



Mosaic Nature of Dialogue in Academic Tutoring ***Mozaikowość dialogu w tutoringgu akademickim***

ABSTRACT

RESEARCH OBJECTIVE: The aim of the article is to problematize and present the mosaic approach to the dimensions of dialogue in academic tutoring.

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM AND METHODS: The considerations carried out in the article are aimed at solving the following research problem: “what are the structure and specific features of the mosaic approach to dialogue in academic tutoring?”. The method used in the process of constructing the scientific argumentation is problematization of issues, based on literature and the author’s experience gained during the “Masters of Didactics” project.

THE PROCESS OF ARGUMENTATION: In order to answer the research question, first, tutoring was characterised as an exemplification of personalised education (learning), and then the author focused on the problematization of three dimensions of dialogue in academic tutoring.

RESEARCH RESULTS: In the process of scientific analysis, three dimensions of dialogue were described (as a way of communication between the tutor and the tutee, a personal dialogue, and a motivational interviewing), showing the mosaic nature of dialogue in academic tutoring and the contribution of this process to the achievement of goals that complement one another.

CONCLUSIONS, INNOVATIONS AND RECOMENDATIONS: In the mosaic approach to dialogue, each of its dimensions is important, and saturation of individual tutoring processes with them is conditioned by the factors corresponding to the personalization of education. Such an approach seems not only to legitimize and make varied tutoring practices more reflective, but it also inspires empirical research on the dimensions of dialogue at universities.

→ **KEYWORDS:** **PERSONALIZED EDUCATION, TUTORING, ACADEMIC TUTORING, DIALOGUE, ACADEMIC TEACHING**

STRESZCZENIE

CEL NAUKOWY: Celem artykułu jest sproblematyzowanie i przedstawienie mozaikowego ujęcia wymiarów dialogu w tutoringach akademickim.

PROBLEM I METODY BADAWCZE: Rozważania prowadzone w artykule ukierunkowane są na rozwiązanie następującego problemu badawczego: „jaka jest struktura oraz specyfika mozaikowego ujęcia dialogu w tutoringach akademickim”. Zastosowana w procesie konstruowania naukowego wywodu metoda to problematyzacja zagadnień oparta na literaturze przedmiotu oraz doświadczeniach autorki pozyskanych w trakcie programu „Mistrzowie Dydaktyki”.

PROCES WYWODU: Dążąc do udzielania odpowiedzi na sformułowane pytanie badawcze, najpierw dokonano charakterystyki tutoringu jako egzemplifikacji edukacji spersonalizowanej, a następnie skoncentrowano się na problematyzacji 3 wymiarów dialogu w tutoringach akademickim.

WYNIKI ANALIZY NAUKOWEJ: W procesie analizy naukowej scharakteryzowano 3 wymiary dialogu (jako sposób komunikacji pomiędzy tutorem a tutorantem, dialog personalny oraz dialog motywujący), pokazując mozaikową naturę dialogu w tutoringach akademickim oraz przyczynianie się tego procesu do realizacji wzajemnie uzupełniających się celów.

WNIOSKI, INNOWACJE, REKOMENDACJE: W mozaikowym ujęciu dialogu każdy z jego wymiarów jest istotny, a nasycenie pojedynczych procesów tutoringowych nimi uwarunkowane jest czynnikami korespondujących z personalizacją edukacji. Takie podejście wydaje się nie tylko uprawomocnić i czynić zróżnicowane praktyki tutorskie bardziej refleksyjnymi, ale również inspirować badania empiryczne dotyczące wymiarów dialogu w uczelniach wyższych.

