

ANNA SARBIEWSKA

University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9429-8228>

PARTICIPATORY CULTURE OF EDUCATION AS A SPACE FOR DEVELOPING STUDENT AGENCY: THE CASE OF ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING*

Introduction: Student agency is widely recognised as a key concept in contemporary pedagogy and is understood as a relational and situational phenomenon emerging within everyday educational practices. In English as a Foreign Language teaching, it is shaped by the tension between institutional constraints and the need for active student participation.

Research Aim: The aim of the study was to reconstruct the areas and forms of student agency emerging in English as a Foreign Language lessons conducted within a participatory culture of education, and to examine how students interpreted their participation in relation to influence, responsibility, communication, and further independent language learning.

Method: The study was qualitative and interpretative in nature. It was conducted as teacher research grounded in close-to-practice inquiry. Data were collected through focus group interviews with secondary school students participating in a pedagogical innovation. The data were analysed using thematic analysis.

Results: The findings indicate that student agency manifests itself in multiple interrelated dimensions, including decision-making agency, reflective agency, responsibility-based agency, agency in pedagogical communication and agency in dealing with errors. Students perceived their participation as meaningful involvement in organising and co-constructing the learning process.

Conclusions: The results confirm that student agency is a relational effect of teaching practice. The study highlights central role of teacher autonomy in creating conditions for student participation and suggests the need to reconceptualise foreign language teaching as the deliberate design of participatory learning environments.

Keywords: student agency, participatory culture of education, English as a Foreign Language, teacher autonomy, qualitative research

* Suggested citation: Sarbiewska, A. (2026). Participatory Culture of Education as a Space for Developing Student Agency: The Case of English as a Foreign Language Teaching. *Lubelski Rocznik Pedagogiczny*, 45(3), 89–103. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17951/lrp.2026.45.3.89-103>

INTRODUCTION

Student agency is a key concept in contemporary pedagogy, understood as a relational and situational phenomenon emerging within specific pedagogical and institutional contexts (Biesta, 2010; Czerepaniak-Walczak, 2015). Student agency is constructed through everyday interactions between students, teachers, and teaching practices. School education extends beyond curriculum implementation to include spaces where students experience themselves as agents (Biesta, 2017).

Paradoxically, however, the emergence of teacher autonomy is the prerequisite for students to develop agency. In this article, teacher autonomy is understood as a professionally and legally grounded capacity to make pedagogical decisions concerning the organisation of teaching and learning, rather than as unrestricted freedom of action (Sarbiewska & Stępkowski, 2024, pp. 96–101). Potentially, therefore, through their autonomous actions, teachers are able to create a supportive institutional and cultural environment in the classroom, in which students can experience a real influence on their own learning (Czerepaniak-Walczak, 2006; Sarbiewska & Stępkowski, 2024, pp. 112–118).

Modern foreign language lessons provide particularly clear context for such analysis. They combine restrictive curriculum and examination requirements with the task of encouraging students to participate spontaneously in communicative activities. This article conceptualises student agency as an analytical category and presents findings from a study conducted within the context of pedagogical innovation in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) lessons.

RESEARCH PROBLEM AND AIM

EFL teaching provides a relevant context for analysing student agency, as it is simultaneously constrained by curriculum requirements and dependent on active student participation. This tension makes EFL lessons a key site for examining agency in school education. With regard to foreign language lessons, the way errors are handled also deserves particular attention. Learning a ‘foreign language’ inevitably involves making linguistic errors, which can be interpreted in radically different ways – as an obstacle or as a natural part of acquiring language competence. Treating errors as an educational resource rather than as grounds for negative assessment can help foster a reflective attitude in students towards their own learning and reduce their anxiety about communicating. In this context, dealing with errors becomes a space for students to experience their own agency (Kopaczynska, 2020; Ministry of National Education, 2018).

Importantly, in everyday school practice, students’ agency is not the result of a single teaching intervention but stems from a sequence of actions that can be described as a participatory culture of education (Sarbiewska, 2025, p. 26). It is

co-created by the teacher and students during educational interactions. This culture manifests itself, for example, in the ways in which lesson objectives are set, in openness to dialogue, in forms of joint decision-making regarding the pace and methods of classroom work, and in assessment principles.

