

**The educational rhetoric
of empowerment in academic tutoring:
The teacher's and student's perspectives**

BEATA KARPIŃSKA-MUSIAŁ

*Received 1.10.2016,
received in revised form 26.06.2017,
accepted 27.07.2017.*

Abstract

The paper discusses the complex issue of language used in individual tutorials in tertiary education. The methodological setting is Critical Discourse Analysis, which allows for the interpretation of language used by teachers as empowering or denigrating students: in both cases language which appeals to their emotions and determines their intellectual and cognitive progress. The assumption of the paper is that the tutorial should be viewed as an exceptional educational context within which the rhetoric of empowerment, viewed as crucial for educational success, can be used. Thus, the concept of an *educational rhetoric of empowerment*, and the tutorial as a framework for its exemplification and application, as well as some examples of real language used for the description of experiencing learning in a tutorial shall be elaborated on and quoted.

Key words

academic tutoring, Critical Discourse Analysis, educational rhetoric of empowerment, language, rhetoric

Edukacyjna retoryka upę̄nomocnienia w tutoringiu akademickim z perspektywy nauczyciela i studenta

Abstrakt

Artykuł jest głosem w dyskusji nad złożonym zagadnieniem dotyczącym roli języka stosowanego w indywidualnym tutorialu na studiach wyższych. Tłem metodologicznym jest Krytyczna Analiza Dyskursu, która pozwala na interpretację języka nauczycieli jako upę̄nomocniającego lub umniejszającego studentów, a w każdym przypadku wpływającego na emocje, które determinują ich rozwój poznawczy i intelektualny. Założenia poczynione przez autorkę postulują o spojrzenie na tutorial jako na wyjątkowy edukacyjny kontekst sprzyjający stosowaniu retoryki upę̄nomocnienia, uznanej za bardzo istotną dla poczucia sukcesu edukacyjnego. Stąd też w artykule rozwinięte są koncepcje edukacyjnej retoryki upę̄nomocnienia, tutorialu jako przestrzeni dla jej efektywnego oddziaływania, a także przywołane są przykłady języka użytego do ewaluacji doświadczenia tutorskiego zebrane w badaniu ewaluacyjnym po projekcie wdrożeń edukacji personalizowanej w Uniwersytecie Gdańskim.

Słowa kluczowe

język, edukacyjna retoryka upę̄nomocnienia, Krytyczna Analiza Dyskursu retoryka, tutoring akademicki

1. Introduction

The following paper poses the question of whether academic tutoring creates a space for practicing communication named, for the purpose of this analysis, *the educational rhetoric of empowerment*. The context of the study is limited to the university milieu, while the theoretical framework applies to any kind of educational institution in which the system of education either already has or is planning to implement personalized tutorials as an alternative to traditional classroom based in-

struction. The discussion is situated, in terms of scientific paradigms and methodology, in Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) serving both as a method of research and as the underlying philosophy of the research analysis. The concept of *the educational rhetoric of empowerment* is described and given special meaning in terms of dialogic education in the tutorial, as opposed to the traditional form of the rhetoric of lecturing, which is more commonly used for presenting subjects at university. Tutoring, viewed as one of the forms of personalized education, provides the context for analysis, as individual space for dialogue and intellectual discussion over written essays enables a pure exchange of language. The paper ends with quotations from a number of examples of rhetorical empowerment pronounced by students and teachers in research conducted within the IQ Project at the University of Gdańsk in the years 2014-2016. The Project provided two semesters of almost 1600 individual tutorials offered to 220 students in various disciplines of language and other academic studies.

