. R., & Van Voorhis, F. L. (2002). *School, family, and community partnerships: Your handbook for action* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press [in English].
2. Kontseptsiiia Novoi ukrainskoi shkoly (2016) [Concept of the New Ukrainian School]. Available at: <https://nus.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/konczepczyia.pdf> (accessed 06 April 2026) [in Ukrainian].
3. Linnik, O. O. (2016). Systema pidhotovky maibutnoho vchytelia do orhanizatsii subiekt–subiektnoi vzaiemodii z uchniamy pochatkovoii shkoly [The system of training future teachers for organizing subject–subject interaction with primary school students]. Extended abstract of Doctor's thesis. Starobilsk [in Ukrainian].
4. Andrushchenko, V. P., & Lynovytska, O. (2014). “Subiekt” i “obiekt” osvity v konteksti svobody ta vidpovidalnosti [“Subject” and “object” of education in the context of freedom and responsibility]. *Politolohichniy visnyk*, 76, 121–133 [in Ukrainian].
5. Skorych, L. (2019). Subiektnist v osvitnomu protsesi [Subjectivity in the educational process]. *Problemy suchasnoi psykholohii*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.32626/2227-6246.2011-11> [in Ukrainian].
6. Zhelanova, V. V. (2020). Subiektnyi kontekst profesiinoi pidhotovky maibutnoho vchytelia pochatkovoii shkoly [Subject context of professional training of future primary school teachers]. *Visnyk Luhanskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni Tarasa Shevchenka. Pedahohichni nauky*, 2 (333), part 1, 99–105 [in Ukrainian].
7. Maksymenko, S. D. (2017). Henetychna psykholohiia uchinna liudyny [Genetic psychology of human learning]. Kyiv: Vydavnychiy Dim “Slovo” [in Ukrainian].
8. Hurlieva, T. S. (2020). Subiektnist yak osnova osobystisnoho rozvytku vzaiemodiiuchykh uchasykyv osvitnoho protsesu [Subjectivity as a basis of personal development of interacting participants in the educational process]. In S. D. Maksymenko (Ed.), *Osvitnii prostir v konteksti humanistychnoi paradyhmy: psykholohichni priorytety suchasnosti*, 40–52. Kyiv. Available at: https://lib.iitta.gov.ua/720509/1/Hurlieva_%282020%29_SUBIEKTNIST_YAK_OSNOVA_OSOBYSTISNOHO_ROZVYTKU.PDF [in Ukrainian].
9. Skrypyk, M. (2017). Nova ukrainska shkola: pytannia subiektnosti [New Ukrainian School: issues of subjectivity]. *Pisliadyplomna osvita v Ukraini*, 2, 12–17. Available at: http://umo.edu.ua/images/content/nashi_vydanya/pislya_dyplom_osvina/2_2017/ПО_2_2017_Скрипник.pdf [in Ukrainian].
10. Halian, O. I. (2017). Subiektnist osobystosti: retrospektyva pohliadiv ta perspektyva vtilennia v pedahohichnyi protses [Subjectivity of personality: retrospective of views and prospects of implementation in the pedagogical process]. *Psykholohiia osobystosti*, 1, 59–67. Available at: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Po_2017_1_10 [in Ukrainian].
11. Zhelanova, V. (2016). Subiekt–subiektna vzaiemodiiia vykhovatel'ia i vykhovantsiv yak zasib tvorchoi samorealizatsii osobystosti [Subject–subject interaction as a means of creative self-realization]. *Pedahohichniy chasopys Volyni*, 2, 71–76. Available at: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/pchv_2016_2_16 [in Ukrainian].
12. Yepikhina, M. (2022). Sutnist ta struktura hotovnosti maibutnoho vchytelia do partnerskoi vzaiemodii v pochatkovii shkoli [The essence and structure of readiness of future teachers for partnership interaction in primary school]. *Pedahohichna osvita: teoriia i praktyka. Psykholohiia. Pedahohika*, 38 (2), 36–43. <https://doi.org/10.28925/2311-2409.2022.386> [in Ukrainian].
13. Law of Ukraine “On Education” (2017). Available at: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2145-19> [in Ukrainian].
14. Yepikhina, M. A. (2023). Partnerska vzaiemodiiia vchytelia pochatkovykh klasiv: systemno-strukturnyi analiz [Partnership interaction of primary school teachers: system-structural analysis]. *Innovatsiina pedahohika*, 55 (1), 22–25 [in Ukrainian].