

УДК 37.06

TEACHER-STUDENT INTERACTION IN HIGHER EDUCATION: PREREQUISITES THAT MATTER

O. Kuznetsova, L. Shtefan

ВЗАЄМОДІЯ ВИКЛАДАЧА І СТУДЕНТІВ У ВИЩІЙ ОСВІТІ: ВАЖЛИВІ УМОВИ

О. Кузнецова, Л. Штефан

Teacher-student interaction is an inseparable component of the teaching process in higher education. The article examines the prerequisites that ensure and contribute to effective teacher-student relations on the basis of the study of the data of the recent studies. Analysing the phenomenon of teacher-student interaction, scholars emphasize the changes it causes in participants of the teaching and learning process and insist on the effect effective teacher-student interaction has on students' achievements in learning and personal growth, contributing to their cognitive development, self-realization and academic success. The study confirms the multifaceted nature of pedagogical teacher-student interaction and proves that teachers have to be proficient in conditions, principles, types of pedagogical interaction organization, teaching methods and in coping with obstacles that complicate it. The study emphasizes the mandatory nature of specific skills lecturers/teachers are expected to possess to arrange productive teacher-student interaction (interaction management skills, communication skills, skills of student-oriented teaching, skills of encouraging educational setting creation). The relevance of dialogic approach providing for mutual cooperation of the teaching and learning process participants is supported as it allows to ensure subject-subject relations and provides students with opportunity to be active agents of their learning. The pedagogical setting and positive educational atmosphere are determined as aspects contributing to strengthening teacher-student interaction. Mutual respect, cooperation and collaboration, mutual support, mutual assistance, recognition of contribution of every participant of the educational communication process, socio-emotional learning strategies are ascertained as the aspects that are of crucial importance in teacher-student interaction in institutions of higher education.

Key words: higher education, teacher-student interaction, subject-subject relations in the teaching process, requirements for effective teacher-student interaction, teacher's skills, dialogic approach, favourable pedagogical setting.

Взаємодія викладач-студент є невід'ємною складовою процесу навчання. У статті на основі вивчення даних нещодавніх досліджень досліджено умови, які забезпечують та сприяють ефективній взаємодії між викладачами і студентами. Аналізуючи феномен взаємодії викладачів та студентів, науковці наголошують на тому, що ефективна взаємодія викладача і студентів впливає на досягнення студентів у навчанні та їх особистісний розвиток, сприяючи їх інтелектуальному розвитку, самореалізації та успішності у навчанні. Вивчення підтверджує багатоаспектність процесу педагогічної взаємодії викладача і студентів та доводить, що викладачі повинні володіти знаннями про умови, принципи, види організації педагогічної

взаємодії, методи навчання та подолання перешкод, що її ускладнюють. Наголошено на обов'язковості володіння викладачами уміннями організовувати продуктивну взаємодію із студентами (уміння управління взаємодією, комунікативні уміння, уміння орієнтувати навчальний процес на студентів, уміння створення сприятливого навчального середовища). Підтверджено актуальність застосування діалогічного підходу, що передбачає взаємну співпрацю учасників навчального процесу, оскільки його використання дозволяє забезпечити суб'єкт-суб'єктні відносини та дає можливість студентам бути активними суб'єктами власного навчання. Сприятливе навчальне середовище визначене як фактор, що сприяє зміцненню педагогічної взаємодії викладача і студентів. Взаємоповага, співпраця, взаємопідтримка, взаємодопомога, визнання внеску кожного учасника процесу освітнього спілкування, впровадження соціально-емоційних стратегій навчання визначено як фактори, які мають принципово важливе значення у взаємодії викладачів і студентів у вищих навчальних закладах.