2. Definitions, functions and paradigms of rhetoric in the educational context

In order to scrutinize rhetoric as a wide sphere of human communication on the one hand, and a collection of verbal and nonverbal tools of educational impact on the other, the very term needs to be theoretically reconstructed. Definitions are numerous and varied. One of them, formulated by Rypel (2011), frames rhetoric as the study of interpersonal communication, strategies of negotiation and persuasion (written or spoken). More specifically, rhetoric covers the analysis of speaking skills, as well as the linguistic analysis of processes which build various communicative situations. Functions of rhetoric, as described by Rypel are: effective argumentation and persuasion, making use of induction/deduction, analogies and alternative solutions in communication, as well as making use of formulaic language. This linguistic setting originates,

among others, in the dual paradigmatic dimensions of the study of rhetoric as a science and from its philosophical roots. One dimension can be identified from the Ciceronian perspective, where rhetoric is viewed as a set of more technical, pragmatic skills, possible to be trained and learnt as genres: *ars dicendi*, *ars praedicandi*, *ars poetriae*, *ars dictaminis*, *ars notaria* and *ars epistolando* (Skwara 2011: 34). Such an approach could be classified as the purely academic perspective, and as such often exercised and followed by teachers. The other applies historically to a more renaissance-like treatment of rhetoric as the *pure art of speaking*, devoid of the Aristotelian truth dogma and giving way to interpretative meanings, perlocution, manipulation and other linguistic distortions of epistemological truth. The latter seems to have close links to contemporary Critical Discourse Analysis (Karpińska-Musiał 2013), which steers discussion towards the educational context of the day. Additionally, a pragmatic orientation might classify this type of perspective as student-oriented, as it is students who aim at mastering communicative skills and proper discursive behavior during their studies.

Major assumptions of the CDA approach can be traced back to the writings of Ruth Wodak (2001). In its wide socio-political impact, Critical Discourse Analysis highlights resistance instead of conformity, promotes development of critical rationality instead of mainstream rationality serving people in power, calls for self-identification and equality of chances for disempowered groups. In this paper it shall be claimed that in the case of rhetoric in education, CDA has at least a double function: to provide methodological tools for the analysis of educational discourse, and thus to improve a didactic process, and secondly: to treat the very didactic process as an empowering construct, a dialogic meeting of two individuals which brings about emancipatory change. A specific example of this empowering context, both linguistically and socio-politically, is the space provided by the individual, academic tutorial, which shall be the main subject of discussion further in this paper.

Objectives of Critical Discourse Analysis as a method of linguistic analysis can be met by analyzing all the different outcomes of pupils' and teachers' academic work: their written documents (essays) as well as verbal communication, curricula, course books and any other project work which results from it. However, Ruth Wodak emphasizes, in accordance with the French school of discourse, that critical analysis goes far beyond text itself (what literary studies do), as it must consider the whole *context* of a language event: cultural, political, social and even economic ones. In other words, CDA as a wider contextual approach to rhetorical analysis verifies content, forms, strategies, semiotic types, and pragmatic effects of communicative acts, which permeate the whole educational (and thus also didactic) processes occurring in academia. It calls for them to be multidimensional, contextualized, constructivist and emancipatory. Above all, educational processes, discursive and linguistic in their nature, should also be empowering.

3. Empowerment in education – from idea to a linguistic practice

As Nicolaidis and Koutroumpezi (2008: 184) quote,

Short *et al* (1994, p. 38) defined empowerment as 'a process whereby school participants develop the competence to take charge of their own growth and resolve their own problems'. Moye *et al* (2005) suggested that empowered teachers: (a) create learning environments which involve students participating as significant cooperators in the learning process and (b) encourage students to be independent and self-motivated.

The issue of empowerment is a case in point in this paper and calls for a deeper insight into the state-of-the-art of didactics in a Higher Education institution. The fact that a didactic process in academia, especially in terms of empowering the students, is a rhetorical process does not raise any doubts. Still, it requires a closer look. Are all the features of a rhetorical

process, viewed as triangular relationships between subject, listener and speaker (or *logos*, *ethos* and *pathos*) mirrored in all the different modes of the didactic process exercised at the university of today? As Zgólkowa and Sobczak (2011) remark, rhetorical process in all its complexity is presented as humanistic (referring to people), based on social interactionism, context-based, dynamic and persuasive in nature, socio-psychological, oriented towards relations and critical argumentation. The last two features, especially, appear essential if we talk about the empowering functions of language in the aura of Critical Discourse Analysis. Are all didactic situations directed towards building relations and inviting critical argumentation? What does critical argumentation mean in the face of the recognized manipulative function of rhetoric? How much meta-analysis is allowed in a process where persuasion is supposed to rule? Do these two exclude or support each other during the academic study of controversial subjects? And, finally, what forms of didactics may become an arena for a critical discussion in the realm of mass university, huge auditory halls and large groups of students?