→ **SŁOWA KLUCZOWE:** **EDUKACJA SPERSONALIZOWANA, TUTORING, TUTORING AKADEMICKI, DIALOG, DYDAKTYKA AKADEMICKA**

Introduction

Irrespective of the transformations of the contemporary university expressed, among other things, in the marketization and commercialisation of its activities, and in the formalization and instrumentalization of the educational process (cf. e.g. Denek, 2013; Krajewska, 2012), this article reflects the idea that a university is still a place of real education. In such an approach, university education is not only a process aimed at the acquisition of knowledge, skills and social competences useful in professional work and resulting from the curriculum of studies, but is seen as “the totality of influences that foster the full development of an individual and his/her acquisition of competences for autonomy and full humanity throughout life” (Kwieciński, 2019, p. 43).

Both in order to fulfill the contemporary pragmatic tasks set for higher education institutions and to improve the actual education taking place there, the subject of efforts made

at various levels is the improvement of the quality of the educational process. One of the aspects of such efforts is the improvement of didactics, e.g. through the implementation of tutoring, which, according to the authors of the "Tutoring Model" (2019) prepared by the Ministry of Education, is not an end in itself, but is intended to generate greater added value for students. The foundation of tutoring, like that of academic education, is dialogue. As a concept, it occurs in many contexts and is understood in different ways depending on the assumptions made. In this context, the aim of the article is to problematize and present the author's mosaic approach to the dimensions of dialogue in academic tutoring. The research problem concerning the structure and specific features of the mosaic approach to dialogue in academic tutoring corresponds with this aim. The analyses carried out are based on the literature on the subject and on the author's tutoring experience gained during her participation in the project "Masters of Didactics."

Academic tutoring as an example of personalised education

Referring to the distinction into three types of education by P. Czekierda (2015, p. 18): mass, individualized and personalized education, tutoring fits into the third approach (cf. also Dziedziczak-Foltyn et al., 2020). Personalized education is defined as "tailoring education to the learner's current situation, his/her traits and needs, in order to help the learner achieve the best possible progress and learning outcomes" (Graf & Kinshuk, 2012, p. 2592). In a systematic way, its components are discussed by D. Miliband (2006). The first of them refers to knowing, communicating and taking into account the student's strengths, weaknesses and educational needs in the educational process. Another component is developing the learner's competence and confidence by providing them with adequate support and using strategies that match their individual needs, pace and style of learning and that give them the opportunity for involvement. This is followed by advocating that students should be able to choose a curriculum adjusted to their individual interests and needs, which would make it possible for them to learn in a comprehensive manner. The fourth component is the idea that the starting point for the functioning of schools/universities is the intention to create proper conditions for the progress of learners. The final dimension of personalized education is the support of schools by local communities and institutions in order to create the best possible educational opportunities. The above components are worth supplementing with the assumptions inspired by personalistic pedagogy. Thus, in personalized education, a person is perceived holistically, taking into account different dimensions of his or her development (cf. Fingas, 2015). A person is to be seen as someone who can make decisions concerning himself/herself, and who has his/her own potential and is ready to fulfil it (cf. Żur, 2016), which means that the main goal of educational activities is making the subject able to "take charge of his or her own development process" (Nowak, 2019, p. 504).

The above-mentioned components of personalized education correspond to the idea of academic tutoring. In addition, however, it is characterised by specific assumptions

that are its particularisation or extension. Tutoring most often takes place in a dyad (tutor-tutee¹ – cf. e.g. Czekierda, 2015; Dziedziczak-Foltyn et al., 2020), but, in the updated version of the publication (2021, p. 10) prepared by the experts of MEiN (Ministry of Education and Science) in cooperation with foreign partners, it is indicated that small and large groups can also participate in tutoring. As noted by Thomas and Hixenbaugh (2006, after Fernandes and Flores, 2013), the pluralism of tutoring is also expressed in organising it for all students or just those reporting problems or needs in this area, in proactivity or reactivity, in its integration into educational curricula, or in its inclusion as a form of additional support. Regardless of the personalized nature of tutoring, it involves the completion of 4 stages: (1) the tutor and tutee(s) get to know each other, build a relationship, understand the objectives of tutoring and construct a contract; (2) the goals of the process are formulated and indicators for their achievement are defined; (3) regular, methodical tutoring work is carried out, based on meetings (tutorials) and the tutee(s)' own activity in between; (4) the process is evaluated (Czekierda, 2015, p. 24). Detailing the issue of objectives, two types of tutoring, often intertwined, should be pointed out, i.e. scientific and developmental one. In the former, the goals are directed towards the search for knowledge and the improvement of scientific, critical and specialist skills adequate to a given field of science, while in the latter the key focus is on the development of personal interests and potential, as well as the tutee's achievement of coherence in terms of his/her own identity and plans (cf. Dziedziczak-Foltyn et al., 2020; Karpińska-Musiał, 2018).