Ключові слова: вища освіта, взаємодія викладачів і студентів, суб'єкт-суб'єктні відносини у навчальному процесі, вимоги до ефективної педагогічної взаємодії, уміння викладача, діалогічний підхід, сприятливе освітнє середовище

Introduction. The study of current research proves that scholars consider teacher-student interaction as the process that influences greatly the academic achievements of students and the quality of higher education process in general. Teacher-student interaction represents one of the key issues of any socio-pedagogical process, as it allows for and ensures a direct "transfer" of knowledge, information, attitudes, values and development of competences. Teacher-student interaction is the prerequisite of classroom environment that affects the learning and growth of students positively. It aids students' cognitive ability development and emotional growth, having a strong positive impact on a student's self-esteem, enthusiasm and academic success. The basic essence of the teaching process presupposes that this process is dual and directed at the achievement of educational objectives. This leads to the relevance of the study of different issues connected with ensuring effective teacher-student interaction (organization of the teaching process, teacher proficiency and readiness to realize successful types of pedagogical interaction with students, its principles, conditions, methods, barriers etc.).

Analysis of recent studies. Scholars argue that universities are for developing "critical being" (Barnet, 1997), for teaching students to reflect critically on knowledge and developing their powers of critical self-reflection and critical action (Brockbank and McGill, 1999). They also believe that higher education institutions should facilitate development of students' autonomy and self-direction. Young (2007) claims that in higher education, students are expected to develop as self-directed researchers, able to independently carry out research and critically evaluate a range of material as well as organize themselves, directing and managing their own learning. External endorsement and feedback from lecturers/tutors play a significant role in students' success by nurturing their sense of themselves, building their confidence and reducing performance anxieties (Searle et al, 2005; Abbott-Chapman, 2006). An individual's self-efficacy can be enhanced by external encouragement and the provision of structured and supported opportunities to face challenges and achieve success

(Bandura, 1994). This is a role that lecturers and teachers can provide. Krause (2001) claims that students want more interactions with tutors/lecturers, especially at the early stages of their higher education experience (Krause, 2001). The lack of contact with lecturers is reported to be a “distressing” aspect for some students (Pearce et al, 2000). Studies into students’ reasons for discontinuation of their degrees have found that lack of social support can play a role (Wilcox et al, 2005).

Searching to work out effective principles, methods and techniques for organization of pedagogically effective teacher-student interaction, scholars analyse different aspects essential for the solution of the given pedagogical phenomenon. They analyse pedagogical interaction investigating pedagogical communication, types of the teaching and learning process organization, essential features of the teaching and learning process, sets of pedagogical situations, mutual activities of the subjects of the teaching and learning process, personality qualities that affect communication (Kuznetsova, 2014), etc. Studies confirm that effective teacher-student interaction has direct impact on students’ learning achievements (Sun et al., 2022; Pennings et al, 2018; Elmi, 2020).

The aim of the study is to examine the prerequisites determining productive nature of teacher-student interaction in higher education on the basis of analysis of current research data.

Research methods. During the research the methods of analysis, synthesis and generalization were used for determining the productive elements of pedagogical interaction in higher education.

Research Findings. O. Gonchar (2011) defines interaction as a complicated multifaceted process leading to the changes in the participants (its subjects) caused by their reciprocal influence. K. Bagrii (2016) views pedagogical interaction within the “teacher-student” system as the system of mutual influences of subjects taking part in the joint activity on the basis of general goals of professional education. V. Matviienko (2009) and N. Kypychenko (2014) regard pedagogical interaction as the relationship of subjects of the teaching process determined by the educational situation and the impact of socio-mental processes leading to quantitative and / or qualitative changes in the qualities and states of these subjects and determines mutual exchange of personal experience and meanings, not only information, mandatory understanding of the educational interaction purpose and creation of the situation of success as its essential indicators. All the given definitions point out that pedagogical interaction is determined by specific educational objectives, presupposes mutual activities and influences and leads to changes in both parties participating in the teaching and learning process.

The requirements to “teacher-student” relations in higher education institutions singled out in scholarly studies include:

- interaction of factors of cooperation and organization of the teaching and learning process;
- creating positive educational setting;
- forming the spirit of collegiality and professional community of teachers and students;

- orientation of the system of pedagogical communication on an adult personality with developed self-awareness;
- rejection of authoritarian teaching style;
- use of professional interest and needs of students as a factor in the management of the teaching and learning process.

