

To cite this article :

D.Ciechanowska, The contemporary university as a threat to learner autonomy, [in:] K.Denek, A.Kamińska, P.Oleśniewicz (ed.), Education of Tomorrow. Education and Other Forms of Activity of Adults. Sosnowiec 2015.

Dorota Ciechanowska*

The contemporary university as a threat to learner autonomy

Introduction

The Magna Charta Observatory of Fundamental University Values and Rights¹ contains a statement that the university, rejecting intolerance and remaining always ready for dialogue, is the best place for teachers able to transfer their knowledge. The fact that the university is an autonomous institution which carries out “research and teaching” is stressed and, which is very important, that research and teaching must be inextricably linked. Academic freedom, or freedom of scientific research and education, is the most fundamental principle of university life. The university, serving its mission, transcends geographical and political lines and satisfies an important need for mutual understanding and interaction of different cultures.² It is made up of academic teachers, who are well prepared to grow knowledge through scientific research and innovation, and students who can, want to and are ready to enrich their minds with this knowledge (Magna Charta Universitatum, 18 September 1988). Since these provisions on the tasks of the university were created in 1988, universities have undergone many transformations. “Higher education has a responsibility not only to be available and accessible to all youth but also to educate young people to make authority politically and morally accountable and to expand both academic freedom and the possibility and promise of the university as a bastion of democratic inquiry, values, and politics, even as

* Wyższa szkoła Humanistyczna Towarzystwa Wiedzy Powszechnej in Szczecin

¹Magna Charta Universitatum Bologna: www.bologna-bergen2005.no

²K. Cwynar, “Idea uniwersytetu w kulturze europejskiej” *Polityka i Społeczeństwo* No.2, 2005.

these are necessarily refashioned at the beginning of the new millennium.”³ The university has remained the trustee of the European humanistic tradition, constantly aiming at universal knowledge, however, the implementation of its mission has encountered more and more obstacles.

The Humboldtian idea of the free university

We owe the image of a modern university to the reform by Wilhelm von Humboldt, whose views were largely influenced by the thought of Immanuel Kant. He called for a far-reaching autonomy of the university community from government and religious institutions. Not denying the state supervision of education, he preached freedom of scientific research. He proposed the establishment of separate disciplines as well as professors to develop these sciences. The university as a hierarchically organized institution and the categorization sciences and personal dependencies had to be a place where truth is sought, independent from external pressure.

Humboldt assumed somewhat differently for scientific institutions to unite for one objective, which was to conduct scientific research. Teaching was the goal of the university on par with scientific work was, and the community of students and professors was to serve the development of science and its transfer.

The modern Humboldtian university professed the principle of freedom of scientific beliefs, the unity of professors and students, and being treated as a research institution. It was regarded as an entity that derives its energy from discovering the unknown. It was under an obligation to explore more and more truths and scientific probabilities and to improve and disseminate methods that allow you to discover them. In Humboldt's tradition, the university was to be the mainstay of culture and national identity. Its task was also to prepare students to use sources of information, set and solve problems, and think creatively. The idea of the university based Humboldt's views was an element connecting Europe spiritually, intellectually and ideologically for many years.

The post-modern criticism of the university

Near the end of the 20th century, the university had to face the post-modern discourse,⁴ which permeated to the cultural consciousness and provoked many social questions. The main area of critique was the university with its fundamental approach to science. When the post-

³ H. A. Giroux, *Higher Education under Siege and the Promise of Insurgent Public Memory*, 2015.

