Jan GRZESIAK,
orcid.org/0000-0003-2898-4075
Doctor Habiliated, Professor of Humanities
of State Higher Vocational School in Konin
(Konin, Poland) jang@amu.edu.pl

AXIOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF SELF-EVALUATION AND SELF-ASSESSMENT IN EDUCATION AND IN SCIENCES CONCERNING IT

The pedagogical impact of a professional teacher constantly requires awareness of the function of all activities and their structure (goals and values of the activity, subject, subject resources, methods, organizational forms, conditions, as well as results and their evaluation). Contemporary education attaches great importance to functional orientation that requires combining scientific theories with practical action. From this point of view, it is no longer enough to just "know or be able to" because the praxeo-pedagogical formula "I know that I know and know how" is becoming increasingly high. This formula sets high challenges and tasks for teachers and academic teachers (Grzesiak, 2010: 124–133). Our long-term research has proven that teacher education, preferring information and remembering, does not develop students' subjective readiness for change, and even to some extent the acquired knowledge may render it less useful or even useless (Grzesiak, 2006; Zaczyński, 1982). Studies have also shown that there are far too few self-evaluation elements on the part of pupils and students, which worries and causes the need to improve the quality of education.

The knowledge of a professional teacher is indispensable to apply it in a variety of educational situations in which, by respecting scientific knowledge, it is assumed that the competences of each learning unit should be multiplied. This applies to both school and academic education, especially to the education of future teachers. The knowledge of the teacher (and academic teacher) requires specific praxeo-pedagogical adaptation to the specificity of individual educational situations. These situations should create an optimal sequence which, on the basis of individualization, should favour positive changes (in terms of competence) of every student. As a consequence, this mechanism causes the teacher to adapt in the context of psychopedagogical and praxeological relation student-task. In this context, the teacher's reflectiveness and self-evaluation, of which self-control, self-correction and self-assessment skills are among the most important factors. Similarly, this applies to the learning subject under the guidance of a competent and responsible teacher.

These and other premis decided that the article presents theoretical and praxeo-pedagogic considerations related to shaping in students, and not least among students, competences consisting in triggering reflectivity in self-control mechanisms, followed by self-correction and self-assessment. At the end of the article, desiderata were presented in order to improve the state in this respect at various levels of education, and at the same time to improve the quality of educational research.

Key words: *quality, effectiveness of education, assessment in education, evaluation, self-evaluation, self-assessment, self-evaluation.*

Ян ҐЖЕСЯК,
orcid.org/0000-0003-2898-4075
доктор габілітований, професор гуманістичних наук
Державної вищої професійної школи в Коніні
(Конін, Польща) jang@amu.edu.pl

АКСІОЛОГІЧНІ АСПЕКТИ САМОКОНТРОЛЮ ТА САМООЦІНЮВАННЯ В ОСВІТІ ТА В НАУКАХ ПРО ЦЕ

Педагогічний вплив професійного вчителя вимагає постійного усвідомлення функції всіх видів діяльності та її структури (цілей і цінностей діяльності, об'єкта, предмета, ресурсів, методів, організаційних форм, умов, а також результатів та їхньої оцінки). Сучасна освіта надає великого значення функціональній орієнтації, яка вимагає поєднання наукових теорій із практичними діями. З цього погляду вже недостатньо «знати чи вміти», адже дедалі більшу роль відіграє праксео-педагогічна формула «знаю, що я знаю та вмію». Ця формула ставить перед учителями й викладачами високі виклики й завдання (Grzesiak, 2010: 124–133). Наше багаторічне дослідження засвідчило, що навчання вчителів, яке віддає перевагу інформації та запам'ятовуванню, не розвиває в студентів суб'єктивну готовність до змін і навіть певною мірою може зробити здобуті знання менш корисними або марними (Grzesiak, 2006; Zaczyński, 1982). Дослідження також показали, що школярі й студенти отримують занадто мало елементів самооцінювання, а це непокоїть і викликає необхідність покращення якості освіти.