Tutoring is based on a master-student relationship. A tutor, as a master, is a guide or a person who is proficient in a given field and has a greater knowledge and experience than the tutee. A tutor is permanently focused on self-improvement and able, through the application of appropriate tools and developmental tasks, to create the opportunity for the student to develop holistically, to achieve goals in accordance with his/her needs, as well as to reach his/her potential and build his/her own identity (cf. Brzezińska & Rycielska, 2009; Czekierda, 2015; Fingas, 2015; Marzec, 2012; Prońko, 2018). The tutor-tutee relationship is based on the student's subjectivity and treating him/her as a partner in the relationship, and the real dimension and effects of the relationship depend on the meeting of individuals and the multidimensionality of their personalities and experiences (cf. Karpińska-Musiał, 2015; Marzec, 2012; Szala, 2015). In this context, the task of the tutor as a master is not to transmit strictly defined knowledge or truth identified with a certain pool of theories in a given field, but to create a space for the tutee to think independently, gain experience and creatively use that possessed by the tutor (Doda, 2002). Therefore, education is not transmissive, but it includes deep involvement of the tutee in the learning process and the development of his/her competences concerning analysis, interpretation, reflexivity, criticism, self-education and planning, as well as fulfilling and taking responsibility for the effects of learning (cf. Szczurkowska, 2012).

¹ The term tutee describes a student who takes part in tutoring.

Mosaic image of a dialogue in academic tutoring

Theses concerning the fundamental role of dialogue in education (cf. e.g. Brzozowski, 2013) and the possibility of conceptualising it in various ways are present in the academic discourse (cf. e.g. Gadacz, 2015; Garlacz-Sobczyk, 2010). When these are complemented by the above-mentioned assumptions about the complexity and personalization of tutoring, they become the inspiration for the construction of the author's mosaic, three-component model of dialogue in academic tutoring. Such mosaic nature of dialogue is expressed in the interweaving of the three dimensions of dialogue in the tutoring practice.

The first component of the model which is presented here refers to dialogue as the basic communication structure defined as a specific way of communication between subjects assuming the roles of a sender and a receiver interchangeably, based on shared meanings (cf. e.g. Fąka, 2007; Garlacz-Sobczyk, 2010; Jaeger, 2019). In listing the features of such a dialogue, one should start with the reflection made by J. Tarnowski (2019, p. 518) and indicate the pursuit of mutual closeness, understanding and cooperation. Irrespective of the fact that the category of pursuit defines the method of dialogue – according to the distinction made by the aforementioned author (Tarnowski, 2019, p. 518) – the process of dialogue (which occurs, since at least one of the components of the method was taken into account), as well as the attitude (involving the readiness to open up to the above-mentioned components) are also present in tutoring. It is important to emphasize that the presence of the method and attitude of dialogue in tutoring is its precondition, while the process of dialogue is being fulfilled during the time in which it lasts. Another feature of the first dimension of dialogue is its purposefulness corresponding to the assumptions of its successive stages. In the course of building the tutoring relationship, setting tutorial dates, exploring developmental needs and formulating process goals, discussing books or topics interesting to the tutee, conceptualising the idea of the essay, as well as giving and receiving feedback, elements occur that allow for the identification of goals attributed to the factual dialogue (learning about the reality, reaching the truth – Frejusz, 2020), information dialogue (gaining knowledge – Jankowska, 2018), technical dialogue (communication – Glinkowski, 2020), or conversation (pleasure – Kita, 1999, after: Garlacz-Sobczyk, 2010). However, this is not a defect, but rather a consequence of its recognition as a basic communicative structure implemented in the academic reality which is oriented at the fulfilment of specific assumptions. Also, dialogue includes the space for being different, for involvement, criticism, individualisation of approaches and views, active listening, self-correction, creativity, reflexivity and subjectivity of its participants. All these elements influence the shape and content of personally significant goals. This dimension of dialogue seems to be close to the experience of both subjects of the process, who, knowing the assumptions of tutoring, decided to participate in it and see it as a method leading to the fulfilment of goals, both personal (scientific and developmental) and those included in the academic didactics.