⁴P. Błędowski, “*Uniwersytet a przemoc. Krytyka postmodernistyczna*” [in:] K.Leja, (ed.), *Společna odpowiedzialność uczelni*. Gdańsk 2008.

modern critique was emerging, the European Academy was constituted by ages of tradition and embodied the Humboldtian idea. The ideas of the university made it an elitist, withdrawn institution. This type of university for the post-modernists was an outdated concept, unable to withstand the pressures of reality, reproducing social inequalities, threatening the intellectual freedom of the individual, directing it along narrow corridors of academic disciplines and discourses. This type of university was facing strong criticism from post-modern positions near the end of the 1960s. The main accusation towards the system of education, including academic education, was symbolic violence, which is due to the thought of Bourdieu and Passeron.⁵ According to them, transmission of cultural patterns served mechanisms of maintaining power and cultivating authority. Each educational action was treated as an intervention into the shape of the cultural environment of the given individual, which was called symbolic violence. Symbolic violence at the university was manifested in three areas: the university, claiming the right to intellectual leaderships, enforced certain research topics while ignoring others, which was called discourse control. Another manifestation of symbolic violence at the university was the rigid division of science into disciplines. It prevented taking up interdisciplinary research, thus hampering the development of science. The symbolic violence of the university also affects its shareholders, ie. students and employees. Intellectual violence against junior employees at the university in the post-modern view applied limitation of academic freedom. Ensuring this freedom to the teachers meant denying it for the students, who, following the master, were subject to cultural and procedural norms. The system of reward and punishment enforcing specific behaviors is a component of *uneven distribution of freedom*. The university in its traditional operation played the role of an arbiter in the area of culture. The system of education and upbringing provided by institutions designed for this task was a carrier of culture perceived as dominant. The university also professed the idea of dominant culture and contributed to its reproduction believing that it is natural and exclusive. As Bourdieu put it, the university as an educational entity has become one of the links in the chain of *symbolic rape*. Regarding the university as a dominant institution, it was the employees who constituted the dominant group. The university was a place to preserve culture and reproduce values. Being a monopolist in practicing symbolic violence, the university demonstrated it also in the relationship between the academic teacher and the student, giving the teacher's authority the rank of a master who played the role of a substitute

⁵ P. Bourdieu, J-C. Passeron, *Reprodukcja. Elementy teorii systemu nauczania*, PWN, Warszawa 1990.

parent. The post-modern critique of the university stigmatizes and highlights all weaknesses and vices of this institution in the perspective of requirements and tasks of the 21st century. In the last decades, the university has been facing the challenge defined as the third mode of the university.

European universities – modernization or crisis

The contemporary university is undergoing a crisis and returning to the Humboldtian idea is no longer possible. Going back would imply a lack of progress. However, new challenges directed at the third mode of the university make it significantly lose out on many important features of the reflective university. In the Magna Carta Universitatum proclaimed in Bologna on 18 September 1988, the European university was raised to the rank of an universal center of learning and culture. It was given the task to observe the fundamental rule of autonomy and unity of scholarly and educational activity, the freedom of conducting academic research and education, and maintaining European humanist tradition. The common declarations such as the Sorbonne Joint Declaration⁶ (28 May 1998) and the Bologna Declaration (19 June 1999) which initiated the Bologna Process aimed at the approximation of higher education in European countries and at the creation, to 2010, the European Higher Education Area, were major challenges, which European countries have taken in the spirit of the basic principles in order to build a knowledge society. The objectives that lay at the core of the initiatives were aimed at the unification of Europe and the overall development of the continent. EU priorities presented in the EU framework programs assume Developing the European Research Area. It assumes development of the potential of research laboratories, universities and companies and their ability to create knowledge and technology at the highest level of quality. The aim of these actions is to serve the economic and social aims of the European Union. They consequently lead to redefining the mission of universities and introducing elements of market economy to their strategies. The conditions of their operation are to be subject to the mechanisms of market economy, such as production, demand, offer, gain and loss. The concept of the entrepreneurial university is the consequence of the idea of knowledge based economy. The demand for modern societies, governments, economic operators, and NGOs has become a high challenge for the functioning of universities and faced them with the necessity to transfer from traditional culture to the culture of entrepreneurial university.

⁶*Sorbonne Joint Declaration. Joint declaration on harmonization of the architecture of the European higher education system*, Paris, the Sorbonne, May 25 1998: http://eua.uni-graz.at/Sorbonne_declaration.pdf

This objective seems to be, at the same time, an obstacle for the independent development of science of research autonomy. We are facing the challenges of the Knowledge Europe, which are becoming limiting factors for the freedom of universities.