Considering the given requirements, it is possible to create proper communicative conditions between lecturer/teacher and students with the help of special skills that allow to relieve tension and create a situation of openness and sincerity, which will contribute to high effectiveness of the educational process. Such skills presuppose teacher's ability to manage the process of interaction and phases of contact (abilities to show sincere kindness; use the principles of positive feedback to increase the self-esteem of interaction participants and actualization of their personal resources allowing for open demonstration of their feelings and attitudes; transfer information highlighting its relevance for students' professional and personal needs; manage positive nature of communication being eager to listen to students' ideas, arguments and reasoning, agreeing with them and expressing appreciation; involve students who are less inclined to share their ideas and communicate in class trying to focus on the specific spheres they are interested in; organize educational objective achievement using indirect methods of influence rather than direct ones; maintain the participation of all students); ability to organize open and communicative interaction creating the atmosphere of respect, trust, tolerance and absence of tension; ability to organize student-oriented communication predicting and avoiding "danger zones" and situations that may cause aggression and annoyance; ability to control the mood, use personal qualities providing for the creation of positive and stimulating teaching and learning atmosphere.

Effective pedagogical interaction implies joint communication aimed at the discussion and solution of problems by its all subjects. Teacher-student activities in this process are directed at the object of communication. If the dialogue approach is followed as the basis of communication and reciprocal influence accordingly, the common solution of educational tasks becomes possible in the process of communication directed at carrying out some mutual activity (Borova, 2011).

Pedagogical dialogue is the method providing each participant with the opportunity to express themselves by means of communication. In the process of dialogue, understanding is achieved at the level of establishing a common content apprehension and interpretation. Dialogue is the interaction of two subjects, creatively forming a common mutually relevant attitude to a particular object of reality. Such interaction presupposes mutual cooperation of the participants, each of them being active communication agents. Cooperation and joint creativity in the process of dialogic communication mean rejection of subject-object relations in the teaching process and give way to firm subject-subject relations involving abandoning the situations of lecturer/teacher dominance and presupposes the approval of another type of relationship: of mutual search and analysis of the results of teaching and learning activities. T. Borova (2011) asserts that the process of joint problem solving is mutually beneficial as motivation grows in every communication participant. This

way, an internal impetus to the activity, contributing to its relevance realization and more productive execution, arises.

University faculty members face the need to select the most productive teaching methods for ensuring effective pedagogical interaction. Nowadays the most valuable in this domain are considered to be the methods of active learning and communicative methods.

Methods of active learning are focused on active teacher-student interaction and intensification of learning and cognitive processes. They presuppose apprehension and analysis of the teaching information through dialogue, problem solving, project activities, analysis of specific situations, thematic discussions. Interactive learning also refers to technologies and methods of active learning and facilitates mutual understanding and self-actualization, allows for changing roles and realizing the position and attitude of your partner and apprehension of how he/ she sees the problem under discussion and thus interpreting the pedagogical situation and constructing one's own activities. Interactive communication presupposes thoroughly planned activities on the part of the teacher. The existing data prove that it is most successfully carried out during practical classes in dialogue, polylogue or round table form.

Communicative methods are based on university lecturers'/teachers' skills to organize and maintain goal-oriented conversations, discussions, problem-based learning provoking students to suggest different solutions. Dialogue-based teaching and learning stimulates recognition of the uniqueness of each partner, their mutual equality in relation to each other, the differences and originality of their views, the focus of each on understanding and active interpretation of their point of view by the partner, waiting for a reaction, mutual enrichment of dialogue partners, their emotional and personal enthusiasm, trust, sincerity of expression of one's feelings and state.

Researchers determine as essential characteristics of "subject-subject" teacher-student pedagogical interaction: equality in the teaching and learning process; students' awareness of being the main agents of the educational process; teaching and learning process orientation at students' needs, interests, value orientations, experience and level of communicative competence; psychological and pedagogical support of students (Kypychenko, 2014).

Scholarly studies present investigations into different models of teacher-student pedagogical interaction. They all reflect strong desire to work out the most effective patterns for planning, organization and maintaining successful pedagogical interaction in higher education institutions.

K. Bagrii (2004) claims that the styles of management followed by teachers at higher education institutions (autocratic; authoritarian; democratic; ignoring; conformal; inconsistent) have a great impact on communicative interaction in the teaching and learning process and give rise to several models of lecturer's/teacher's behavior in communication with students in the classroom.