The Principles of the Pedagogical Innovation

Pedagogical innovation in EFL lessons at a general secondary school was methodological and curricular in nature and was implemented in 2022–2023 as part of compulsory educational activities. In the Polish school context, such an innovation creates a formally recognised space for introducing teaching practices that go beyond standard classroom routines while remaining within compulsory schooling and the teacher's professional responsibility. Its overarching aim was to create teaching conditions in which students could genuinely influence the course of lessons and their own education, thereby developing personal agency in learning. The innovation was based on long-term teacher student cooperation within a participatory culture of education (Sarbiewska, 2025).

Participation involved joint decision-making on content, pace and task difficulty, while the teacher retained responsibility for learning outcomes. The students' involvement in decision-making did not mean that the teacher relinquished their role as organiser of the teaching process, but rather fitted into a model of teacher autonomy, within which the teacher creates the framework and conditions for students' activities, whilst retaining responsibility for achieving the learning objectives. The innovation included four elements: planning learning, self-assessment, treating errors as a resource, and ongoing teacher–student dialogue supporting adaptive teaching. As Olszowska (2025, p. 142) emphasises, students' self-assessment and reflection constitute a key element of contemporary approaches to assessment.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study took place in June 2024. It was theoretically grounded in the concept of pedagogical content knowledge, according to which teacher's knowledge is not a simple application of theory, but is constituted in action, in the relationship between educational content, students, and the teaching situation (Shulman, 1986). Research competence is an essential dimension of this knowledge. It is conceptualised as the ability to systematically reflect on one's actions, formulate questions arising from practice, and use empirical data to improve it (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009; Sarbiewska & Kacprowska, 2025). Adopting this perspective allows the dual role of the teacher-as-researcher to be viewed not as a source of distortion, but as an epistemic condition for accessing meanings constructed within a participatory culture of education.

The study focused on student agency in EFL learning within a participatory pedagogical innovation. Its aim was to reconstruct the areas and forms of agency that students experienced in EFL lessons and to examine how they interpreted their participation in relation to influence, responsibility, communication, and further independent language learning. In this article, students' interpretations of agency are understood as the meanings they attributed to their own participation in the learning process, their perceived influence on classroom work, their responsibility for learning decisions, their communication with the teacher and peers, and the transfer of these experiences to subsequent language learning. The main research question was: How do students experience agency in EFL lessons conducted within a participatory culture of education? It was elaborated through three questions:

1. What areas and forms of student agency can be identified in students' experiences of EFL lessons conducted within a participatory culture of education?
2. How do students interpret their participation in these lessons in relation to their sense of influence, responsibility and communication?
3. What significance do students attribute to these agency-related experiences for their further independent learning of English?

Eight second-year students from two cross-class language groups in a general secondary school participated in the study. Data were collected through two online focus group interviews (four students in each group). The online format was chosen for organisational reasons: the moderator was based in Warsaw, the school in Masuria, and the interviews took place at year-end. Students were purposively selected from the analysed cross-class EFL groups on the basis of their involvement in the pedagogical innovation and willingness to discuss experiences related to planning, self-assessment, communication, and dealing with errors in language learning. Data collection formed part of the school-based evaluation of a pedagogical innovation introduced within the teacher's autonomous pedagogical activity. The study was framed as teacher research embedded in close-to-practice inquiry and linked to the development of the teacher's pedagogical content knowledge (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009; Shulman, 1986). At the time of the innovation, the author was acting as a school teacher, author, and implementer of the innovation, conducting research into her own pedagogical practice rather than as an external researcher or principal investigator of a university-based academic project. Therefore, the study was not submitted to a university ethics committee. It followed basic ethical principles: voluntary participation, informed consent from students' parents/legal guardians and the school headteacher, and confidentiality of students' statements. To reduce the possible influence of the teacher-student relationship, the focus group interviews were moderated by an external researcher and attended by the school deputy headteacher as a non-participating observer.

During the interviews, projective techniques in the form of visual-reflective Mentimeter tasks were used to support reflection on personal experiences and the negotiation of meanings within the focus group, understood as the collective clarification and interpretation of students' experiences related to participation, responsibility, errors, communication, and influence on learning (Maison, 2010, pp. 116–123). The interview script covered three thematic areas: (1) planning and organising work in EFL lessons, (2) self-assessment of knowledge and language skills, (3) making mistakes and reflecting on them. All excerpts were translated from Polish into English by the author.