Transformations and dangers in the Polish academic education

Universities in Poland are going through a period of change. Education has gone a long way from the positivist or modernist assumptions, however, it is still far from the post-modern understanding of knowledge and education aiming towards critical reflection.⁷ Looking at the mode of operation of educational entities at all levels, one can become convinced that schools are still serving the function and fulfilling tasks of the industrial society, educating passive and obedient performers and applying pressure on the formalized academic achievement.⁸ The successive reforms are trying to approximate standards of higher education in Poland to European standards and recommendations of the Bologna Process, neglecting the ancient tradition of doing science and organizing higher education in the country. As a result, in the legal sphere, we have regulations and requirements of European standards, which in practice are not able to bridge the powerful economic, mental and organization gap which emerged due to the quick adjustment to the “new”.

The humanities and social sciences have suffered in a special way, as they lie close to the national culture and language due to their specificity. Universities were forced to surrender to the virtually unhampered rules of the market game where the overriding criterion of the specifically understood “efficiency” became economic aspects. We are hearing criticism of the methods of doing science, or rather controlling and evaluating it, that are imposed. “The Polish university reminds me a bit of a panopticon prison. The fashion for including universities in the neo-liberal logic of the market game, disseminated by the Bologna Process and the adaptation of its provisions by the recent reforms of the Ministry changes academics into self-controlling freaks, involved in the tyranny of the moment. Scientific achievements have been reduced to publication – publications to scoring points – and the points, in turn, like water into wine, turn into money for the university, while determining the parametric evaluation of the academic institution as a whole and each individual researcher. As a result our work and life time have been reduced to the present:

⁷Z. Melosik, *Kultura, akademie i edukacja – modernistyczno/postmodernistyczne interpretacje*, „Przegląd Pedagogiczny”, 2011., No. 1, 46-72.

⁸M. Wasielewski, *Kształcenie i wychowanie w szkole wyższej – pomiędzy tradycją a współczesnością* [in:] A. Łacina-Łanowski i J. Stanek (ed.), *Edukacja – wychowanie – oświata w perspektywie temporalnej (między przeszłością a współczesnością)*, Łódź 2014, s. 9-36.

publish now – or perish!”⁹ The wide-ranging critique of the modern university accuses it of adopting a direction of development which deprives the university of its autonomy, limiting it by external funding modes and assessment of learning.¹⁰ The needs arising from industrialization and fast development of science resulting from access to digital resources of knowledge are in themselves a challenge to universities. The number of universities in the Polish market, and the emergence of private colleges made it necessary to perform a unified parametric evaluation, which, performed in regular periods, would provide objective data on the academic condition of an operator to both authorities and the universities themselves.¹¹ The very process of parametric evaluation raises controversy, accompanied by diverse aims of institutions and opinions on evaluation criteria. Seeing inadequacies, attempts are made to find methods of objective evaluation of academic education operators bereft of unifying bias.

All emotions associated with the universities facing the new requirements result from the belief that universities are losing their specificity sanctified by tradition. And although the criticism of the traditional university has enabled liberation from its limiting violent actions, the created third mode university squanders the uniqueness of the university as “the temple of knowledge”. The third generation university model, also referred to as the Entrepreneurial University, has evolved naturally as a continuation of the earlier vision of the university as the Humboldtian university. According to this model, universities cannot function any longer as independent institutions, as they had previously done.¹² In the pursuit of required marketization of education, freedom of scientific research, the courage of independent thought and the teacher's influence on the student are lost. “The university is becoming, in this perspective, a manufacturing company which is subject to the assessment of performance indicators, profits and losses measured only by financial data, operating on a neo-liberal market among a variety of goods and services ...”¹³ The reform of the university shapes it too strongly as an institution earning money and moving away from the democratic model.