Знання професійного вчителя неодмінно слід застосовувати в різних навчальних ситуаціях, в яких передбачається примноження компетентностей кожного її учасника. Це стосується як шкільної, так і академічної

освіти, особливо освіти майбутніх учителів. Знання вчителя (та академічного викладача) вимагає конкретної праксео-педагогічної адаптації до специфіки окремих навчальних ситуацій. Ці ситуації повинні мати оптималь-ну послідовність, яка на основі індивідуалізації повинна сприяти позитивним змінам (з боку компетентності) кожного учня чи студента. Як наслідок, цей механізм змушує вчителя адаптуватися в контексті психо-педа-гогічного й праксеологічного відношення учень – завдання. У цьому контексті істотного значення набувають рефлективність і самооцінка вчителя, визначальними критеріями яких постають навички самоконтролю, само-корекції та самооцінювання. Аналогічною мірою це стосується навчального предмета під керівництвом компе-тентного й відповідального вчителя.

Ці й інші передумови стали підґрунтям для того, щоб представити в статті теоретичні й праксео-педа-гогічні міркування, пов'язані з формуванням в учнів і студентів компетентностей здійснювати самоконтроль із подальшими самокорекцією та самооцінкою. Наприкінці статті окреслено постулати стосовно покращення цієї ситуації на різних рівнях освіти й підвищення якості освітніх досліджень.

Ключові слова: якість, ефективність навчання, оцінювання в освіті, оцінювання, самоконтроль, самооцінка, самооцінювання.

Determining the problem. In both school and academic education, a lot of space is occupied by the issues of assessing and assessing pupils as well as students (especially students prepared to work as teachers). In education theory, control and assessment are treated as an inseparable link in the learning and teaching process (F. Bereźnicki, K. Denek, W. Okoń, B. Niemierko and others). This is because, among others, of too loosely related psychological aspects of learning with school didactic (academic) teaching. In recent years, publications on neurodidactics, cognitive science and psycho-pedagogical diagnostics have appeared on the publishing market. An undoubted scientific achievement of the authors of these publications are successful attempts to explain and then highlight the essence and determinants of learning outcomes in the context of knowledge of neuroscience, clinical psychology, psychopathology and psychiatry. In educational reality, not many of these theoretical achievements have been "captured" by specific didactics and methodological studies. The traditionally shaped principles of education and upbringing are still dominant, quite often detached from the reality of everyday life in education. As a consequence, there is a growing criticism of the imperfections and helplessness of the education system, including teachers. For these and other reasons, several years ago, we initiated qualitative research on improving the quality of education and upbringing, while implementing our proprietary concept of task and activity education based on directives related to the developed methodology of the so-called "live" teaching (Grzesiak, 2006; 2010).

Among the theoretical premises, we adopted the principle of humanization of education preferring learning mechanisms, which included each learner (individually or as a team member) in the broadly understood self-evaluation based on reflective self-control, self-correction and self-assessment. The distinguished mechanisms in this concept determine the specificity and importance of values recognized and related to each other at various stages of shaping competences.

State of the research. The above-mentioned issue of subjective treatment of the pupil (student), including his empowerment in the use of auto-evaluation procedures is reflected in too narrow degree and scope (Grzesiak, 2007; 2008; 2014). The categories of freedom and lack of stress in relation to the conditions of student participation in educational processes, occupy the most place in this type of research. The praxeological aspects of introducing students to the exercise of self-control, self-correction and self-assessment are almost completely omitted (Grzesiak, 2009). This is because in recent years the socio-humanities research prevails, with a simultaneous decrease in interest in research into detailed didactics and technologies of integrating education (Denek, 1998; 2011). The research we initiated and their results have been disseminated in many centers in Poland. The shortage of young academic staff in the subdisciplines of didactics, and even more so in neurodidactics (Żylińska, 2013; Grzesiak, 2014), makes the implementation of these elements into educational practice in schools and colleges unsatisfactory. This requires a reorientation of social research into its links with methodological aspects of didactic research based on evaluation of their quality (Palka, 1998; Grzesiak, 2010; 2014).

The aim of the article. In the context of the above-mentioned manifestations of education imperfections, the sources of which should be seen, inter alia, in the quality and development of education sciences. In the next part of the article attention will be focused on aspects and quality of education without leaving out the issues of qualitative didactic measurement. This cannot take place without taking into account the procedures for developing humanities competence in pupils and students, among which self-control, self-correction and self-assessment should be considered as key. They make up the whole world of the values of children and adults. Hence, our considerations will include contextual preparation of

teachers to develop this kind of competence in their students.