Linguistic practice in terms of giving voice to all the participants in the educational realm (i.e. in its emancipatory function) also calls for some revision. According to Zgólkowa *et.al.* (2011), nowadays there is too much focus on text construction instead of text decoding (in teaching writing), and, secondly, too little attention paid to the perlocutionary effects of communication seen as awareness of *ethos* in speaking. What is usually taught in scholarly terms about rhetoric (and usually only in philological disciplines) are the pragmatic effects of rhetorical figures, the eristic organization of the text in literary studies, or the style of speaking in sociolinguistics (*linguistic etiquette*). Michał Rusinek (2009) concludes that it is a commonplace to talk today about rhetoric either from a historical perspective or in a rather future-oriented context, where scholars ascribe sets of tasks for rhetoric in numerous academic fields. There is, as Rusinek claims, a certain difficulty in

talking about rhetoric in the present context, here and now, in terms of a conflict between its historical functions and the contemporary function of an esthetic ornamentation of speech (Rusinek 2009: 229). Historically, in close relation with ancient philosophy, rhetoric is to seek Truth and Cognition, but contemporarily, the esthetic function of oratory argumentation, using figurative language (often misleading in order to manipulate) stands, paradoxically enough, in opposition to clarity and pure Cognition. This conflict is made particularly clear if we take into consideration the figurative nature of language, always full of metaphors, hyperboles, similes and many other tools to convey meaning in any kind of text or speech.

With this in mind, we must remember about the urgent need to find the golden mean in the contemporary language of instruction. As some authors claim, a future-oriented study of rhetoric should cover instruction how to treat communicative acts as a coherent and cohesive means to persuade the interlocutor, but with full responsibility for the word. In other words, students (of any discipline) should be taught how to use wisely the subsequent phases of building communication: *inventio*, *topos*, *dispositio*, *elocution*, *memoria* and *pronunciatio* (Wilczek 2009: 9) while preserving so called “rhetorical tactfulness”. And, something which seems to be particularly important for my argumentation, how to use communicative acts to empower the other by not forgetting about *ethos*.

From a purely linguistic point of view, methods that ease building this type of awareness may include teaching about rules of logic, strategies of persuasion, paraphrasing, active listening, giving feedback, knowing turn-taking rules, counter-arguing and cross-cultural differences in linguistic etiquette. As we know, however, communication is not only about language (however contextualized), it is even more about emotions. Education, being a communicative act, cannot be separated from the emotional aspects of those who participate in it (e.g. Krashen 1987, 1988). As Krashen claims, “In the real world, conversations with *sympathetic* native speakers who are

willing to help the acquirer understand are very helpful”.¹ Understanding can be either hindered or accelerated by emotions conveyed in speech. Brian Vickers, one of the most renowned historians of rhetoric, considered isolated figures of speech as “language means which contain and initiate many potential relations between meaning and emotion” (Vickers 1988: 339; in Rusinek 2009: 232), but even he claimed that it is more reasonable to talk about a “polipathy” of those figures (by analogy to polysemy of figures). The reason is, as he states, the fact that numerous emotions are evoked by the same figures, depending on the context in which they are pronounced and used. Susan Benesch, for example, draws attention to so called Inflammatory Speech or Dangerous Speech, by which she means hate speech and negative manipulation used to denigrate people for reasons that are either political or social, education not being an exception (Benesch 2012). If so, let us see whether individual tutorials can be seen as academically contextualized realms which create space for positive empowerment by means of both language and emotions.