⁹M.Zawadzki, *Krajowe ramy panoptyzacji*, <http://michalzawadzki.innpoland.pl/115613.krajowe-ramy-panoptyzacji> [access march 2015]

¹⁰D. Jemiłniak, D. J. Greenwood, *Wake Up or Perish: Neo-Liberalism, the Social Sciences, and Salvaging the Public University*, [in:] *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies* 2015, Vol. 15(1) 72 –82.

¹¹D.Antonowicz ., J.M Brzeziński., “Doświadczenia parametryzacji jednostek naukowych z obszaru nauk humanistycznych i społecznych 2013 – z myślą o parametryzacji 2017” *NAUKA* No. 4, 2013, p. 51-85.

¹² F.Nowacki, *Aktywność przedsiębiorcza uniwersytetu trzeciej generacji– uniwersytet czy przedsiębiorstwo?* [in:] D.Burawski (ed.), *Uniwersytet trzeciej generacji. Stan i perspektywy rozwoju.*, Poznań 2013.

¹³ A. F. Kola *Uniwersytet jako pralnia. Esej o stanie akademickiego namysłu nad nauką i szkolnictwem wyższym w Polsce*, „*Rocznik Pedagogiczny*”, 2012 No. 35, s. 93-110.

Y- or C-Generation at the university

The ongoing transformation of universities also implies widening their tasks beyond educating students and conducting research on creating relationships with the environment. This arrangement of the higher education institution means that modern universities are evolving from the traditional “temples of knowledge” in the direction of entrepreneurial organizations, and finally knowledge-based organizations.¹⁴ The enterprising university model assumes that the university should evolve as expected by the social environment. The entrepreneurial education model is geared to meeting the needs of customers and, more broadly, social and market needs. The dominant instrumental rationality means that the processes of education are placed at the first level of learning; according to the concept of Gregory Bateson it is a level that allows only for memorizing information, which also has to comply with the already acquired beliefs.¹⁵

Building a community based on trust and free exchange of views untreated by the audit regime and not limited to the parametric evaluation is needed especially in the face of digitization life. It specially applies to the generation of students who are presently at universities. We refer to them as the millennials,¹⁶ the Y-Generation, the C-generation (where “C” stands for “connected”) or the CV generation.¹⁷ The “wired generation” is different significantly from their counterpart who was at universities 10 years ago.¹⁸ They live in a world where digital devices are always in sight. Often addicted to media, they function better better in the digital space, in social networks, listening to music on their iPads, watch movies on tablets and not necessarily look for companionship. As students, they present different learning strategies than their colleagues working in the reading rooms in previous years. They greatly depend on digital sources of knowledge, treating them more broadly than just reading rooms available anywhere. They learn quickly, though superficially. They do not seek to in-depth analysis of issues since they know they can quickly find answers to their questions, “asking” them online. Ultimately, they are willing to look at studies done by someone else,

¹⁴K.Leja, *Uniwersytet organizacją służącą otoczeniu* [in:] K.Leja (ed.), *Społeczna odpowiedzialność uczelni*, Gdańsk 2008.

¹⁵M.Zawadzki, *Deuniwersytacja współczesnego uniwersytetu*, [in:] Ł.Sułkowski. (ed.), *Krytyczny nurt zarządzania*, M.Zawadzki, Warszawa 2014.

¹⁶M.A.Yahr, K. Schimmel, *Comparing current students to a pre-Millennial generation: are they really different?* „Research in Higher Education Journal”, June 2013.

¹⁷D.Ciechanowska, *Akademickie kształcenie pokolenia Y w perspektywie zmian w dydaktyce szkoły wyższej*, [in:] D.Ciechanowska (ed.), *Perspektywy zmian w praktyce kształcenia akademickiego*, Szczecin 2014.

¹⁸M.A. Yahr, K. Schimmel, *Comparing current students to a pre-Millennial generation: are they really different?*, “Research in Higher Education Journal”, June 2013.

abstracts, scripts, lists and tables.¹⁹ Changing the admissions strategies and massification of higher education in Poland have led to lowering the level of academic education. Universities in their teaching activities directed their teaching programs at the student, calculated at best at the average one, and instead of passing the most current knowledge and enforce its understanding and ability to apply it, have often limited themselves to the enforcement of knowledge acquisition. These remarks do not apply to all the universities, but the multitude of students and the lack of direct contact with the academic teacher present significant obstacles to cultivate deep learning.²⁰ The world is changing, social expectations grow, the identity of the students is changing along with their learning culture.