They are distinguished as: – the dictatorial model (presupposes no personal interaction, focuses on knowledge transfer, is characterized by absence of

psychological and emotional contact with students and passivity of students); – the non-contact model (weak feedback between the teacher and the students because of the lack of willingness to cooperate on both sides, orientation at information transfer rather than dialogical nature of the lesson, indulgent attitude towards students, low level of teacher-student interaction, students' indifference towards teacher); – the model of differentiated attention (the teacher is not focused on the entire audience, but only on some students, for example, on those who are talented or those whose academic achievements are poor; teacher's inability to address all students in a group, teacher-student interaction is fragmentary); – the hyporeflexive (monological speech of teacher prevails, the teacher is emotionally deaf to the needs and ideas of students, factual absence of teacher-student interaction, absence of psychological and emotional nature of communication); – the hyperreflexive model is the opposite of the hyporeflexive model (the lecturer/teacher is concerned not so much with the content of interaction, but with how he is perceived by others, he/she constantly doubts the effectiveness of his/her arguments and actions, reacts strongly to the nuances of the psychological atmosphere in class and is likely to lose control of academic interaction); – the inflexible response model (the teacher's relationship with students is strictly based on the teaching programme, which clearly states the goals and objectives of the lesson, and didactically justified methods, there is impeccable logic of presentation and argumentation of facts, polished facial expressions and gestures, but the teacher does not realise the changing nature of communication situations and the influence of socio-psychological factors, the quality of pedagogical interaction is poor); – the authoritarian model (the teacher is the main actor providing information, arguments, judgements and asking questions, there is no place for creative interaction, students' initiative is suppressed by the teacher, the motivational sphere of cognitive activity is distorted and the creative nature of learning is lost); – the model of active interaction (the teacher maintains constant dialogue with students, cares about their positive mood, encourages students' initiative, grasps changes in the psychological climate of the group and responds flexibly to them, educational, organizational and ethical problems are creatively solved by joint efforts) (Podoliak, Yurchenko, 2006). It is quite evident that the model mentioned the last (*model of active interaction*) is the most productive and considered to be the most favourable for successful achievement of the objectives of the teaching process and organization of pedagogical interaction.

Considering the requirements providing for effective teacher-student interaction, T. Ravchyna (2005) analyses the role of the educational setting as a means of indirect pedagogical influence on students in higher education. On the basis of analysis of philosophical theories the scholar points out the aspects essential to be considered in teaching and learning process organization in higher education: the student as a subject of educational and cognitive activities independently acquires knowledge on the basis of personal experience and understanding; educational information is perceived and interpreted by each student individually and it depends on their acquired knowledge and experience; mastering ways of thinking instead of accepting ready-made knowledge and opinions contributes to the development of personal knowledge, views

and concepts; learning activities become a process of acquiring social and professional knowledge, skills and abilities, if students analyse and solve real problems relevant to their lives, social interaction, self-cognition; teaching and learning process, organized as interpersonal interaction of students and teachers on the basis of respect and trust, affects the individual's inclination to search for their own understanding of social phenomena and development of impartial and tolerant attitude to other people; an important task of the teacher in the teaching process is to create situations and contexts in which students gain experience of cognitive and social activity, and of interpersonal interaction.

Bearing in mind the above-mentioned ideas, the task of the teacher is to put efforts to organize the educational setting stimulating students' self-realization as well as self-regulatory and motivated actions. The teacher is the key figure who provides conditions for subject-subject pedagogical interaction and interpersonal interaction of students, harmonizes this environment with their needs, professional interests, supports its development, involving students in its improvement or modification.

It is important to realise that the mechanisms of effective pedagogical interaction and educational environment are mutual understanding, adjustment, coordination. On the one hand, these mechanisms are essential for the organization of effective teacher-student interaction due to the specific nature of educational setting and, on the other hand, they influence the creation of favourable educational environment.

T. Ravchyna (1999) points to the principles of educational setting design that stimulate students to develop personal knowledge, professional concepts, acquire social experience and vocational experience and foster their internal motivation to acquiring higher education and asserts that they cover: involvement of everyone in the learning process, absence of barriers, openness, helpful sensitivity to others, respect for the individual, positive orientation of the process, organization of the teaching process functioning as the process of experience self-acquisition.