Basic lecture. In education and in everyday life, children and adults experience numerous situations that lead to reflection and self-reflection. In the course of studying or in the process of professional work, reflection is a kind of self-assessment of the acting subject. Reflection is also an intellectual process that brings about certain changes in the sphere of knowledge and human experience – the same applies to the acquisition of knowledge and skills in the course of studying or in the learning process. In any case, reflectivity requires dialogues between students and academic teachers and supervisors during the apprenticeship period. Honesty, openness, reliability and responsibility cannot be missing here. Noteworthy is the hierarchical and gradual system of tasks towards human reflexivity in the multi-entity education model, in which we distinguish the following elements:

1) a reflective academic teacher;

2) a reflective student (apprentice);

3) a reflective teacher at school;

4) a reflective student.

Similarly, in the work process, you can distinguish adequate relationships:

1) a reflective instructor (teacher, methodologist);

2) a reflective apprentice;

c) a reflective employee – apprentice's tutor;

d) a reflective employee striving for higher and higher professional advancement levels (Grzesiak, 2007: 231–240).

Self-control and control are extremely important in education. In educational reality, it is not uncommon for control and assessment of pupils (students) to be a priority for teachers. Self-examination, self-correction and self-assessment procedures are moved to the background. These mechanisms have a two-part character because they occur on the teacher's and student's side. Therefore, on the principle of bipolarity and bipartism, they can be combined in parallel with each other:

1) self-control – control;

2) autocorrection – correction;

3) self-assessment – assessment (Grzesiak, 2009: 401–419).

In the first part of each of the highlighted relationships, there are activities on the pupil's (student's) side, and the procedures written on the right refer to the teacher – as the mentor (mentor) of the pupil (student). Similarly, this may happen in situations where teachers are assessed, controlled or corrected, for example in the procedure of applying for a higher degree of professional promotion. Similar considerations also apply to the situations in which the student finds himself as a participant in higher education processes in the unity of apprenticeship.

It should be emphasized that making control, assessments and corrections requires respecting the theory and norms established by theory, and also requires real (not alleged) competences of the person fulfilling the obligations related to these tasks. It is therefore necessary to shape such competences in the teacher education process. Similarly, among pupils (students) in the processes of education and upbringing, great importance should be attributed to shaping their competences in the field of self-evaluation, including, among others, elements of self-control, self-correction and self-assessment.

Managing the process of shaping the above competencies requires the teacher to take into account the full psychopedagogical diagnosis of each pupil (student) in creating and programming for him an individual (or role in a team form) series of educational situations. Each situation has a direct impact on the active and effective participation of each pupil (student) in the learning process (study), and is formed by integrally related structural elements:

1) the state of environmental conditions to perform these roles and to simultaneously shape the entity's new competences;

2) the state of competence of the learning subject and thus his readiness to undertake new tasks (roles);

3) task and role of the subject necessary to perform it resulting from the assumptions and specific educational goals;

4) the action program and its implementation adequately to the task chosen;

5) evaluation and self-evaluation of the obtained result (Grzesiak, 2010; 2014; Jarosz, Wysocka, 2006).

Live teaching (Grzesiak, 2006; 2010) fully taking into account subjectivity and individualization in the education process is only real if the teacher has a fairly detailed diagnosis of the current state of each student individually and, as a result, also of the whole class as a pupil team. It is difficult to imagine conducting lessons and other forms of classes with pupils that we do not know about their competences, environmental conditions, expectations, etc. Therefore, more and more attention in theory and in practice is paid to the issues of student diagnostics. Issues in the field of diagnosis and pedagogical therapy are increasingly being studied on the basis of teacher education standards. Thus, teaching competencies also include knowledge and skills in the diagnosis and evaluation of student school achievements. The effectiveness of these interactions depends on the degree of adaptation of pedagogical teaching interactions to the diagnosed student. Similarly, to the above, knowledge of the student is an

equally important element, having a specific high rank in the course of preparation of the academic teacher for classes with students. It is difficult to imagine conducting classes, seminars or practical classes at school with the participation of students about which the academic teacher (teacher – apprentice's tutor) does not have knowledge of their competences, environmental conditions, expectations, etc. Therefore, more and more attention in theory and in practice is paid to the issues of the diagnostics of a student. Thus, the competence of academic teachers also includes knowledge and skills in diagnosing and evaluating student predispositions and achievements. There is no doubt therefore, that the effectiveness of these interactions depends on the degree of adaptation of the pedagogical impact of academic teachers to the diagnosed student. In this context, a lot of attention should be paid to systematic monitoring of student progress on the basis of continuous monitoring (diagnosis and support).