Characterizing the quality of academic education, several aspects should be pointed out:

- Universities are undergoing a period of organizational transformation and must meet the internal requirements and those of external accreditations
- Universities are faced with the challenges of commercialization and the third mode, focusing on building their market potential
- Massification of academic education and the liberalization of the criteria to enter the university have resulted the falling quality of academic education
- Students learn superficially, are looking for quick, unambiguous answers, are more interested in practical applications than the theoretical analysis of phenomena

Inhibition or supporting the learning autonomy youngest generation of students

All these factors are not conducive to the building of the reflective university. They also represent a significant factor limiting the autonomy of the students. The concept of “learner autonomy” was first introduced and developed by Henry Holec, director of CRAPEL, in the early 1970s. Holec defined the notion of “learner autonomy” as the “ability to take charge of one’s own learning.”²¹ “On the basic definition of learner autonomy, there has been a remarkable degree of consensus around the idea that autonomy involves learners taking more control over their learning. In recent work, this definition is also often linked to

¹⁹L. Simões, L.B. Gouveira, *Targeting the Millennial generation. III Jornadas de Publicidade e comunicação. A Publicidade para o consumidor do Sèc. XXI*.UFP.Porto.10 de Abril.

http://homepage.ufp.pt/lmbg/com/lsimoes1_sopcom08.pdf [access March 1, 2015].

²⁰ D.Ciechanowska, *Student responsibility in deep learning*, [in:] K.Denek, A. Kamińska, P.Oleśniewicz (eds.), *Education of tomorrow. Since education in family to system aspects of education*, Sosnowiec 2014.

²¹ D. Ezgi Avcı Vilea, I. Büyükduman, *Breaking the Chains: Autonomous Learners*. 4th International Conference on New Horizons in Education, https://www.academia.edu/5423662/Breaking_the_chains_Autonomous_learners. [access February 7, 2015]

the philosophical idea of personal autonomy, which involves people struggling for greater control over the course of their lives.”²² The university deprived of its scientific autonomy, that must submit its educational content to external accreditation, in which students more frequently look for simple descriptions and clear information rather than ways to solve problems is very difficult for the autonomy of learners. Traditional university labor standards mentioned and appreciated by respected professors who remember the times of their studies in the postwar years and the “apprenticeship” with their masters unfortunately no longer fit the learning style and the characteristics of the contemporary university students.

It is often not one but two generations that divide academics from their students. If professors expect their students to use methods and standards of work such that they had used, they are exposed to educational failure. “In order to teach autonomy, the teacher must exercise autonomy in his own learning. A teacher who does not practice autonomy cannot assist his student in achieving a level of autonomy.”²³ These failures may arise from the difference in conditions of socialization of the young generation. Therefore, academics should take note that the new generation was shaped differently, thinks in other categories and is committed to the objectives of the digital 21st century.

Autonomous learning is possible when certain conditions are met. It is not learning without support. Autonomous learning is the use of appropriate learning strategies with the care of the teacher who has the obligation to indicate the direction of individual work and learning objectives and methods for their verification. Autonomous learning ability is particularly important in times of fast pace of life and quick growth rate of knowledge. It is easy to get used to learning limited to memorizing facts and descriptions, and to draw from widely available sources of knowledge regarding them as one's own.