It can be asserted that the educational setting in higher education is determined by the sphere of interpersonal interaction and social relations, the system of means of communication and information that play an educational role, the system of organized pedagogical influences and processes.

The study proves that effective teacher-student interaction cannot be maintained if the lecturer/teacher does not realise the reasons of likely conflicts and barriers. The most typical causes of teacher-student interaction conflicts are determined by: differences in value orientations; intolerance and tactlessness in communication; differences in mutual expectations; the level of professionalism of the teacher and success (achievements) of students. R. Bagrii (2016) claims that students point to injustice, prejudice at exams, subjectivity of assessment of their academic achievements, arrogance, contempt for students, incompetence, negligence and inefficient teacher organization as the reasons for conflicts with lecturers/teachers.

The study of scientific publications makes us believe that the focus on social and emotional learning approach can add to the improvement of teacher-student interaction as it concerns the development of emotional intelligence skills, including self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible

decision-making (Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning). It has been confirmed that an effective social and emotional learning approach is designed to improve the quality of classroom interactions, academic development, motivation to learn, and teacher-student engagement through empirical practices, classroom activities that infuse social-emotional competencies into teacher-student interactions (Reicher, 2010) and is integral to quality teaching and learning (Srinivasan, 2019). Research in higher education populations demonstrates that social and emotional adjustment is associated with positive academic outcomes, including academic performance and retention. The recent research data have demonstrated that social and emotional competences are critical to higher education students' development, adjustment, and success (Conley, 2015; Elmi, 2020).

Conclusion. The problem of student-teacher interaction is the one that has been thoroughly analysed because of its social and pedagogical significance and direct relevance to students' academic achievements in higher education:

- the factors that influence its solution cover the lecturer's/ teacher's professional skills and personal qualities, their proficiency in teaching process design and organization, awareness of learning process mechanisms;
- the pedagogical setting and positive atmosphere contribute to strengthening teacher-student interaction in higher education and affect students' learning effects;
- teacher–student interaction based on subject-subject relationship promotes students' learning engagement;
- crucial in teacher-student interaction are mutual respect, cooperation and collaboration, mutual support, mutual assistance, recognition of contribution of every participant of the educational communication process;
- the teaching and learning process has to be organized as the process of various types of active educational and cognitive activities oriented at knowledge acquisition and gaining experience;
- socio-emotional learning strategies are worth being incorporated in the teaching process with the aim of effective teacher-student interaction promotion in higher education institutions.