4. A new space for the rhetoric of empowerment in the academic tutorial

In search of a compromise between language, emotions, cognition and the academic institutional context, defining the *educational rhetoric of empowerment* appears to be a challenge. Knowledge about the figurative and any of the six of Jacobson’s functions of language (e.g. emotive), as well as mastery of methods of teaching and recognizing varied rhetorical components of academic didactics might still not be enough to create a real-life context for empowerment-based educational discourse. The difficulty lies in combining them all in a unique, dialogic (i.e. verbal and emotional) process that can be realized

¹ Available at <<http://www.sk.com.br/sk-krash.html>>. Accessed 17.09.2016.

between two autonomous Subjects under very specific circumstances.

Before I try to argue why it is the academic tutorial that meets the requirements of such a context, let me try to define (redefine) the *educational rhetoric of empowerment*. By the aforementioned reference to Critical Discourse Analysis, empowerment means giving voice to the silent (here – usually students), respecting otherness (in beliefs and values), using inclusive language forms, negotiating differences (in opinions), asking and answering critical questions, showing tolerance for counter-arguments, promoting subjective narratives and the ability to read/decode or transfer hidden meanings. Looking from a rhetorical perspective, there are many figures of speech that can be helpful to achieve this. As has been argued above, however, the rhetoric of empowerment appeals also, if not mainly, to the emotions. Critical pedagogy does not necessarily undermine the positive psychology assumptions (Seligman 1995) which call for giving reassurance, teaching “resilience” (e.g. Benard 1991, 1998), building a caring relationship and positive feedback in the educational dialogue between student and teacher. The term *aposiopesis* has been used by Vickers as an example of a *polipathic* case – it may allow a show of anger, doubt but also shame, uncertainty, openness as well as difference and anxiety etc. (Rusinek 2009: 232). Figures of speech such as *aposiopesis*, may create positive or negative emotions, which does not exclude them from contributing to a creative expansion of skills and knowledge. As Carl Rogers emphasizes in his theory of the *supportive relationship* in education, it is about a reciprocal respect, a holistic approach to both success and failure, an appreciation of strengths and openness to weaknesses that make any educational experience not only emotional, but progressive and successful. That this can be done by figures of rhetoric goes at this point without saying. But they are not the only tools.

An educational rhetoric of empowerment should, then, be based on a number of essential prerequisites, which do not

stem only from language. Those that refer to language are, for example, innovative reconfigurations of written or spoken utterances, a search for new interpretations, each being equally precious for the further development of ideas or arguments, mutual “argument tracking” performed by both parties while reading texts or talking, active listening and open counter-argumentation in the case of disagreement, and the reinterpretation of facts while exploring new resources. A rhetoric of empowerment that goes far beyond language must include a pedagogical attitude marked by respect and compassion, language skills on a metacognitive level and epistemic knowledge exemplified in dialectic talk. These three components allow the perception of tutorials in terms of not only *linguistic imperialism* (Phillipson 1997: 240) which sets the norms of accuracy and impeccable formulas of speaking and writing *in language*, but more in terms of an ethical, topical exchange of knowledge occurring in an aura of respect, inquisitiveness, patience, empathy, forgiveness, motivation and shared wisdom *by means of language*. At this point the rhetoric of empowerment in education combines eristic and figurative communication with pure and straightforward cognition. As Phillipson remarks, “Linguicism [another name for linguistic imperialism – BKM] may be overt or covert, conscious or unconscious, in that it reflects dominant attitudes, values and hegemonic beliefs about what purposes particular languages should serve, or about the value of certain pedagogic practices” (Phillipson 1997: 240). At the same time, however, the same author claims that “Education is a vital site for social and linguistic reproduction, the inculcation of relevant knowledge, skills and attitudes [...]”, thus underlying the role of extralinguistic factors as being meaningful in education. It is my argument that one such factor, except for political and social hierarchy or postcolonial hegemonies observed in multilingual communities, is the linguistic expression of respect for wisdom and the potential of the Other.

If we take a tutorial² as an example of a personalized educational act in which both the student and teacher are devoted to the *topos* of their dialectic talk (which lets them explore the arcanae of new knowledge by mutual reading, writing new texts, and tracking their arguments covered in essays), this form of teaching appears to be a perfect arena for practicing the rhetoric of empowerment. Tutorials show many of the enumerated features of a contextualized rhetorical stage to perform the language of science (subject matter, be it language itself or other). It also promotes dialectic discussions with the use of figurative speech. Being paradigmatically grounded in personalist philosophy and anthropology, tutoring provides a space for intellectual autonomy and critical thinking by counter-argumentation in written essays, caring for the Other in the case of disagreement and building mutual trust due to lack of time pressure or formal evaluation.