The problem of copying and appropriation of content derived from digital sources of knowledge should be mentioned here.²⁴ It is a mass phenomenon occurring at each institution and in every country.²⁵ Not all academic centers have the courage to openly discuss and denounce the problem.²⁶ Students left alone in the institutional machinery of the university will not learn the art of learning, which is thought, reflection and the search for truth. “The

²² P.Benson, What's New in autonomy. JALT 2011 Plenary Speaker, <http://jalt.org/conference/jalt2015/plenary-speakers> [access February 5, 2015]

²³ D. Elliott Parallel, *Blogging: Explorations in Teacher and Learner Autonomy*, https://www.academia.edu/11213433/Parallel_Blogging_Explorations_in_Teacher_and_Learner_Autonomy

²⁴ S.Nadelson, *Academic Misconduct by University Students: Faculty Perceptions and Responses*. “Plagiarism, Cross - Disciplinary Studies in Plagiarism, Fabrication, and Falsification”, 2007, No 2, (2)p. 1 - 10.

²⁵ *Plagiarism across Europe and beyond. Conference Proceedings*. Brno 2013.

²⁶ A. Błażnio, M.Werenko, *Academic Cheating is Contagious: the Influence of the Presence of Others on Honesty. A Study report*, “International Journal of Applied Psychology”, 2011, No. 1(1) p. 14-19

main issue in discussions about autonomy as a character ideal seems to be the tension between substantive independence, and the dependence on and connection with others.”²⁷ It is in the conditions of digitization of knowledge and its interference in most aspects of life that shaping the elites needs to realize their distinctiveness from the surrounding pop culture and the value of independent thought. It is a condition (dimension) of human functioning which is not achieved alone.²⁸ A tutor, an adviser, a facilitator, a master is highly needed to students discovering the areas of knowledge which they have chosen according to their passion and needs. Writing these words, I wonder how much room this flattening of educational requirements for universities leaves for passion and for discovering the truth, and building a better world. Could it not be that students only take up studies in order to get a job? As you can see, we still have vivid dreams of a university of science and truth.

The autonomy of learning is considered as a decision-making freedom, independence from influences and willingness to take responsibility for one's development. In the literature we find many references to the issue of autonomy. Autonomy is mentioned more often in the category of self-learning, especially in the case of foreign languages, and less attention is paid to the autonomy of the person in the philosophical dimension. Autonomy in this dimension, above all, is freedom. Free will is the freedom of choice, an act inherent in every human person, independent of any external circumstances. It consists in making an informed decision, not subject to pressures and control. Inner freedom determines the independence of the human being controlled by an internal moral law. Freedom makes the human individual responsible for his or her decisions. Freedom, responsibility, willingness to take independent decisions and bear the consequences are the most often mentioned components of autonomy in education. This is indicated by P.C. Candy, who sees autonomy among components of Self-Directed Learning.²⁹ Self-Directed Learning, according to Candy, is comprised of Personal Autonomy, Self-Management in learning, the Independent Pursuit of Learning and Learner-Control of Instruction. Autonomy is the first self-directed fundamental dimension of learning. SDL together with the ability to think rationally and learner autonomy are the basic characteristics of the reflective university student. The student who independently explores issues does not stop to discover the gist of the problem, compares opinions, generalizes and

²⁷ M. Schermer *The different faces of autonomy. Patient Autonomy in Ethical Theory and Hospital Practice*. Library of Ethics and Applied Philosophy, Vol. 13. 2002 p.10.

²⁸D.Elliott, *Learner Development through Meaningful Reflective Practice*, 2015, https://www.academia.edu/11211689/Learner_Development_through_Meaningful_Reflective_Practice

²⁹P.C. Candy, *Self-directed learning for lifelong learning*. San Francisco-Oxford, 1991.

draws conclusions, is today a highly desirable and extremely rare being. Autonomy is a basic feature of an adult learner, who is characterized by the ability to cooperate and show respect towards others. She or he is a creative person, as the ability to transcend limitations of the acquired knowledge and habits is a transgressive feature which requires the skill of independent thinking. He or she is able to be guided by rational criticism in evaluating phenomena and to focus on an independently established objective. It is an independent person who believes in his or her thinking, which allows her or him to solve complex problems.