СПИСОК ЛІТЕРАТУРИ

- Багрій, К. Л. (2016). Викладач і студенти: взаємодія у процесі навчання. *Вісник Чернівецького торговельно-економічного інституту. Економічні науки*, 2, 174–182. http://chtei-knteu.cv.ua/herald/content/download/archive/2016/v2/NV-2016-v2_19.pdf
- Борова, Т. А. (2011). *Теоретичні основи адаптивного управління професійним розвитком науково-педагогічних працівників вищого навчального закладу*. Харків: Компанія СМІТ.
- Гончар, О. В. (2011). *Педагогічна взаємодія учасників навчального процесу в системі вищої освіти України (історико-педагогічний аспект)*. Харків: ХНАДУ.
- Кипиченко, Н. С. (2014). Педагогічна взаємодія викладачів і майбутніх учителів початкової школи під час практики. *Актуальні проблеми соціології, психології, педагогіки*, 3(24), 153–158. <https://elibrary.kubg.edu.ua/id/eprint/4545>
- Кузнецова, О. Ю. (2014). Усвідомлення особливостей мовної особистості для налагодження ефективної взаємодії. У *Каразинські читання: Людина. Мова. Комунікація: тези доповідей XIII наукової конференції з міжнародною участю (07 лютого 2014 року)*. Ч. 1. (с. 186–187). Харків: ХНУ імені В. Н. Каразіна.
- Матвієнко, О. В. (2009). Підготовка майбутніх учителів до педагогічної взаємодії. Київ: НПУ ім. М. П. Драгоманова.
- Подоляк, Л. Г., & Юрченко, В. І. (2006). Психологія вищої школи: навчальний посібник для магістрантів і аспірантів. Київ: Філ-студія. [https://www.psyh.kiev.ua/Подоляк_Л.Г.,_Юрченко_В.І._Психологія_вищої_школи_\(навчальний_посібник\)](https://www.psyh.kiev.ua/Подоляк_Л.Г.,_Юрченко_В.І._Психологія_вищої_школи_(навчальний_посібник))
- Равчина, Т. (2005). Організація взаємодії студентів з освітнім середовищем у вищій школі. *Вісник Львівського університету. Серія педагогічна*, 19(2), 3–16. https://pedagogy.lnu.edu.ua/departments/pedagogika/periodic/visnyk/19_2/01_ravchyna.pdf
- Равчина, Т. (1999). Роль педагога як посередника у навчанні й вихованні молоді. *Вісник Львівського університету. Серія педагогічна*, 14, 167–175.
- Abbott-Chapman, J. (2006). Moving from technical and further education to university: an Australian study of mature students. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 58(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13636820500507666>
- Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachaudran (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of human behavior*, (Vol. 4, p. 71–81). New York: Academic Press.
- Barnett, R. (1997). *Higher education: a critical business*. Open University Press.
- Brockbank, A., & McGill, I. (1999). *Facilitating reflective learning in higher education*. Open University Press. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED423743.pdf>
- CASEL. (dateless). Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. *What is SEL?* <https://casel.org/what-is-sel/>
- Conley, C. S. (2015). SEL in higher education. In J. A. Durlak, C. E. Domitrovich, R. P. Weissberg, & T. P. Gullotta (Eds.), *Handbook of social and emotional learning: Research and practice* (pp. 197–212). The Guilford Press. https://www.academia.edu/79317701/SEL_in_Higher_Education
- Elmi, C. (2020). Integrating Social Emotional Learning Strategies in Higher Education. *European Journal of Investigation in Health, Psychology and Education*, 10(3), 848–858. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ejihpe10030061>
- Krause, K. (2001). The University Essay Writing Experience: A pathway for academic integration during transition. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 20(2), 147–168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360123586>
- Pearce, A., Murphy, H. & Conroy, P. (2001). Smoother pathways from TAFE to higher education. In L. Richardson and J. Lidstone (Eds), *Flexible Learning for a Flexible Society*, 536–544. Proceedings of ASET-HERDSA 2000 Conference, Toowoomba, Qld, 2–5 July 2000. ASET and HERDSA. <http://www.aset.org.au/confs/aset-herdsa2000/procs/pearce2.html>

- Pennings, H. J. M., Brekelmans, M., Sadler, P., Claessens, L. C. A., van der Want, A. C., & van Tartwijk, J. (2018). Interpersonal adaptation in teacher-student interaction. *Learning and Instruction*, 55, 41–57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2017.09.005>
- Reicher, H. (2010). Building inclusive education on social and emotional learning: Challenges and perspectives – A review. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 14, 213–246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110802504218>.
- Searle, J., Billett, S. and Behrens, K. (2005). Affordances and engagements: The shaping of adults' initial experiences in higher education. In *13th Annual International conference on post-compulsory education and training* (Vol. 2, p. 163–170). Gold Coast, Queensland.
- Srinivasan, M. (2019). *SEL Every Day: Integrating Social and Emotional Learning with Instruction in Secondary Classrooms (SEL solutions series)*. W.W. Norton & Company: New York.
- Sun Hai-Long, Sun Ting, Sha Feng-Yi, Gu Xiao-Yu, Hou Xin-Ru, Zhu Fei-Yan, & Fang Pei-Tao. (2022). The Influence of Teacher–Student Interaction on the Effects of Online Learning: Based on a Serial Mediating Model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 779217. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.779217>
- Wilcox, P., Winn, S. & Fyvie-Gauld, M. (2005). 'It was nothing to do with the university, it was just the people': the role of social support in the first-year experience of higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 30(6), 707–722. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070500340036>
- Young, I. (2007). Building Better Pathways to Higher Education. <https://apo.org.au/sites/default/files/resource-files/2007-04/apo-nid1383.pdf>