Professional practice in the course of teacher studies, it helps shape competences in the field of evaluation and self-evaluation (Grzesiak, 2010: 124–133). In its course, it is difficult to treat individual links of education separately from self-assessment and assessment. The issue of school evaluation still occupies a relatively large place in the pedagogical literature and causes a lot of controversy (Denek, 1998; 2011; Grzesiak, 2010; Niemierko, 1999; Palka, 1998; Żegnałek, 2006).

Issuing grades and making diagnoses in the course of education is not a purpose in itself, but on the contrary, assessing the student's progress and successes is one of the very important determinants of learning motivation. It is also a factor prompting the teacher to improve the quality and increase the effects of his didactic and educational activities (Bereźnicki, 2009; Grzesiak, 1983; 2011; 2014).

Control and as grading are mainly related to diagnosis and evaluation of the implementation of anticipated educational goals in the context of the possibilities, needs and actual cognitive effort of the student. As a result, this requires a transformation of formal school grading into a dynamic grading system with high information and motivational values as well as pedagogical values – into a system that properly exposes the elements of self-control, self-correction, and in the final stage very desirable elements of the student's self-assessment. For this reason, it is necessary to develop requirement standards and their indicators, which should therefore contribute to a systematic improvement of the real competences of students and their teachers.

Let's take a closer look at the situation of a first-year student who, after the holidays preceded by

obtaining a secondary school-leaving certificate, learns (studies) according to rules completely different from those used at previous levels of school education. Daily lessons and systematic homework assignments, as well as intra-school assessment systems have turned into weekly lectures and exercises, which at the end of the semester require degrees in the form of credits, tests or exams. Our research shows that first-year students require special support and assistance from academic teachers. Most of the newly admitted students face natural difficulties and barriers caused by the study system, and at the end of a semester, they face exams and tests to obtain credits. It is quite important to develop the skills of independent and systematic "self-learning" in the context of syllabuses, though not necessarily and not always. Thus, at the start of university education of a young student, a situation arises that requires treatment according to a two-task and two-subject approach (Denek, 1998; Grzesiak, 2011: 399–421; Żylińska, 2013).

Changing school pupil roles to university student roles requires a different view on qualifying student competencies, especially in the first semesters of the studies. On the basis of a quick and accurate diagnosis, an academic teacher should react immediately, adapting to the educational situation and offering the student to perform a task that on the one hand should allow him/her to compensate for the shortcomings detected, and on the other hand should enable active participation in his/her further successful education. If the diagnosis is late, it will be difficult to expect the student to cope alone.

The essence of a good diagnosis is finding confirmation that a given student has achieved competences at the assumed level in a given phase. If so, the education process can be continued according to the plan. If not, it is a signal that at the moment the student should correct their intentions and proceed to specific pedagogical therapy. From this point of view, we attach so much importance to the control and self-control of each student's achievements in the study process and in the process of teaching in a classroom.

Therefore, special emphasis should be placed primarily on self-control and self-correction on the part of students throughout the entire period of study, in particular in the first year of study. This issue becomes really significant in studies preparing for work as a teacher (Grzesiak, 2010; 2011). In this regard, descriptive assessment should initially lead to current instruction provided at the most anticipated moment by the student. That is why it is so important to quickly diagnose the educational situation, most often brought down to the student's task situation.

So what value can be assigned to a semester grade (often negative) issued a dozen or so weeks after the beginning of the semester? And what values may guide your grading at retake exams – often appointed only after a few days from the initial grade being issued? Our research allows us to provide unequivocal answers stating that such grading is not effective, as it does not fulfil the assumed function of good assessment in the system of training teachers – professionals.

On the other hand, in assessing learning outcomes (studying), emphasis should be placed primarily on bringing assessment first to checking the progress of learning (studying) – primarily in order to make current and comprehensive stage (shaping) diagnoses and final diagnoses of a synthetic nature (Grzesiak, 2014; Niemierko, 1999; Włoch S., Włoch A., 2009), and as a result, to self-control and self-correction as competence effects of each subject separately (Grzesiak, 2010; 2011). If the student does not have such competences, it will be difficult for him/her in future work to perform adequate roles in this respect. The complex situation demanding from the student (and even more so from a school pupil) to display self-control and self-assessment is evidenced by the phenomenon of avoiding self-evaluation (and self-evaluation) by students as well as by active teachers in the system of periodic evaluation of their work.