DATA ANALYSIS

Following the principles of qualitative pedagogical research (Kubinowski, 2010), the data were analysed inductively: data → codes → categories → interpretation (Braun & Clarke, 2006, 2021). Transcripts were repeatedly reviewed to identify meaningful units. Due to the article's length limitations, the Results section presents selected representative excerpts illustrating each analytical category; all quotations are given verbatim with respondent identifiers and focus group codes, while the coding procedure was based on the full corpus of students' statements.

This was followed by preliminary coding, in which the data fragments were assigned descriptive codes reflecting the reconstructed meanings (e.g., co-determining the pace of work, self-assessment of progress, working with errors, dialogue with the teacher). In this way, the following analytical categories were identified: decision-making agency, reflective agency, responsibility-based agency, agency in pedagogical communication, agency in dealing with errors, and critical awareness of school norms. For the purposes of this analysis, the identified categories were treated as analytical dimensions of relationally situated student agency rather than as separate psychological traits.

Decision-making agency refers to students' perceived influence on the organisation of learning, including the pace of work, deadlines, forms of classroom activity and task difficulty, within the boundaries of the teacher's professional responsibility. Reflective agency refers to students' capacity to monitor their own progress, recognise difficulties, and draw conclusions from learning experiences. Responsibility-based agency denotes students' recognition of the relationship between their own choices, preparation, and learning consequences; it does not imply self-blame, but reflective ownership of learning decisions. Agency in pedagogical communication refers to students' ability to initiate and co-shape classroom dialogue by asking questions, expressing difficulties, requesting clarification, and participating in discussions about learning. Agency in dealing with errors refers to students' capacity to treat errors as analysable learning resources and to use

correction, feedback, and self-verification for further action. Critical awareness of school norms refers to students’ ability to compare the participatory organisation of EFL lessons with other school practices and identify differences in assessment, communication and learning responsibilities.

The trustworthiness of the analysis was supported through the triangulation of data sources (focus group interviews, school documents, reflective notes), the maintenance of a transparent coding procedure, and the reflective positioning of the researcher as a professional teacher reflecting on her own teaching practice (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009). This procedure made it possible to link the empirical material with the reconstructed analytical categories and to maintain transparency in moving from interview data to findings. Table 1 below presents the analytical logic of the study by linking the thematic areas of the focus group interviews with sample questions, identified analytical categories, and summary findings.

Table 1
Linking focus group interview questions to analytical categories and findings

Thematic area of the interview	Sample focus group questions	Identified analytical categories	Summary of results
Planning and organisation of work in EFL lessons.	• How do you plan your work in EFL lessons? • How do you assess your influence on the timing and methods of your work? • What was communication with the teacher like regarding lesson planning?	Decision-making agency; agency in pedagogical communication; responsibility-based agency.	Students described the opportunity to have a say in the pace of work, deadlines, and forms of teaching activities.
Self-assessment of language knowledge and skills.	• How would you rate your level of English? • What experience do you have of self-assessing your progress? • What were the discussions about your progress with your teacher and other students like?	Reflective (metacognitive) agency; agency in pedagogical communication.	Students indicated that the opportunity for self-assessment allowed them to better understand their own difficulties and progress.
Making mistakes and reflecting on them.	• What situations from lessons in which you made a mistake do you remember? • What contributed to these mistakes? • What was the process of correcting mistakes and discussing them like?	Agency in dealing with errors; reflective agency; agency in pedagogical communication.	Mistakes were described as a natural part of the learning process.

Comparison of innovative experiences with other school lessons	• How would you compare these lessons with other school lessons? • What was different about the way you learned?	Critical awareness of school norms.	Students recognised the differences between the participatory organisation of lessons and more traditional school practices. Students linked their acquired experiences to a sense of being better prepared for independent language learning outside school, pointing to the development of planning, self-assessment, and experiential learning skills.
The significance of school experiences for future learning.	• Do you think these experiences will help you learn the language in the future?	Reflective agency; responsibility-based agency.	

Note. Author's own study.

RESULTS

Areas of Student Agency

The analysis identified how students experienced and interpreted their agency in EFL lessons:

Making Agency

Decision-making agency was evident in students' statements regarding co-decision-making on the organisation of the learning process, particularly in terms of planning work and the pace of covering the content: "When we do grammar, the teacher usually tells us how many lessons we'll spend on it, and how many lessons we'll do on our own. And when I asked to do one more lesson, that's exactly what happened" (U1, 2A6, 13:32–13:53). Decision-making was also linked to long-term planning of work during the term: "At the start of the term, we write down in our notebooks what we want to achieve, and then we send the teacher a photo" (U2, 2A6, 15:25–15:35). These statements indicate that students saw themselves as participants in a negotiated decision-making process within a regular cross-class EFL school group, concerning selected aspects of classroom work, rather than as executors of imposed instructions or as taking over the teacher's instructional responsibility.