REFERENCES

- Bahrii, K. L. (2016). Vykladach i studenty: vzaiemodiia u protsesi navchannia. Visnyk Chernivetskoho torhovelno-ekonomichnoho instytutu [Lecturer and students: interaction in the process of teaching]. *Visnyk Chernivetskoho torhovelno-ekonomichnoho instytutu. Ekonomichni nauky [Bulletin of the Chernivtsi Trade and Economic Institute. Economic sciences]*, 2, 174–182. http://chtei-knteu.cv.ua/herald/content/download/archive/2016/v2/NV-2016-v2_19.pdf [in Ukrainian]
- Borova, T. A. (2011). *Teoretychni osnovy adaptivnoho upravlinnia profesiinym rozvytkom naukovo-pedahohichnykh pratsivnykiv vyshchoho navchalnoho zakladu [Theoretical foundation of adaptive management of professional development of scientific and pedagogical staff at higher education institution]*. Kharkiv: SMIT.
- Honchar, O. V. (2011). Pedahohichna vzaiemodiia uchasnykiv navchalnoho protsesu v systemi vyshchoi osvity Ukrainy (istoryko-pedahohichni aspekt) [Pedagogical interaction of the participants of the teaching process in the system of higher education in Ukraine (historical and pedagogical aspects)]. Kharkiv National Automobile and Highway University. [in Ukrainian]
- Kypychenko, N. S. (2014). Pedahohichna vzaiemodiia vykladachiv i maibutnikh uchyteliv pochatkovoї shkoly pid chas praktyky [Pedagogical interaction of lecturers and future primary school teachers during practice]. *Aktualni problemy sotsiologii, psykholohii, pedahohiky [Actual problems of sociology, psychology, pedagogy]*, 3(24), 153–158. <https://elibrary.kubg.edu.ua/id/eprint/4545> [in Ukrainian]
- Kuznetsova, O. Yu. (2014). Usvidomlennia osoblyvostei movnoi osobystosti dlia nalahodzhennia efektyvnoi vzaiemodii [Awareness of the peculiarities of language personality for establishing effective interaction]. U *Karazinski chytannia: Liudyna. Mova. Komunikaatsiia: tezy dopovidei XIII naukovoї konferentsii z mizhnarodnoiu uchastiu [Karazin readings: Man. Language. Communication: abstracts of reports of the 13th scientific conference with international participati]* (07.02.2014). P. 1. (p. 186–187). V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. [in Ukrainian]

- Matviienko, O. V. (2009). *Pidhotovka maibutnikh uchyteliv do pedahohichnoi vzaiemodii* [Training future teachers for pedagogical interaction]. Kyiv: National Pedagogical Dragomanov University. [in Ukrainian]
- Podoliak, L. H., & Yurchenko, V. I. (2006). *Psykhohohiia vyshchoi shkoly: navchalnyi posibnyk dlia mahistrantiv i aspirantiv* [Psychology of high school: teaching textbook for master degree students and postgraduates]. Kyiv: Fil-studiia. [https://www.psyh.kiev.ua/Podoliak_L.H.,_Yurchenko_V.I._Psykhohohiia_vyshchoi_shkoly_\(navchalnyi_posibnyk\)](https://www.psyh.kiev.ua/Podoliak_L.H.,_Yurchenko_V.I._Psykhohohiia_vyshchoi_shkoly_(navchalnyi_posibnyk)) [in Ukrainian]
- Ravchyna, T. (2005). Orhanizatsiia vzaiemodii studentiv z osvitim seredovyshchem u vyshchii shkoli [Organization of students' interaction with educational environment in higher school]. *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu. Ceriia pedahohichna* [Bulletin of Lviv University. Pedagogical series], 19(2), 3–16. https://pedagogy.lnu.edu.ua/departments/pedagogika/periodic/visnyk/19_2/01_ravchyna.pdf [in Ukrainian]
- Ravchyna, T. (1999). Rol pedahoha yak poserednyka u navchanni y vykhovanni molodi [Teacher's role of a mediator in the upbringing of the youth]. *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu. Ceriia pedahohichna* [Bulletin of Lviv University. Pedagogical series], 14, 167–175. [in Ukrainian]
- Abbott-Chapman, J. (2006). Moving from technical and further education to university: an Australian study of mature students. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 58(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13636820500507666>
- Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachaudran (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of human behavior*, (Vol. 4, p. 71–81). New York: Academic Press.
- Barnett, R. (1997). *Higher education: a critical business*. Open University Press.
- Brockbank, A., & McGill, I. (1999). *Facilitating reflective learning in higher education*. Open University Press. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED423743.pdf>
- CASEL. (dateless). Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. *What is SEL?* <https://casel.org/what-is-sel/>
- Conley, C. S. (2015). SEL in higher education. In J. A. Durlak, C. E. Domitrovich, R. P. Weissberg, & T. P. Gullotta (Eds.), *Handbook of social and emotional learning: Research and practice* (pp. 197–212). The Guilford Press. https://www.academia.edu/79317701/SEL_in_Higher_Education
- Elmi, C. (2020). Integrating Social Emotional Learning Strategies in Higher Education. *European Journal of Investigation in Health, Psychology and Education*, 10(3), 848–858. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ejihpe10030061>
- Krause, K. (2001). The University Essay Writing Experience: A pathway for academic integration during transition. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 20(2), 147–168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360123586>
- Pearce, A., Murphy, H. & Conroy, P. (2001). Smoother pathways from TAFE to higher education. In L. Richardson and J. Lidstone (Eds), *Flexible Learning for a Flexible Society*, 536–544. Proceedings of ASET-HERDSA 2000 Conference, Toowoomba, Qld, 2–5 July 2000. ASET and HERDSA. <http://www.aset.org.au/confs/aset-herdsa2000/procs/pearce2.html>
- Pennings, H. J. M., Brekelmans, M., Sadler, P., Claessens, L. C. A., van der Want, A. C., & van Tartwijk, J. (2018). Interpersonal adaptation in teacher-student interaction. *Learning and Instruction*, 55, 41–57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2017.09.005>
- Reicher, H. (2010). Building inclusive education on social and emotional learning: Challenges and perspectives – A review. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 14, 213–246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110802504218> .
- Searle, J., Billett, S. and Behrens, K. (2005). Affordances and engagements: The shaping of adults' initial experiences in higher education. In *13th Annual International conference on post-compulsory education and training* (Vol. 2, p. 163–170). Gold Coast, Queensland.