The evaluation procedures used in practice are most often parametric in nature, based on the mechanisms of questionnaire, excessive testing and grading - far away from the value of a qualitative approach in training professionals. Meanwhile, the most intentional and effective stimulation of the development of each individual student is possible on the basis of accurate qualitative or qualitative – quantitative diagnosis, in which our proprietary dynamic assessment concept in the sense of a progressive process plays an important role (Grzesiak, 1983; 2006; 2010; 2011). It is dynamic because under the influence of a series of educational situations, over time it becomes possible to make a change and at the same time verify the current state of competence of the student (school pupil) to a successively higher level of detailed competence. It should be emphasised that such a model of assessment is not possible when using point grades (e.g. as a result of tests and quizzes) usually detached from psycho-pedagogical diagnosis. Progressive assessment is the subject-treated process of creating opportunities for the student and his/her continuous development and further improvement in terms of the same specific competence (for example, the level of proficiency in pronouncing specific words). However, it should be emphasised that treating grades in accordance with the concept assumed above is associated with the active participation and fulfilment of tasks by all teachers (including academic teachers) and students as partners in cooperation in fulfilling the responsible tasks set before them, before every school and every university.

Bringing down control and grading procedures to holistic diagnosis procedures should not end with preaching slogans or writing essays. In the face of the need to "learn a change" and skilfully adapt to the reality, the methodology of shaping key competences at all levels of education is of particular importance. In this regard, essential and extremely important tasks should be imposed on education sciences and researchers in this area.

Let us also draw attention to the fact that evaluation in dialogue, understood as an analysis of values (Grzesiak, 2007: 279–289; 2010), requires teachers to be fully competent in self-control, self-correction and self-assessment, as well as to control and assess the effectiveness of pedagogical interactions. We set here directive requirements so that every university graduate has the competence to the following:

− evaluating various structural elements constituting the educational system;

− conducting qualitative research, and then developing and interpreting the obtained source data;

− respecting assumptions of "live" teaching in the course of subject teaching on everyday basis;

− diagnosing, evaluating pedagogical phenomena and designing new solutions (Grzesiak, 2006; 2007: 279–289; 2008: 273–280).

In the course of pedagogical internships, students as participants of educational processes should become more and more experienced researchers in this process (as a matter of fact, acting as the examined subject – as an apprentice). Interns may also be placed in difficult situations, forcing them to improvise in evaluation, e.g. a selected fragment of a class scenario or a project developed by other participants of the learning process. This kind of efforts of *micro-teaching* undertaken in our research allowed students to self-evaluate their own competences.

Evaluation and self-evaluation in assessing the quality of education is multifaceted and should be focused on the organization and effectiveness of the academic teacher only for that reason. In a narrower sense, it can be equated with the number of grades given in exams, or the success of some students during competitions, sporting events, etc. In the work of an academic teacher and scientific worker as a researcher, diagnostics and self-evaluation should accompany him/her on a daily basis (Grzesiak, 2007: 231–240; 2008: 273–380; 2014). In the considerations

on measuring and evaluating the quality of education, one cannot ignore the issue of the relationship between evaluation and auto-evaluation mechanisms that occur with respect to each other on the teacher's (academic teacher's) side and on the pupil's (student's) side. Shaping the skills of self-correction, self-control and self-evaluation of students is a particularly significant challenge for higher education teaching (Grzesiak, 2009: 411–420).

To complement our considerations, we will discuss the issue of mentoring in educational processes with self-evaluation and feedback procedures.