What is more, in tutorials the language used by the teacher and the student appears to be *organically connected* with its speaker. A specific “organic unity” of speakers and thoughts develops verbalized by both parties in language. This unity is given a chance only under circumstances which deprive the whole educational event of fear, negative assessment and criticism, offering in return a feeling of flow, the urge to overcome *cognitive dissonance* (one of the conditions of learning) and the experience of empowering emotions. Grzegorzczuk puts this type of learning-inductive integrity between the human being and the language he/she uses for communication in the framework of an *ecological harmony of man and his interactional surroundings* (Grzegorzczuk 2016: 98-100). The surrounding (here the meeting in a tutorial) may be more or less stable, it changes and fluctuates, but the point is that it constantly evolves to reach balance called, after Maturana and

² The tutorial is viewed here as the typical pattern of education traditionally offered in British Universities, i.e. an individual, one-hour long meeting of a teacher and student, being part of a cycle of a minimum of 8 up to 12 meetings devoted to mastering a chosen issue, topic, skill or academic research problem.

Varela (1980), a level of *autopoiesis*. The student-teacher rhetorical and educational relationship in a tutorial can be viewed, as Grzegorzczuk claims, as an ecological system which aims at constant, self-recuperating actions to empower both of them and take them to a higher level of existence. As for communication, the author states that “another model of communication is created: a one in which two living organisms, communicating in a particular, contextual surrounding, adapt to each other and in this way affect their own epistemologies” (Grzegorzczuk 2016: 99).³

5. Teacher and Student voices about their experience

Tutoring can be viewed as education that brings change. This change is enormously multilayered and refers, among other things, to levels of motivation (Redzimska 2016), the introduction of pedagogical innovation (Jendza 2016), levels of systemic and organizational learning at university (Karpińska-Musiał 2016b), or anthropological and methodological interference with traditional study methods in the academic context, regardless of disciplines (Wierucka 2016, Szuba 2016). Above all, teaching and learning during one-hour long individual meetings of students with their tutors, devoted to inspirational talks over essays, is an example of a micro-scale educational environment marked strongly with *social self-construction*. This fact has been considered as a crucial marker of teaching adults who need to feel like true participants and co-creators of their learning in order to learn effectively (Jankowski 2005: 83-101). If so, tutoring becomes a truly constructivist and empowering space for university teaching, especially if implemented as an elite alternative to regular, traditional instruction and lecturing (Karpińska-Musiał 2016a, 2016b). This can be confirmed by descriptions written by academic tutors at the

³ “Powstaje więc inny model komunikacji, taki, w którym dwa organizmy porozumiewające się w określonym kontekstualnie środowisku dostosowują się wzajemnie do siebie, a w ten sposób wpływają na swoje własne i wzajemne epistemologie (por Maturana, Varela 1980)” (Grzegorzczuk 2016: 99).

University of Gdansk who participated in the IQ Project in the years 2014-2016.⁴ The Project, financed by the EEA Grants and Norway Grants within the Scholarship and Training Fund offered by the Foundation for the Development of the Education System, consisted of professional training for academic teachers and two semesters of individual tutoring offered to interested students (going beyond their regular study programs). Having gone through the experience of individual tutoring for two semesters of the academic year 2014/2015, 29 tutors and over 220 students were asked to complete evaluative questionnaires, which became part of a wider research study conducted by myself as the project author and coordinator. Some of the questions in the questionnaire were open and gave space to describe the experience of personalized education. The whole project has been described, as well as analyzed, in a monograph published in 2016 entitled: *Edukacja spersonalizowana w uniwersytecie. Ideologia – instytucja – dydaktyka – tutor* (Karpińska-Musiał 2016b). In brief, every student was subjected to a tutorial process consisting of 7-8 one hour long individual meetings with their chosen tutor. The meetings took place every second week and covered a program and issues voluntarily chosen by the students themselves.