Reflective Agency

Reflective agency involved reflecting on one's own learning and assessing progress over the long term. The students referred to comparing their current state of knowledge with previous experiences. One student stated: "At the very end of the year, we compare whether we have improved this knowledge" (U3, 2A6, 15:35–15:41). This reflection was often linked to analysing mistakes and drawing conclusions from them: "Now I know why I made that mistake and how I should proceed" (U4, 2A4, 42:33–42:40). These declarations show that the students related their actions to the learning process as a whole, rather than solely to individual assessments or tasks.

Responsibility-Based Agency

Responsibility-based agency was evident in statements related to bearing the consequences of one's own decisions. As one student put it: "Since I chose the deadline myself, it was my responsibility" (U5, 2A4, 40:10–40:15). Another student added: "If I hadn't prepared, I knew it was my own fault" (U20, 2A6, 34:40–34:50). Here, responsibility is understood as reflective ownership of learning decisions and their consequences, rather than as self-blame.

Agency in Pedagogical Communication

Agency in pedagogical communication was evident in statements regarding the ability to ask questions, raise difficulties, and engage in dialogue with the teacher and peers. The students emphasised their lack of fear of speaking up: "We can say that we don't understand something, and that's normal" (U7, 2A6, 33:00–33:05). Another student pointed to an atmosphere conducive to communication: "If someone doesn't know something, someone else will always help." (U21, 2A6, 31:10–31:20). These statements show that students could initiate or redirect dialogue about learning, while peer support and communicative safety functioned as relational conditions enabling such agency.

Agency in Dealing with Errors

An important area of agency was dealing with mistakes. The students described mistakes as a natural part of learning, which did not involve sanctions but rather the opportunity to improve and receive support. One of the students explained: "If I made a mistake, it was normal for me to go straight to someone so they could help me" (U9, 2A4, 42:10–42:25). Another student described the process of self-verification: "And we figure out for ourselves why we've made a mistake" (U10, 2A6, 32:08–32:15). Another person supported this view: "A mistake isn't the end; it just tells you what to correct" (U22, 2A4, 43:05–43:15). Errors were therefore interpreted not as failures, but as moments that enable self-verification, feedback-seeking, and further learning decisions.

Critical Awareness of School Norms

The final identified area concerned reflections on the rules in force at school. The students compared their experiences in EFL lessons with practices observed in other classes, highlighting differences in the way marks were awarded and errors were addressed. As the students noted: “In other lessons, we just know it’s wrong and that’s the end of it, but here we know why” (U11, 2A6, 33:00–33:18); “Here you can ask why something is the way it is, rather than just accepting it” (U23, 2A4, 37:40–37:50). These comparisons indicate students’ emerging awareness of how different classroom norms may support or restrict their sense of agency.

Ways of Interpreting Students’ Participation in EFL Lessons

The analysis of students’ statements suggests that participation in EFL lessons was interpreted as more active and meaningful than in traditional forms of teaching: “In these lessons, it’s not just the teacher talking and us listening; everyone says something of their own” (U12, 2A6, 31:40–31:52); “I feel I’m more involved in the lesson, rather than just sitting there doing exercises” (U13, 2A4, 38:05–38:15). These statements suggest that students interpreted their participation as being part of the teaching process, rather than merely responding to the teacher’s instructions.

The Significance of Experiences of Agency for Further Learning

The students’ statements indicate that experiences of agency were linked to further, more independent English language learning: “When I study at home, I do it similarly as in class, because I know what works” (U16, 2A6, 34:05–34:15); “Now I have a better idea of what’s difficult for me and what isn’t” (U17, 2A4, 41:50–42:00). The students interpreted these experiences as a resource that could be used in future educational situations, including those outside the direct influence of the teacher.

The interpretation of students’ statements was related to school documents, which made it possible to capture the tension between declarative level of institutional regulations and actual experiences of agency revealed in everyday teaching practice. The students’ experiences revealing the possibility of co-decision-making stand in clear tension with the formal requirements of school documents, which emphasise student activity but do not specify the extent of their actual influence on the organisation of the teaching process.