The axial category for another component of the constructed dialogue model is the relationship between the tutor and tutee having the features of the "I-You" relationship

(cf. Buber, 1992). This relationship is based on the assumption that a person is someone who has the capacity for dialogue and is constituted by dialogue (cf. e.g. Glinkowski, 2011). M. Buber (1992) notes that this type of a relationship is open, direct, verbal, and authentic, and that it does not objectify a partner in the relationship (You). The implementation of academic tutoring is situated in a higher education institution where subjects are assigned specific roles that determine the shape and boundary conditions of the relationships among them. In this context, the thesis reflected in tutoring is that of W.P. Glinkowski (2011, p. 227) according to which “the relationship between the tutor and the tutee never achieve full reciprocity which is inherent in the dialogic relationship.” Also, we have to agree with the justification of this thesis according to which full reciprocity would deprive the tutor of the function of stimulating the educational process. In this context, the above-mentioned author (2011, pp. 228-229) points out that, in a relationship understood in this way, it is advisable to combine two levels of interaction – the superior dialogical-subjective level allowing for the total fulfilment of the “I-You” relationship, and the subordinate monologic-utilitarian one focused on techniques and procedures enabling the fulfilment of goals.

This statement is fully reflected in tutoring, in which the foundation for the fulfilment of any objectives is an authentic, subjective, developing relationship between two subjects. In the light of the above considerations, dialogue occurring in tutoring is not an existential dialogue, but it is undoubtedly a personal dialogue, which is based on trust, authentic presence in the relationship, freedom, and topics related to personal experiences and feelings that are important for the subjects (Frejusz, 2020). In this sense, tutoring is compliant with the approach typical of the ontological pedagogy of dialogue (cf. Matusov & Miyazaki, 2014). Justifying this thesis and referring to the assumptions of the above-mentioned approach, it should be noted that this dimension of dialogue is a value in itself, a pleasure, an (intellectual) challenge, a shared journey towards values, a profound experience leading to dialogical, initially undefined effects that occur alongside those defined and constituting the essence of the first dimension of dialogue. These effects may refer to holistic development, reaching the essence and fulfilling the subjectively interpreted humanity of all the subjects of the relationship, being in a relationship with significant others, seeing the real meaning of academic education, or to pedagogical action.

An element that complements the constructed mosaic model of dialogue in academic tutoring is motivational interviewing. Irrespective of the fact that its origins are related to psychotherapy oriented towards helping patients to change undesirable health-related behaviours by increasing the patients’ inner motivation and overcoming their resistance to changes, it is also possible to apply it within the educational context (cf. e.g. Wells & Jones, 2016). W. Miller and S. Rollnick (2014, p. 524) define it as “a person-oriented way of helping with reference to the common problem of ambivalence towards change”, and indicate four intersecting aspects of its “spirit” that permeate one another: partnership, acceptance, evocation, and compassion. In this sense, dialogue leading to change is based on collaboration; putting the client’s needs first; seeing the client