The modern technological university is faced with many challenges and problems. We participate in the debate on the crisis of the university. It concerns not only reflective university, the crisis of the university also induces technological tasks and the “marketization” of science. A heated debate has been going on regarding this issue for many years an intensive discussion. Still, the university is a place of teaching for young people entering into an independent life, shaping their knowledge and skills to prepare for an undisturbed life. The high dynamics of culture and rapidly growing amount of information are far from stable foundations of life. Therefore, it is important that universities are able to take due care to address the evolution of the autonomy of students in its full, containing the component of the personality and personal philosophy. The autonomous person can become a reflective student and a valuable, creative employee.

References:

- Antonowicz D., Brzeziński J.M., “Doświadczenia parametryzacji jednostek naukowych z obszaru nauk humanistycznych i społecznych 2013 – z myślą o parametryzacji 2017” *NAUKA* No. 4, 2013.
- Benson P., What’s New in autonomy. JALT 2011 Plenary Speaker, <http://jalt.org/conference/jalt2015/plenary-speakers> [access February 5, 2015]
- Błachnio A., Werenko M., *Academic Cheating is Contagious: the Influence of the Presence of Others on Honesty. A Study report*, “International Journal of Applied Psychology”, 2011, No. 1(1)
- Błędowki P., “*Uniwersytet a przemoc. Krytyka postmodernistyczna*” [in:] K.Leja, (ed.), *Spoleczna odpowiedzialność uczelni*. Gdańsk 2008.
- Bourdieu P., Passeron J-C., *Reprodukcja. Elementy teorii systemu nauczania*, PWN, Warszawa 1990.
- Candy P.C., *Self-directed learning for lifelong learning*. San Francisco-Oxford, 1991.

- Ciechanowska D., *Akademickie kształcenie pokolenia Y w perspektywie zmian w dydaktyce szkoły wyższej*, [in:] D.Ciechanowska (ed.), *Perspektywy zmian w praktyce kształcenia akademickiego*, Szczecin 2014.
- Ciechanowska D., *Student responsibility in deep learning*, [in:] K.Denek, A. Kamińska, P.Oleśniewicz (eds.), *Education of tomorrow. Since education in family to system aspects of education*, Sosnowiec 2014.
- Cwynar K., "Idea uniwersytetu w kulturze europejskiej" *Polityka i Społeczeństwo* No.2, 2005.
- Elliott D., Parallel, *Blogging: Explorations in Teacher and Learner Autonomy*, https://www.academia.edu/11213433/Parallel_Blogging_Explorations_in_Teacher_and_Learner_Autonomy
- Elliott D., *Learner Development through Meaningful Reflective Practice*, 2015, https://www.academia.edu/11211689/Learner_Development_through_Meaningful_Reflective_Practice
- Ezgi Avcı Vilela D., Büyükduman I., *Breaking the Chains: Autonomous Learners*. 4th International Conference on New Horizons in Education, https://www.academia.edu/5423662/Breaking_the_chains_Autonomous_learners. [access February 7, 2015]
- Giroux H. A., *Higher Education under Siege and the Promise of Insurgent Public Memory*, 2015.
- Jemielniak D., Greenwood D. J., *Wake Up or Perish: Neo-Liberalism, the Social Sciences, and Salvaging the Public University*, [in:] *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies* 2015, Vol. 15(1)
- Kola A. F., *Uniwersytet jako pralnia. Esej o stanie akademickiego namysłu nad nauką i szkolnictwem wyższym w Polsce*, „*Rocznik Pedagogiczny*”, 2012 No. 35.
- Leja K., *Uniwersytet organizacją służącą otoczeniu* [in:] K.Leja (ed.), *Społeczna odpowiedzialność uczelni*, Gdańsk 2008.
- *Magna Charta Universitatum Bologna*: www.bologna-bergen2005.no
- Melosik Z., *Kultura, akademia i edukacja – modernistyczno/postmodernistyczne interpretacje*, „*Przegląd Pedagogiczny*”, 2011, No. 1.
- Nadelson S., *Academic Misconduct by University Students: Faculty Perceptions and Responses*. "Plagiary, Cross - Disciplinary Studies in Plagiarism, Fabrication, and Falsification", 2007, No 2, (2)
- Nowacki F., *Aktywność przedsiębiorcza uniwersytetu trzeciej generacji– uniwersytet czy przedsiębiorstwo?* [in:] D.Burawski (ed.), *Uniwersytet trzeciej generacji. Stan i perspektywy rozwoju.*, Poznań 2013.
- *Plagiarism across Europe and beyond. Conference Proceedings*. Brno 2013.
- Schermer M., *The different faces of autonomy. Patient Autonomy in Ethical Theory and Hospital Practice*. *Library of Ethics and Applied Philosophy*, Vol. 13. 2002 .
- Simões L. Gouveira L.B., *Targeting the Millennial generation. III Jornadas de Publicidade e comunicação. A Publicidade para o consumidor do Sèc. XXI*.UFP.Porto.10 de Abril. http://homepage.ufp.pt/lmbg/com/lsimoes1_sopcom08.pdf [access March 1, 2015].