Students’ Agency in Relation to the School’s Institutional Framework

Students’ agency was also interpreted in relation to the school’s institutional framework, including the school statute, subject-specific assessment guidelines, and the EFL curriculum. These documents declared student activity, responsibility for learning, cooperation, and formative assessment, but did not specify mechanisms enabling students to influence the organisation of learning. In the analysed case, agency was therefore not generated by formal regulations themselves, but by

the teacher's pedagogical decisions and the coherence between declared values and everyday teaching practice.

Students described decision-making, dialogue, reflection, and work with errors as meaningful experiences, although these were not explicitly guaranteed by school documents. This confirms the relational and situational character of agency: it emerged through interaction with the teacher and peers, and depended on the organisation of the teaching process.

From the perspective of teacher research, the findings align with a form of analysis showing that a participatory culture of education is not a simple consequence of existing documents, but the result of a teacher's reflective action in a specific school context. The study builds upon findings indicating a close interdependence between teacher autonomy and student agency, understood as the possibility of genuine, active participation in the educational process. This interdependence is widely described in pedagogy as a prerequisite for changing teaching practices and creating a participatory culture of education (Kwiatkowska, 2008; Priestley et al., 2015; Sarbiewska 2023; Sarbiewska, & Stępkowski, 2024).

DISCUSSION

The findings suggest that agency is not an individual trait but a relational effect of teaching practices. The categories identified in the analysis should therefore be understood as interrelated analytical dimensions of agency emerging within a specific pedagogical arrangement, rather than as separate or stable attributes of students. Agency is not understood as an individual disposition or as an outcome of formal curriculum obligations. Instead, it is conceptualised as an experience embedded in specific configurations of relationships, norms, and teaching decisions within the classroom.

The areas of agency identified in the study – including decision-making agency, reflective agency, responsibility-based agency, agency in pedagogical communication, and agency in dealing with errors – are consistent with the body of research emphasising the importance of student participation and their real influence on the course of the educational process. These findings align with previous research (Cook-Sather, 2006; Fielding, 2011; Priestley et al., 2015). This agency is multi-dimensional and its various aspects intertwine and reinforce one another in the course of everyday educational experiences.

However, it should be noted that a participatory culture of education does not automatically lead to mature forms of agency. In the case studied, students' agency was sometimes manifested in strategies aimed at minimising effort, such as choosing tasks below students' own capabilities or attempting to avoid established assessment rules. Such actions can be interpreted as a manifestation of an instru-

mental interpretation of education, entrenched in the transmission model, where the goal is to obtain a high grade rather than develop competences.

From a pedagogical perspective, these situations do not negate agency, but rather reveal its ambivalent nature. Agency signifies the capacity to act and make decisions, yet it does not guarantee that these decisions will foster development. In such moments, a special role falls to the teacher, whose task is to facilitate dialogue, adjust the strategies adopted, and consistently enforce the principles of honesty and responsibility. This means that participation requires constant relational work and does not exempt one from the need to set boundaries.

This process does not always end in complete success. Some students may use the space for agency in a way that replicates previous patterns of behaviour at school. However, even then, experiencing the consequences of one's own decisions is part of learning responsibility. Participation does not eliminate tensions, but makes them visible and subjects them to pedagogical work.

The ambivalent nature of agency was also evident in individual student trajectories. The researcher's notes recorded the case of a student who joined the group in Year 2 at risk of failing. Initially, she used the decision-making space mainly in an instrumental way, attempting to minimise her effort. Through individual conversations and the consistent establishment of rules of fairness, she gradually changed her approach, began to openly communicate her difficulties and made attempts at independent work. Ultimately, she completed her course of study with a pass mark. This case does not constitute proof of the model's effectiveness, but illustrates the process-oriented nature of shaping responsibility and the importance of relational support in developing agency.

The tension between the institutional framework of the school's operation and students' actual experiences of agency became a key theme revealed in the analysis. Although school documents declare an active role for the student and assessment that supports development, it was only specific teaching practices that enabled students to experience agency as a real influence on the learning process. The research findings indicate that, in the analysed case, the teacher's autonomy and her ability to reflectively interpret and implement institutional provisions in educational practice became a key factor determining student agency. This relationship has previously been described in research on participatory educational culture and teachers' professional autonomy (Kwiatkowska, 2008; Sarbiewska, & Stępkowski, 2024).