as an expert on “himself,” his desired change and motivation; appreciating his potential and worth; believing in the deep layers of wisdom inherent in the person and respecting his autonomy; empathy; seeking, affirming and valuing his/her strengths and developmental efforts; and enhancing his/her sense of self-efficacy (cf. Miller & Rollnick, 2014; Wells & Jones, 2016; Widder-Prewett et al., 2017). Regardless of the fact that tutoring is not a therapy, the above assumptions of motivational interviewing comply, in many aspects, with the postulates related to tutoring. Moreover, they inspire tutoring work in many ways – both with students experiencing learning problems and those with clearly defined goals. Taking into account the close link between learning and change, and ambivalent emotions connected with change, the implementation of this dimension of dialogue seems to be inalienable and inscribed in the tutoring relationship, emphasizing, at the same time, the subjectivity of the tutee in this process. In such an approach to dialogue, a tutor is someone who is able to guide the tutee through the process of changes oriented towards the achievement of goals that are important for him/her, as well as to arouse in him/her the motivation for taking responsibility for their own development and the effects of their decisions and actions.

Conclusion – results of the scientific analysis, conclusions and recommendations

The author of the text characterised her approach to dialogue in academic tutoring in which its mosaic nature is emphasized. Within the framework of the suggested model, in tutoring there are three different and, at the same time, complementary ways of approaching dialogue:

- as a way of communication between the tutor and the tutee, oriented at the fulfilment of established goals;
- as a personal dialogue leading to developmental results exceeding those defined at the stage of constructing the process goals;
- as a motivational interviewing based on the allied interactions of the tutor and the tutee due to which the tutee may discover his/her motivation for changes and overcome ambivalent emotions connected with changes.

The research question also requires reflection on the significance of the dimensions of dialogue and the proportions in which they should occur in the tutoring process. To answer this question by pointing to any of the variants of dialogue would contradict both the assumptions of personalized education and tutoring as its exemplification. Rather, it is reasonable to conclude that each dimension is important, and that the saturation of the tutoring dialogue with them is determined by factors related to the tutee (e.g. his/her needs, personality, goals, motivation, problems), but it can also change over time. In this context, it is necessary to emphasize the potential of the mosaic approach that enables the fulfilment of the assumptions of real education. Such potential results from the diversity and complementarity of its components. Also, it is worth emphasizing the

inalienable role of the tutor as a person who, in an active, reflective and attentive manner, constructs the shape of the dialogue while including in this process the tutee as a partner and not just a participant in the dialogue. It also seems that such an approach is one of the factors preventing the occurrence of the mutual blockade in tutoring, as described by A. Doda (2002). Such a blockade includes the lack of resistance to the assertions formulated by the tutor as a master.