- *Sorbonne Joint Declaration. Joint declaration on harmonization of the architecture of the European higher education system*, Paris, the Sorbonne, May 25 1998: http://eua.uni-graz.at/Sorbonne_declaration.pdf
- Wasielewski M., *Kształcenie i wychowanie w szkole wyższej– pomiędzy tradycją a współczesnością* [in:] A. Łacina-Łanowski i J. Stanek (ed.), *Edukacja – wychowanie – oświata w perspektywie temporalnej (między przeszłością a współczesnością)*, Łódź 2014.
- Yahr M.A., Schimmel K., *Comparing current students to a pre-Millennial generation: are they really different?* „Research in Higher Education Journal”, June 2013.
- Yahr M.A., Schimmel K., *Comparing current students to a pre-Millennial generation: are they really different?*, “Research in Higher Education Journal”, June 2013.
- Zawadzki M., *Deuniwersytacja współczesnego uniwersytetu*, [in:] Ł.Sułkowski. (ed.), *Krytyczny nurt zarządzania*, M.Zawadzki, Warszawa 2014.
- Zawadzki M., *Krajowe ramy panoptyzacji*, <http://michalzawadzki.innpoland.pl/115613,krajowe-ramy-panoptyzacji> [access march 2015]

The contemporary university
as a threat to learner autonomy

Keywords: learner autonomy, higher education, university transformation

Abstract: The modern university was shaped by the centuries-old tradition of European universities. The idea established in the last century thanks to Humboldt, where the university is a community of professors, in which knowledge is created and teaching is done in equal measures, has been criticized by postmodernists, who accused the university of violent action towards its stakeholders. Under the influence of economic transformations, the contemporary university is forced to serve a third mission and to become the technological university competing in the market economy on par with other entities. Students, who are digital natives, cannot learn deeply or seek knowledge. The university, occupied with soliciting its position in international statistics does not develop the autonomy of learners that could prevent them from the need to memorize superficial information and from thoughtless participation in the society.

Współczesny uniwersytet zagrożeniem dla autonomii uczenia się studentów

Słowa kluczowe: autonomia uczenia się, kształcenie akademickie, ewolucja uniwersytetu

Streszczenie: Współczesny uniwersytet ukształtowany został wielowiekową tradycją uniwersytetów europejskich. Ustanowiona w ubiegłym wieku za sprawą Humboldta idea uniwersytetu będącego w wspólnotą profesorów, w którym na równi tworzy się wiedzę oraz jej nauza uległa krytyce postmodernistów, którzy zarzucili mu działania przemocowe wobec swych interesariuszy. Pod wpływem przemian gospodarczych współczesny uniwersytet zmuszony jest służyć trzeciej misji i stać się uniwersytetem technologicznym konkurującym na ekonomicznym rynku na równi z innymi podmiotami. Studenci będący generacją cyfrowych tubylców nie potrafią uczyć się głęboko i poszukiwać wiedzy. Uniwersytet zajęty zabieganiem o swoją pozycję w międzynarodowych statystykach nie rozwija autonomii uczących się aby obronić ich przed powierzchownym zapamiętywaniem i bezrefleksyjnym udziałem w społeczeństwie.