The findings broaden the conceptualization of agency in language education. They demonstrate that the development of agency is not simply a consequence of adopting particular curricula or instructional methods but rather results from coherence between declared educational values and their implementation in everyday teaching practice. Student agency therefore emerges as a dynamic process shaped by teaching relationships and classroom culture, rather than as a characteristic that can be established through procedural implementation alone.

CONCLUSIONS

Foreign language lessons are a particularly sensitive context for shaping students' (in)efficacy, as it is based on the public use of language, communicative risk, and constant exposure to error. In situations where error and linguistic uncertainty are treated solely as obstacles to achieving teaching objectives, students readily adopt a reactive and avoidant attitude. In contrast, a participatory culture of education, based on dialogue and the co-construction of meaning, encourages the perception of communication in a foreign language as a process rather than a test of correctness, which significantly strengthens students' agency.

Student agency supports future learning by fostering self-regulation, responsibility, and a sense of personal influence. In this context, student agency is not viewed as an end in itself. Rather, it serves an educational function by promoting attitudes of responsible participation in the foreign language learning process. The findings suggest that teacher education should shift its focus from selecting instructional methods to designing participatory learning conditions. Rather than asking, "Which method should be used?", teacher education should emphasize the question, "What teaching conditions enable students to take linguistic risks, co-construct meanings, and reflect on their own learning?" Approached in this way, teaching methodology contributes to the development of teachers' subject-specific pedagogical knowledge and strengthens their ability to design educational practice critically and reflectively. The findings are context-bound and should be interpreted in relation to the specific pedagogical, institutional, and relational conditions of the analysed case. Nevertheless, they suggest that students' agency can be supported in everyday teaching practices when the lesson is organised as a space for co-participation, dialogue, and responsible decision-making. In this sense, an EFL lesson may become a space for building student agency within a relational and participatory understanding of education (Biesta, 2010; Priestley et al., 2015; Sarbiewska, 2025). The patterns of teaching practice identified in the study do not constitute a universal model, but rather an illustration of how to organise a culture of education in which student agency emerges as a relational effect of cooperation, responsibility, and the conscious interpretation of institutional frameworks.

LIMITATIONS

The study has several limitations. First, it was conducted in a specific educational context and involved a small purposive sample of students participating in one pedagogical innovation. The findings are therefore context-bound and should not be read as general claims about all EFL classrooms, but as an interpretative reconstruction of agency emerging within the analysed case. Second, the study captures mainly the final stage of the innovation, which limits insight into the full

developmental trajectory of students' agency. Third, the author's role as a teacher researching her own practice may have influenced the interpretation of the data. This limitation was addressed through external moderation of the focus group interviews, triangulation of data sources, a transparent coding procedure, and reflective positioning of the researcher.

REFERENCES

- Biesta, G. (2010). *Good education in an age of measurement: Ethics, politics, democracy*. Routledge.
- Biesta, G. (2017). *The rediscovery of teaching*. Routledge.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. SAGE.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (2009). *Inquiry as stance: Practitioner research for the next generation*. Teachers College Press.
- Cook-Sather, A. (2006). Sound, presence, and power: "Student voice" in educational research and reform. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 36(4), 359–390. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2006.00363.x>
- Czerepaniak-Walczak, M. (2006). *Pedagogika emancypacyjna*. Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne.
- Czerepaniak-Walczak, M. (2015). *Emancypacja i edukacja*. Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne.
- Fielding, M. (2011). Student voice and the possibility of radical democratic education. In G. Czerniawski, & W. Kidd (Eds.), *The student voice handbook* (pp. 3–17). Emerald.
- Kopaczyńska, I. (2020). *Pedagogiczna kategoria błędu. Teoretyczne konteksty – praktyczne inspiracje dla edukacji wczesnoszkolnej*. Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls.
- Kubinowski, D. (2010). *Jakościowe badania pedagogiczne. Filozofia – metodyka – ewaluacja*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Kwiatkowska, H. (2008). *Nauczyciel jako podmiot zmiany edukacyjnej*. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Maison, D. (2010). Techniki projekcyjne i techniki wspomagające – sposób na lepsze zrozumienie badanego problemu? In D. Maison, & A. Noga-Bogomilski (Eds.), *Jakościowe metody badań społecznych. Podejście aplikacyjne* (pp. 116–123). Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Ministry of National Education. (2018). Rozporządzenie Ministra Edukacji Narodowej z dnia 30 stycznia 2018 r. w sprawie podstawy programowej kształcenia ogólnego dla liceum ogólnokształcącego, technikum oraz branżowej szkoły II stopnia (Dz.U. 2018 poz. 467). <https://isap.sejm.gov.pl/isap.nsf/DocDetails.xsp?id=W-DU20180000467>