Below several answers given by teachers and students to a number of the questions asked in the questionnaire are given. They have two-fold significance for the analysis of the *educational rhetoric of empowerment*: first of all they are a collection of words and phrases which connote a personal body of experience, and secondly, they reflect feelings that extend beyond the linguistic level and apply directly to cognition and emotions. These phrases exemplify the aforementioned assumptions by featuring ideas concerning a positive approach, personal growth, the development of motivation and know-

⁴ The full title of the Project was “W trosce o jakość w ilości – projekt interdyscyplinarnego wspierania studenta filologii obcej w oparciu o metodę tutoringową akademickiego w Uniwersytecie Gdańskim” (“Ideal Quality in Good Quantity”), <www.projektiq.ug.edu.pl>.

ledge, an expansion of skills, positive change, processual cognition and growing satisfaction.⁵

Phrases of empowerment (selected examples):

TUTOR'S PERSPECTIVES⁶

1. What does this experience mean to you?

- *a field to practice openness, sincerity and spontaneity;*
- *a chance to focus on their individual development;*
- *students crave for a more personal contact and want to learn if given a chance;*
- *tutorials demanded from me much mindfulness;*
- *I was surprised by the enormous influence of the student's interests on the process, shape and effects of the tutorial. students' discoveries and the joy of discovering;*
- *experience of the authentic pleasure the students had in widening their knowledge;*
- *developing skills and a growing sense of purposefulness in their study;*
- *my academic experience has been enriched by a different dimension of relating to the student;*
- *tutorials are a perfect form of relating to students who are hungry for more knowledge after traditional group classes;*
- *I regained faith in students;*
- *I saw passion in their eyes;*
- *I regained faith that students want to work, which is not so obvious on a regular basis.*

2. What did tutoring give to you personally that was new?

- *It enables the creation of a space for listening to the student;*

⁵ For more research data analysis see the chapter entitled: "Tutoring in the university as a learning organization – empirical research" (Karpińska-Musiał 2016a: 93-245).

⁶ The complete questionnaire consisted of several questions and can be found in a monograph by B. Karpińska-Musiał (2016a: 130-133).

- It allows one *to revise and verify methods* of teaching used for years;
- Tutorials ruin the schemata built by the system and allow more satisfaction to be gained from didactics;
- *The luxury of time to spare...*;
- Students' perspectives *enriched me as a teacher*;
- *A feeling of authentic impact* on another person's development;
- Charging one's "batteries";
- Lots of *positive emotions*.

3. My personal "jewel in the crown" is....

- *The euphoria of reading a text* – students read it with emotion;
- *The twinkle of satisfaction* in their eyes;
- *The tear in her eye* (and also in mine), which meant that it was worth trying, it was interesting and it changed something in us.

STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVES

1. What does this experience mean to you?

- *It allowed me to see and develop skills* of which I was not aware before;
- *I was not afraid to ask* questions and propose new ideas;
- *I recognized my potential* and areas which I still need to improve;
- *Tutoring developed my translation skills*;
- *I have more courage in writing*;
- *I broadened my literary interests*;
- *I developed the scope of my lexicon* and learnt to construct utterances better;
- *I have learnt to be more decisive and assertive* in expressing opinions, *have improved my writing skills*.

2. What new did tutoring give to you personally that was new?

- Tutorials *developed my creativity* and taught me respect for literature;

- It *broadened my mind*;
- *Tutoring opened a totally new world to me*;
- It gave me *a lot of satisfaction* due to a chance to discuss things with my tutor.

6. Conclusion

Tutoring, as stated above, is an example of academic *Quality Teaching* (2012, 2007)⁷ which goes far beyond the definition of a systemic, traditional didactics. Its educational effects can be observed, measured and discussed within subjects of dialectic, academic talk. It should, however, be noticed that this success is achieved to a great extent by an application of a rhetoric of empowerment during one-to-one tutorials. The rhetoric of empowerment does not exclude a critical overview, neither does it call for only positive feedback. An educational rhetoric of empowerment is a language of trust, support and the creative development of skills and knowledge of those who ask for it (here: students). It can also be called *the language of resilience*, resilience meaning, after Benard (2016), “Being interested, actively listening, validating feelings, getting to know interests, dreams, strengths and gifts. These inter-related strategies clearly convey the message, ‘You matter.’”