Thus, while formulating recommendations, I find it important to postulate that training agendas should include issues related to the assumptions of personalized education, the mosaic image of dialogue in tutoring, the importance of reflexivity of a tutor as a co-creator of dialogue, as well as the avoidance of routinization, schematization and standardization of this process. It seems, moreover, that the mosaic approach to dialogue in academic tutoring presented in the text inspires research on the subject, not only in terms of the category of dialogue, but also in terms of the importance of tutoring for the development of the tutees' competences, both those having an instrumental dimension and those that are part of the idea of education empowering people to take responsibility for their own development.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brzezińska, A.I., & Rycielska, L. (2009). Tutoring jako czynnik rozwoju ucznia i nauczyciela. In P. Czekierda, M. Budzyński, J. Traczyński, Z. Zalewski & A. Zembrzuska (Eds.), *Tutoring w szkole między teorią a praktyką zmiany edukacji* (pp. 20-31). Towarzystwo Edukacji Otwartej.
- Brzozowski, T.T. (2013). Wartość edukacyjna dialogu. *Podstawy edukacji*, 6, 77-97. <http://cejsh.icm.edu.pl/cejsh/element/bwmeta1.element.ojs-issn-2081-2264-year-2013-volume-6-article-807>
- Buber, M. (1992). *Ja i Ty. Wybór pism filozoficznych* (J. Doktór, Trans.). „Pax”.
- Czekierda, P. (2015). Czym jest tutoring. In P. Czekierda, B. Figas & M. Szala (Eds.), *Tutoring. Teoria, praktyka, studia przypadków* (pp. 15-36). Oficyna a Wolters Kluwer business.
- Denek, K. (2013). Uniwersytet. Między tradycją a wyzwaniem współczesności i przyszłości. *Edukacja Humanistyczna*, 1(28), 7-21. https://depot.ceon.pl/bitstream/handle/123456789/4360/1-denek_1.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
- Doda, A. (2002). Dyskurs mistrza w perspektywie poststrukturalistycznej – implikacje dla pedagogiki. In E. Malewska & B. Śliwowski (Eds.), *Pedagogika i edukacja wobec nowych wspólnot i różnic w jednoczącej się Europie* (pp. 173-189). Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”.
- Dziedziczak-Foltn, A., Karpińska-Musiał, B., & Sarnat-Ciasto, A. (2020). *Tutoring drogą do doskonałości akademickiej. Percepcja i implementacja personalizacji kształcenia w polskim szkolnictwie wyższym w latach 2014-2019*. Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”.
- Fąka, P. (2007). Dialog – koncepcje, problemy badawcze i kontrowersje. *Językoznawstwo: współczesne badania, problemy i analizy językoznawcze*, 1(1), 17-18. https://bazhum.muzhp.pl/media/files/Językoznawstwo_wspolczesne_badania_problemy_i_analizy_jezykoznawcze/Językoznawstwo_wspolczesne_badania_problemy_i_analizy_jezykoznawcze-r2007-t1-s7-18/Językoznawstwo_wspolczesne_badania_problemy_i_analizy_jezykoznawcze-r2007-t1-s7-18.pdf
- Fernandes, S., & Flores, M.A. (2013). Tutors' and students' views of tutoring: A study in higher education. In M.A. Flores (Ed.), *Back to the future: Legacies, continuities and changes in educational policy, practice and research* (pp. 277-295). Sense Publishers.