- Olszowska, G. (2025). *O!Cena w szkole. Nieodrobione lekcje. Od przepisów do sztuki oceniania*. Fundacja Czerwona Kreska.
- Priestley, M., Biesta, G., & Robinson, S. (2015). *Teacher agency: An ecological approach*. Bloomsbury.
- Sarbiewska, A. (2023). Partycypowanie uczniów w (samo)kształceniu na lekcjach języka angielskiego. Raport z badania nauczycielskiego. *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska. Sectio J, Paedagogia-Psychologia*, 36(2), 211–232. <https://doi.org/10.17951/j.2023.36.2.211-232>
- Sarbiewska, A. (2025). *Uczeń i nauczyciel w duecie. Partycypacyjna kultura kształcenia w praktyce szkolnej*. Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.
- Sarbiewska, A., & Kacprowska, A. (2025). Nauczycielska kompetencja badawcza wobec metodycznej popkultury na przykładzie nauczyciela języka angielskiego w edukacji wczesnoszkolnej (studium przypadku). *Problemy Wczesnej Edukacji*, 60(1), 130–143. <https://doi.org/10.26881/pwe.2025.60.10>
- Sarbiewska, A., & Stępkowski, D. (2024). Autonomia nauczyciela w dyskursie pedagogicznym i prawnym. *Kultura i Edukacja*, 1, 96–121. <https://doi.org/10.15804/kie.2024.01.06>
- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4–14.

PARTYCYPACYJNA KULTURA KSZTAŁCENIA JAKO PRZESTRZEŃ ROZWIJANIA SPRAWCZOŚCI UCZNIA NA PRZYKŁADZIE NAUCZANIA JĘZYKA ANGIELSKIEGO

Wprowadzenie: Sprawczość ucznia stanowi jedną z kluczowych kategorii współczesnej pedagogiki, jednak jej znaczenie oraz sposoby operacjonalizacji pozostają niejednoznaczne. W literaturze przedmiotu podkreśla się jej relacyjny i sytuacyjny charakter, ujawniający się w codziennych praktykach edukacyjnych. W edukacji językowej szczególnie widoczne jest napięcie między wymogami systemowymi a potrzebą aktywnego udziału ucznia w procesie uczenia się.

Cel badań: Celem badania było zrekonstruowanie obszarów i sposobów ujawniania się uczniowskiej sprawczości na lekcjach języka angielskiego jako języka obcego realizowanych w warunkach partycypacyjnej kultury kształcenia oraz rozpoznanie, jak uczniowie interpretują swój udział w tych lekcjach w odniesieniu do poczucia wpływu, odpowiedzialności, komunikacji i dalszego samodzielnego uczenia się języka.

Metoda badań: Badanie miało charakter jakościowy i interpretacyjny. Badanie zostało przeprowadzone w paradygmacie badań nauczycielskich (teacher-as-researcher approach), osadzonych w logice badań bliskich praktyce (close-to-practice). Dane zebrano za pomocą wywiadów fokusowych przeprowadzonych z ośmiorgiem uczniów szkoły ponadpodstawowej uczestniczących w innowacji pedagogicznej. Analiza danych miała charakter tematyczny.

Wyniki: Wyniki wskazują na wielowymiarowy charakter sprawczości uczniów, obejmujący sprawczość decyzyjną, refleksyjną, odpowiedzialnościową, sprawczość ujawniającą się w komunikacji pedagogicznej oraz sprawczość związaną z pracą nad błędami. Uczniowie postrzegali ją jako realny udział w organizowaniu procesu uczenia się oraz współtworzenie przebiegu działań dydaktycznych.

Wnioski: Sprawczość ucznia ma charakter relacyjny i sytuacyjny oraz stanowi efekt organizacji praktyki dydaktycznej, a nie zapisów formalnych. Kluczową rolę odgrywa autonomia nauczyciela oraz tworzenie kultury edukacyjnej sprzyjającej współuczestnictwu, refleksyjności i odpowiedzialności uczniów.

Słowa kluczowe: sprawczość ucznia, partycypacyjna kultura kształcenia, język angielski jako język obcy, autonomia nauczyciela, badania jakościowe