As the quoted fragments of research indicate, personalized education which makes use of the rhetoric of empowerment generates a further language of positive emotions. These are semantically expressed by words of progress, metaphors of opening, discovery and development. The way respondents described tutoring was totally deprived of disillusion, criticism or negative expressions. This might raise doubts as to whether the research can be valid, not providing a counterbalanced set of expressions of less positive semantic and pragmatic loading. This is, however, a fact. There were no negative opinions of the experience, except for a small number of remarks about logis-

⁷ For example, Henard and Roseveare (2012) or Amosa, Ladwig, Griffiths and Gore (2007).

tics and problems with time in terms of the organization of the tutorials in some of the responses. As for the form, content and results of this type of education, both tutors and tutees appeared fully satisfied and even excited. This allows for the conclusion that not only a tutor-student eco-linguistic experience can turn into an *autopoietic* system (Grzegorzczuk 2016, Maturana and Varela 1980), but also rhetorically this experience functions as a metaphorical driving wheel for more rhetoric of empowerment in the wider context of academic research in education. Thus, *autopoiesis* expands.

References

- Amosa, Wendy, James Ladwig, Tom Griffiths, Jennifer Gore (2007). "Equity effects of Quality Teaching: Closing the gap". Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education conference, Fremantle, 25–29 November, 2007. Available at <<http://www.sixbigideasforschoolimprovement.org/uploads/2/4/8/6/24869360/amo07284.pdf>>. Accessed 17.09.2016.
- Benard, Bryan (1991). *Fostering Resiliency in Kids: Protective Factors in the Family, School, and Community*. Portland: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.
- Benard, Bryan (1998). "Prevention from the inside out: Tapping resilience in youth". *Prevention Tactics* 2/3: 1-8.
- Benard, Bryan (2016). *From Risk to Resiliency: What Schools Can Do*. Available at: <http://www.tanglewood.net/projects/teachertraining/book_of_readings/benard.pdf>. Accessed 18.09.2016.
- Benesch, Susan (2012). *Dangerous Speech: A Proposal to Prevent Group Violence*. Available at: <<http://www.worldpolicy.org/sites/default/files/Dangerous%20Speech%20Guidelines%20Benesch%20January%202012.pdf>>. Accessed 25.06.2017.
- Grzegorzczuk, Grzegorz (2016). "Tutoring w perspektywie kontekstowo-ekologicznej". In: Beata Karpińska-Musiał (ed.). *W trosce o jakość w ilości: Tutoring oksfordzki w Uniwersytecie Gdańskim*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo LIBRON, 95-112.
- Henard, Fabrice, Deborah Roseveare (2012). *Fostering Quality Teaching In Higher Education: Policies and Practices. AN IMHE Guide for HE Institutions*. IMHE Institutional Management in Higher Ed-