- Fingas, B. (2015). Fundamenty i źródła tutoring. In P. Czekierda, B. Figas & M. Szala (Eds.), *Tutoring. Teoria, praktyka, studia przypadków* (pp. 37-61). Oficyna a Wolters Kluwer business.
- Frejusz, K. (2020). *Wychowanie jako „dialog i spotkanie” w myśli pedagogicznej Janusza Tarnowskiego*. Wydawnictwo Naukowe Collegium Bobolanum.
- Gadacz, T. (2015). Pięć koncepcji dialogu. *Kwartalnik Pedagogiczny*, 60(2), 75-91. <http://cejsh.icm.edu.pl/cejsh/element/bwmeta1.element.ceon.element-01a92ae1-25f5-3d38-9dc7-0337348a27b6>
- Garlacz-Sobczyk, K. (2010). Typologia dialogu. *Lingwistyka stosowana*, 3, 149-166. http://www.lis.uw.edu.pl/documents/7276721/11195587/LS3_2010_art_GARLACZ-SOBCZYK.pdf
- Glinkowski, W.P. (2011). *Człowiek – istota spoza kultury. Dialogika Martina Bubera jako podstawa antropologii filozoficznej*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Glinkowski, W.P. (2020). *Człowiek w dialogu*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Graf, S., & Kinshuk (2012). Personalised learning. In N. Seel (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of the science of learning* (pp. 2594-2596). Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1428-6>
- Jaeger, E.L. (2019). Initiation, response, follow-up and beyond: Analyzing dialogue around difficulty in a tutorial setting. *Dialogic Pedagogy: An International Online Journal*, 7, A1-A26. <https://doi.org/10.5195/dpj.2019.195>
- Jankowska, D. (2018). Dialog mimo wszystko. *Studia z Teorii Wychowania*, 2(23), 61-78. <http://cejsh.icm.edu.pl/cejsh/element/bwmeta1.element.desklight-b3a78629-676c-43e1-b413-df8a5e264dbf>
- Karpińska-Musiał, B. (2015). Tutoring akademicki – pomiędzy epistemą a doxą. Tożsamość metody w kontekście kształcenia akademickiego. In P. Czekierda, B. Figas & M. Szala (Eds.), *Tutoring. Teoria, praktyka, studia przypadków* (pp. 123-139). Oficyna a Wolters Kluwer business.
- Karpińska-Musiał, B. (2018). O nierozłączności kształcenia naukowego i rozwoju osobistego. In B. Karpińska-Musiał & M. Prońko (Eds.), *Tutoring jako spotkanie. Historie indywidualnych przypadków* (pp. 15-18). Wolters Kluwer.
- Krajewska, A. (2012). Przemiany misji i funkcji uniwersytetu. *Studia Ecologiae et Bioethicae*, 10(2), 89-107. <https://DOI:10.21697/seb.2012.10.2.06>
- Kwieciński, Z. (2019). Edukacja w galaktyce znaczeń. In Z. Kwieciński & B. Śliwerski (Eds.), *Pedagogika. Podręcznik akademicki* (pp. 48-53). Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Marzec, I. (2012). Tutoring jako metoda spersonalizowanego wspierania rozwoju człowieka. In M. Taraszkiewicz (Ed.), *Tutoring akademicki. Przegląd zagadnień* (pp. 89-127). Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej TPW w Warszawie.
- Matusov, E., & Miyazaki, K. (2014). Dialogue on dialogic pedagogy. *Dialogic Pedagogy: An International Online Journal*, 2, ddp 2-ddp 5. <https://dpj.pitt.edu/ojs/dpj1/article/view/121/60>
- Miliband, D. (2006). Choice and voice in personalised learning. In *Personalising Education* (pp. 21-30). OECD, CERI. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264036604-en>
- Miller, W.R., & Rollnick, S. (2014). *Dialog motywujący. Jak pomóc ludziom w zmianie* (R. Andruszko, Trans.). Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Nowak, M. (2019). Pedagogika personalistyczna. In Z. Kwieciński & B. Śliwerski (Eds.), *Pedagogika. Podręcznik akademicki* (pp. 488-508). Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Prońko, M. (2018). Misja tutora. In B. Karpińska-Musiał & M. Prońko (Eds.), *Tutoring jako spotkanie. Historie indywidualnych przypadków* (pp. 19-24). Wolters Kluwer.
- Szala, M. (2015). Praca tutorska i proces stawania się tutorem. In: P. Czekierda, B. Figas & M. Szala (Eds.), *Tutoring. Teoria, praktyka, studia przypadków* (pp. 62-78). Oficyna a Wolters Kluwer business.
- Szczurkowska, S. (2012). Tutoring w praktyce nauczyciela akademickiego. In M. Taraszkiewicz (Ed.), *Tutoring akademicki. Przegląd zagadnień* (pp. 11-43). Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej TPW w Warszawie.
- Tarnowski, J. (2019). Pedagogika egzystencjalna. In Z. Kwieciński & B. Śliwerski (Eds.), *Pedagogika. Podręcznik akademicki* (pp. 510-529). Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

- Wells, H., & Jones, A. (2016). Learning to change: The rationale for the use of motivational interviewing in higher education. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 55(1), 111-118. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2016.1198714>
- Widder-Prewett, R., Draime, J.A., Careron, G., Anderson, D., Pinkerton, M., & Chen, A.M.H. (2017). Impact of student vs. faculty facilitators on motivational interviewing student outcomes. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 81(6), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe816107>
- Żur, A. (2016). Edukacja spersonalizowana a rozwijanie potrzebnych współcześnie kompetencji społecznych wśród studentów uczelni wyższych. *Horyzonty Wychowania*, 15(34), 137-155. <https://horyzontywychowania.ignatianum.edu.pl/HW/article/view/802>

Copyright and License



This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution – NoDerivs (CC BY- ND 4.0) License <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/>