Caring (mentoring) for another person at various stages of his/her development and career is associated with improving managerial skills by using the experience of people with higher competences and position in the organisational hierarchy in the process of education, work, play, etc. Similarly, mentoring can be regarded as an academic teacher's service and indispensable roles towards a student or a small group of students. Fulfilling a mentor's tasks has a significant impact on the entire professional development of each student without neglecting his/her personal and organisational culture (Grzesiak, 2010: 11–120). There are closer connections and interdependencies between mentoring exercised by the academic teacher and self-evaluation on the student's side. An academic teacher in the role of mentor can use multiple methods and techniques of managing human resources. By conducting systematic and planned dialogues with the student (apprentice), the mentor creates opportunities for joint development of solutions and stimulating his/her motivation for thoughtful implementation proceedings. At that time, a professional teacher plays the role of a trainee supervisor and also a coach. The style of management exercised by the mentor and based on coaching should help students to identify their strengths and weaknesses. Furthermore, it promotes the determination of means and methods of own development, as well as constant communication interactions in the atmosphere of dialogue and evaluation (Grzesiak, 2008: 9–12).

Reasoning and conclusions. Teachers in the course of performing multiple professional roles cause changes in competences of each of the pupils (students) while maintaining the principle of individualisation of education.

It should be emphasized that the immediate goal in the education process is to support and stimulate the development of each learner, rather than assessing and examining. They lose their psychological significance of proper leaning and didactic principles, and teaching methods distinguished in school and academic didactics (Bereżniki, 2009; Denek, 2011; Żegnałek, 2006). The expected improvement in the quality of school and teacher work can take place on the basis of good knowledge and full respect of scientific theories about education. It is not enough to just say that you need to improve quality. In the era of transformation, the necessity of specific and rational cooperation of all participants of educational processes, including scientific authorities in this area, is even more essential. Great attention should be paid to preparing students to perform competent and responsible teacher roles. Similarly, this applies to the preparation of academic teachers and young academic staff to participate in the creation of a genuinely good change – not just imaginary, and specifically not a politicized change.

The issue of value, evaluation and self-evaluation in the education process is extremely important at all levels of education - especially in online remote learning processes. It is necessary to conduct systematic research on the course of education of future teachers and their behaviour in various forms and scopes of their professional activity, including reflectivity and self-evaluation. Diagnostics (including docimology) and evaluation (axiology) in education should be coupled with educational dialogue procedures and more broadly, social dialogue procedures. There is a close relationship between evaluation, self-evaluation and dialogue in respect of knowledge, skills and respect for the standards of behaviour of every participant in education processes without exception.

The conceptualisation outlined in this article and the partial results of its implementation are only an attempt to improve the theoretical system and practical teacher education. It will not be possible to achieve "good changes" without giving educational processes a multi-task and multi-entity character. This is because it is primarily determined by highly competent and responsible teachers, and moreover, not less, or even more so – their teachers, i.e. as teachers of teachers (Grzesiak, 2008: 273–280).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bereźnicki F. Zagadnienia dydaktyki szkoły wyższej. Szczecin : WSH TWP, 2009.
2. Denek K. O nowy kształt edukacji. Toruń : Akapit,1998.
3. Denek K. Uniwersytet w perspektywie społeczeństwa wiedzy. T. 1–3. Poznań : WSPiA, 2011.
4. Grzesiak J. Kontrowersje wokół zasad klasyfikowania i promowania uczniów w klasach początkowych. Oświata i Wychowanie. 1983. Nr 16 (515).

5. Grzesiak J. Nauczanie żywe a karty pracy we współczesnej szkole. *Edukacja jutra* / K. Denek, T. Koszczyc, P. Oleśniewicz eds. Wrocław : AWF, 2006.

6. Grzesiak J. Przez analizę wartości do postępu pedagogicznego. *Ciągłość i zmiana w pedagogice XXI wieku* / T. Zacharuk eds. Siedlce : UPH, 2007. S. 279–289.

7. Grzesiak J. eds. Wybrane konteksty praktyk pedagogicznych. Konin : PWSZ, 2010. S. 124–133.

8. Grzesiak J. O powołaniu nauczyciela do żywej metodyki wobec procedur ewaluacyjnych w zmieniającej się klasie szkolnej. *Ewaluacja i innowacje w edukacji. Autoewaluacja i refleksyjność nauczyciela.* / J. Grzesiak eds. Konin : PWSZ, 2007. S. 231–240.

9. Grzesiak J. O edukacji jutra zadecydują niewypaleni nauczyciele. *Edukacja jutra* / K.Denek, K. Zatoń, A. Kwaśna eds. Wrocław : AWF, 2008. S. 273–280.