- ucation. Available at <<http://www.oecd.org/edu/imhe/QT%20policies%20and%20practices.pdf>>. Accessed 17.09.2016.
- Jankowski, Dzierżymir (2005). "Człowiek dorosły współkreatorem swojego środowiska edukacyjnego". In: Marek Podgórny (ed.). *Człowiek na edukacyjnej fali: Współczesne konteksty edukacji dorosłych*. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza IMPULS, 83-103.
- Jendza, Jarosław (2016). "Tutoring w uniwersytecie – pomiędzy nabywaniem a tworzeniem znaczeń w procesie studiowania". In: Beata Karpińska-Musiał (ed.). *W trosce o jakość w ilości: Tutoring oksfordzki w Uniwersytecie Gdańskim*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo LIBRON, 29-59.
- Karpińska-Musiał, Beata (2013). "Revising academic discourse – Intercultural Rhetorical Competence of a lecturer in postmodern Europe". Post-conference electronic proceedings. Also available at <http://www.unisaarland.de/fileadmin/user_upload/Institute/eir/Proceedings/Paper_Karpi%C5%84ska-Musia%C5%82_Beata.pdf>. Accessed 19.09.2016.
- Karpińska-Musiał, Beata (2016a). *Edukacja spersonalizowana w uniwersytecie: Ideologia – instytucja – dydaktyka – tutor*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo LIBRON.
- Karpińska-Musiał, Beata (2016b). "Czy tutoring akademicki jest skazany na elitarność? Szanse i rozczarowania w kontekście kształcenia systemowego w polskiej akademii". In: Beata Karpińska-Musiał (ed.). *W trosce o jakość w ilości: Tutoring oksfordzki w Uniwersytecie Gdańskim*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo LIBRON, 207-227.
- Krashen, Stephen D. (1987). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall International.
- Krashen, Stephen D. (1988). *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall International.
- Maturana, Humberto, Francisco Varela (1980). *Autopoiesis and Cognition: The Realization of the Living*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Nicolaidis, Christos S., Evangelia Koutroumpezi (2008). "Empowerment in tertiary education: A strategic source of learning advantage. The case of Greek universities". *Industry & Higher Education* 22/3: 183-188.
- Phillipson, Robert (1997). "Realities and myths of linguistic imperialism". *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 18/3:

- 238-248. Also available at: <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01434639708666317>>. Accessed 17.09.2016.
- Redzimska, Joanna (2016). "Motywacja a tutoring – czy uniwersytet może się zmienić?" In: Beata Karpińska-Musiał (ed.). *W trosce o jakość w ilości: Tutoring oksfordzki w Uniwersytecie Gdańskim*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo LIBRON, 159-165.
- Rogers, Carl. R. (1961). *On Becoming a Person: A Therapist's View of Psychotherapy*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Rusinek, Michał (2009). „Retoryka a psychologia”. In: Maria Barłowska, Agnieszka Budzyńska-Daca, Piotr Wilczek (eds.). *Retoryka*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo PWN, 227-240.
- Rypel, Agnieszka (2011). "Dydaktyka retoryki – retoryka w dydaktyce. O możliwościach wykorzystania retoryki w doskonaleniu procesu edukacji". In: Sobczak Barbara, Halina Zgólkowa (eds.). *Dydaktyka retoryki*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 54-60.
- Seligman, Martn (1995). *The Optimistic Child*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Skwara, Marek (2011). "Tradycje nauczania retoryki w Europie i w Polsce od antyku do końca XVII wieku (wybrane zagadnienia)". In: Sobczak Barbara, Halina Zgólkowa (eds.). *Dydaktyka retoryki*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 16-44.
- Sobczak, Barbara, Halina Zgólkowa (eds.) (2011). *Dydaktyka retoryki*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie.
- Szuba, Monika (2016). "Twarzą w twarz". In: Beata Karpińska-Musiał (ed.). *W trosce o jakość w ilości: Tutoring oksfordzki w Uniwersytecie Gdańskim*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo LIBRON, 61-71.
- Vickers, Brian (1988). *In Defence of Rhetoric*. Oxford: OUP.
- Wierucka, Aleksandra (2016). "Antropologia (w) tutoring". In: Beata Karpińska-Musiał (ed.). *W trosce o jakość w ilości: Tutoring oksfordzki w Uniwersytecie Gdańskim*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo LIBRON, 73-81.
- Wilczek, Piotr. (2009). "Co to jest retoryka i dlaczego warto ją studiować?" In: Barłowska Maria, Agnieszka Budzyńska-Daca, Piotr Wilczek (eds.). *Retoryka*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo PWN, 7-13.
- Wodak, Ruth, Michael Meyer (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis: Introducing Qualitative Methods*. Vol. 113. Los Angeles – London – New Delhi – Singapore – Washington, D.C.: SAGE Publications.

Beata Karpińska-Musiał
Instytut Anglistyki i Amerykanistyki
Uniwersytet Gdański
ul. Wita Stwosza 51
80-308 Gdańsk
Poland
lingbet@gmail.com