- Srinivasan, M. (2019). *SEL Every Day: Integrating Social and Emotional Learning with Instruction in Secondary Classrooms (SEL solutions series)*. W.W. Norton & Company: New York.
- Sun Hai-Long, Sun Ting, Sha Feng-Yi, Gu Xiao-Yu, Hou Xin-Ru, Zhu Fei-Yan, & Fang Pei-Tao. (2022). The Influence of Teacher–Student Interaction on the Effects of Online Learning: Based on a Serial Mediating Model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 779217. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.779217>
- Wilcox, P., Winn, S. & Fyvie-Gauld, M. (2005). 'It was nothing to do with the university, it was just the people': the role of social support in the first-year experience of higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 30(6), 707–722. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070500340036>
- Young, I. (2007). Building Better Pathways to Higher Education. <https://apo.org.au/sites/default/files/resource-files/2007-04/apo-nid1383.pdf>

Кузнецова Олена Юрїївна

доктор педагогічних наук, професор,
завідувач кафедри іноземних мов № 3
Національного юридичного університету
імені Ярослава Мудрого,
вул. Пушкінська, 77, м. Харків, Україна
61000

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1156-1842>

e-mail: O.Yu.Kuznetsova@nlu.edu.ua

Kuznetsova Olena

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor,
Head of the Department of Foreign
Languages № 3 of Yaroslav Mudryi
National Law University, Pushkinska street,
77, Kharkiv, Ukraine 61000

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1156-1842>

e-mail: O.Yu.Kuznetsova@nlu.edu.ua

Штефан Людмила Андрїївна

доктор педагогічних наук, професор,
професор кафедри освітології та
інноваційної педагогіки Харківського
національного педагогічного
університету імені Г.С. Сковороди,
вул. Валентинівська, 2, м. Харків,
Україна, 61166

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6281-980X>

e-mail: Valeriy.61.sh@gmail.com

Shtefan Liudmyla

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor,
Professor of the Department of Educology
and Innovative Pedagogy, H. S. Skovoroda
Kharkiv National Pedagogical University,
Valentynivska street, 2, Kharkiv, Ukraine
61166

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6281-980X>

e-mail: Valeriy.61.sh@gmail.com