10. Grzesiak J. eds. Ewaluacja w dialogu-dialog w ewaluacji. Kalisz-Konin : UAM – PWSZ, 2008. S. 9–12.

11. Grzesiak J. Doradztwo i mentoring w przygotowywaniu studentów do pracy w zawodzie nauczyciela. *Poradnictwo zawodowe w teorii i praktyce* / R. Parzęcki eds. Gdańsk : GWSH, 2010. S. 111–120.

12. Grzesiak J. Samoocena ucznia a samoocena nauczyciela. *Ewaluacja i innowacje w edukacji* / J.Grzesiak eds. Kalisz-Konin : WPA – PWSZ, 2009. S. 401–419.

13. Grzesiak J. Podstawy teorii i metodyki kształcenia praktycznego nauczycieli. Konin : PWSZ, 2010. 152 s.

14. Grzesiak J. eds. Kompetencje i odpowiedzialność nauczyciela. Kalisz – Konin : UAM – PWSZ, 2010. 519 s.

15. Grzesiak J. Wielozadaniowe i wielopodmiotowe konteksty ewaluacji jakości kształcenia w szkole i w uczelni. *Ewaluacja i innowacje w edukacji. Pomiar i ewaluacja jakości* kształcenia / J. Grzesiak eds. Kalisz-Konin : WPA-PWSZ, 2011. S. 399–421.

16. Grzesiak J. Lekcje i diagnostyka psychopedagogiczna w edukacji dziecka. Konin : PWSZ, 2014. 254 s.

17. Jarosz E.,Wysocka E. Diagnoza psychopedagogiczna. Warszawa : Żak, 2006. 429 s.

18. Niemierko B. *Między oceną szkolną a dydaktyką.* Warszawa : WSiP, 1999.

19. Palka S. eds. Orientacje w metodologii badań pedagogicznych. Kraków : UJ, 1998. S. 55–74.

20. Włoch S., Włoch A. Diagnoza całościowa w edukacji przedszkolnej i wczesnoszkolnej. Warszawa : Żak, 2009.

21. Zaczyński W. Metodologia badań własnego nauczycielskiego warsztatu pracy. *Dydaktyka Szkoły Wyższej*. 1982. Nr 2.

22. Żegnałek K. Dydaktyka ogólna. Warszawa : WSP TWP, 2006.

23. Żylińska M. Neurodydaktyka. Nauczanie i uczenie się przyjazne mózgowi. Toruń : UMK, 2013.

REFERENCES

1. Bereźnicki F. *Zagadnienia dydaktyki szkoły wyższej* [*Issues of university didactics*]. Szczecin: WSH TWP, 2009 [in Polish].

2. Denek K. *O nowy kształt edukacji* [*For a new shape of education*]. Toruń: Akapit,1998 [in Polish].

3. Denek K. *Uniwersytet w perspektywie społeczeństwa wiedzy* [*University perceived by a community of knowledge*]. T. 1 – 3. Poznań: WSPiA, 2011 [in Polish].

4. Grzesiak J. Kontrowersje wokół zasad klasyfikowania i promowania uczniów w klasach początkowych [Controversies regarding rules of crediting and promoting students at stages of early education]. *Oświata i Wychowanie*. 1983. Nr 16 (515) [in Polish].

5. Grzesiak J. *Nauczanie żywe a karty pracy we współczesnej szkole* [*Vivid teaching and worksheets in a contemporary school*]. In: K. Denek, T. Koszczyc, P. Oleśniewicz (eds.), *Edukacja jutra* [*Education of Tomorrow*]. Wrocław: AWF, 2006 [in Polish].

6. Grzesiak J. *Przez analizę wartości do postępu pedagogicznego* [*Through value analysis to pedagogical progress*]. In: T. Zacharuk (eds.), *Ciągłość i zmiana w pedagogice XXI wieku* [*Continuity and progress in 21st century pedagogy*]. Siedlce: UPH, 2007. S. 279–289 [in Polish].

7. Grzesiak J. (eds.). *Wybrane konteksty praktyk pedagogicznych* [*Selected contexts of pedagogical practice*]. Konin: PWSZ, 2010. S. 124–133 [in Polish].

8. Grzesiak J. *O powołaniu nauczyciela do żywej metodyki wobec procedur ewaluacyjnych w zmieniającej się klasie szkolnej* [*About teacher's calling for vivid methods regarding evaluation procedures in changing school grade*]. In: J. Grzesiak (eds.), *Ewaluacja i innowacje w edukacji. Autoewaluacja i refleksyjność nauczyciela.* [*Evaluation and innovations in education. Autoevaluation and reflectiveness of a teacher*]. Konin: PWSZ, 2007. S. 231–240 [in Polish].

9. Grzesiak J. *O edukacji jutra zadecydują niewypaleni nauczyciele* [*Education of tomorrow will be decided by not burnt-out teachers*]. In: K. Denek, K. Zatoń, A. Kwaśna (eds.), *Edukacja jutra* [*Education of tomorrow*]. Wrocław: AWF, 2008. S. 273–280 [in Polish].

10. Grzesiak J. (eds.). *Ewaluacja w dialogu-dialog w ewaluacji* [*Evaluation in the dialogue – dialogue in evaluation*]. Kalisz-Konin: UAM – PWSZ, 2008. S. 9–12 [in Polish].

11. Grzesiak J. *Doradztwo i mentoring w przygotowywaniu studentów do pracy w zawodzie nauczyciela* [*Advising and mentoring in preparing students to work in a teacher profession*]. In: R. Parzęcki (eds.), *Poradnictwo zawodowe w teorii i praktyce* [*Professional counselling in theory and practice*]. Gdańsk: GWSH, 2010. S. 111–120 [in Polish].

12. Grzesiak J. *Samoocena ucznia a samoocena nauczyciela* [*Self-esteem of a student and self-esteem of a teacher*]. In: J. Grzesiak (eds.), *Ewaluacja i innowacje w edukacji* [*Evaluation and innovations in education*]. Kalisz-Konin: WPA – PWSZ, 2009. S. 401–419 [in Polish].

13. Grzesiak J. *Podstawy teorii i metodyki kształcenia praktycznego nauczycieli* [*Basics of theory and methodology of practical teacher education*]. Konin: PWSZ, 2010. S. 152 [in Polish].

14. Grzesiak J. (eds.). *Kompetencje i odpowiedzialność nauczyciela* [*Competences and responsibility of a teacher*]. Kalisz – Konin: UAM – PWSZ, 2010. S. 519 [in Polish].

15. Grzesiak J. *Wielozadaniowe i wielopodmiotowe konteksty ewaluacji jakości kształcenia w szkole i w uczelni* [*Multitasking and multisubject contexts of evaluating education quality at schools and universities*]. In: J. Grzesiak (eds.), *Ewaluacja i innowacje w edukacji. Pomiar i ewaluacja jakości kształcenia* [*Evaluation and innovations in education. Measuring and evaluating education quality*]. Kalisz-Konin: WPA-PWSZ, 2011. S. 399–421 [in Polish].

16. Grzesiak J. *Lekcje i diagnostyka psychopedagogiczna w edukacji dziecka* [*Lessons and psychopedagogical diagnosis in children' education*]. Konin: PWSZ, 2014. S. 254 [in Polish].

17. Jarosz E.,Wysocka E. *Diagnoza psychopedagogiczna* [*Psychopedagogical diagnosis*]. Warszawa: Żak, 2006. S. 429 [in Polish].

18. Niemierko B. *Między oceną szkolną a dydaktyką* [*Between a school grade and didactics*]. Warszawa: WSiP, 1999 [in Polish].

19. Palka S. (eds.). *Orientacje w metodologii badań pedagogicznych* [*Methodology orientations in pedagogical research*]. Kraków: UJ, 1998. S. 55–74 [in Polish].

20. Włoch, S., Włoch, A. *Diagnoza całościowa w edukacji przedszkolnej i wczesnoszkolnej* [*Complex diagnosis in preschool and early school education*]. Warszawa: Żak, 2009 [in Polish].

21. Zaczyński W. Metodologia badań własnego nauczycielskiego warsztatu pracy [Methodology of researching own teacher professional skills]. *Dydaktyka Szkoły Wyższej* [*University didactics*]. 1982. Nr 2 [in Polish].

22. Żegnałek K. *Dydaktyka ogólna* [*General didactics*]. Warszawa: WSP TWP, 2006 [in Polish].

23. Żylińska, M. *Neurodydaktyka. Nauczanie i uczenie się przyjazne mózgowi* [*Neurodidactics. Brain-friendly teaching and learning*]. Toruń: UMK, 2013 [in Polish].