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Abstract

The Bologna Process defends the adoption of a higher education in teaching-learning methodologies that – in contraposition to the previous model based on the transmission of knowledge, which for being essentially theoretical, gives the student a passive role in the knowledge construction process – allows a (pro)active, autonomous and practical learning, where the student acquires and develops his competences. The personal tutorial guidance sessions are included in the teaching contact hours.

This abstract presents a study about the University of Minho (first cycle) Courses Students’ perceptions of the personal tutorial guidance sessions’ relevance in the scope of the learning-teaching process, so as to confirm if the implementation/implantation of the commonly called tutorial (type) education, as an approach to an active, autonomous and practical learning, is sensed by the learners themselves.

The institutional consideration on the students’ perceptions of the teaching-learning process in the University of Minho

In the scope of the implantation in Portugal of the denominated Bologna Process, the Working Group for the Reorganization of the Higher Education Network « Bologna : Agenda for Excellence », on the result of the concerned study, recognizes that « the teaching methodologies applied (…) do not consider the new realities of a global first cycle higher education », since, amongst other constraints, « the teaching is essentially magisterial, little motivator for the increasingly heterogeneous learner body » (SIMÃO, SANTOS & COSTA, 2004 : 3.8). Besides, by recognizing that the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) introduces a new paradigm in the organization of the learner centered teaching and in the training purposes, the same Working Group underlines, still on the same study, that that system has « implications on the learning methodologies, inevitably active, cooperative and participative » (SIMÃO, SANTOS & COSTA, 2004 : 5.4).

In the framework of convergence with the guiding principles of the Bologna Process, the University of Minho – hereafter designated as UM –, by registering, from the school year 2006/2007 on, most of its courses in the paradigm designated as Bologna Model, expresses, besides other principles, its particular adhesion to the reformulation of the teaching-learning methodologies, so as to confer « greater emphasis to the student’s work », mostly by introducing the active learning « in contraposition to a passive teaching based on the knowledge transmission » (UM, 2007a : n.p.).

In the scope of the specific process to follow-up the quality of the teaching in the UM, initiated in 1991, this higher education establishment promotes, since 2004, the evaluation of
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the quality of the teaching-learning process, through the self-report questionnaires Students’ Perceptions of the Teaching-Learning (PEA) and Teachers’ Perceptions of the Teaching-Learning (PED) – from the adaptation and validation to the Portuguese higher education context of the Student’s Evaluation of Educational Quality – SEEQ (MARSH, 1987, 1991, 2001) – given that UM considers those « perceptions can provide a necessary basis to the proposal of alterations to be introduce on the evaluation of this section » (UM, 2007b : n.p.).

The evaluation of the teaching dimension through the students’ perceptions of higher education – singular aspect which is the focus of this study – has been gaining relevance, in a scientific and political perspective, as an important indicator of the educational quality (AMARAL, 1998 ; AMARAL & ROSA, 2004 ; MARSH, 1987, 2001 ; MARSH & ROCHE, 1994 ; RAMSDEN, 1991 ; SANTIAGO et al., 2001 ; SIMÃO, 2003a, 2003b ; SIMÕES, 2000 ; SOBRINHO, 2000). That is because learners, for being the main agents of the learning dimension, can not be impeded to participate in the evaluation of the parallel teaching dimension (MURRAY, 1984), despite the evaluation of that dimension through the students’ perceptions isn’t considered to be sufficient per se to assess the education quality, since the unidimensional/unidirectional nature of the learners representations does not include all the complexity of the teaching-learning process (BEDGOOD & POLLARD, 1999 ; MILLMAN, 1981).

Although the forms/modalities to evaluate the teaching dimension should be multiple/diversified (teachers’ self-evaluation, evaluation by and among peers, teachers’ portfolio, subject portfolio…) and subject to combinations in a reciprocal complementarity perspective (ESTRELA & SIMÃO, 2003 ; VIEIRA et al., 2002) so as to even the limitations of the unidimensional/unidirectional aspect of the learners’ representations for the evaluation of the complex teaching-learning process in higher education field, the priority resort to the application of questionnaires (paper-and-pencil or online) is a primary form/modality to collect the corresponding information privileged for the generality of the scientific studies about the teaching dimension evaluation and for the institutions which use that same evaluation (MARSH & ROCHE, 1997).

Despite the PEA questionnaire in force at the UM, through the corresponding items, anticipates the teaching-learning quality in the scope of the multidimensional conceptualization, complemented by several items concerning the global evaluation of the curricular unit and the teacher comparing with the remaining curricular units and other teachers on the course (UM, 2007d : s.p.), the tool reveals more than a teaching paradigm (based on the instruction-transmission of information, knowledge and contents from the teacher-instructor to the student-trainee which vulgarized designation is traditional pedagogics) than the learning paradigm (based on the construction/discovery of information, knowledge and contents by the student-learner with high or low support form the teacher-helper, and more commonly defined as active pedagogics) (LEGENDRE, 1993).

Giving the teacher the priority statute of agent on the teaching-learning process, the formulation of the corresponding items in the UM’s PEA questionnaire denounces, in the scope of the Bologna Model courses, the conceptual and functional deviation of that same evaluation tool for the generic pedagogical approach sponsored by the Bologna Process. In other words, the active pedagogics, of this study’s context in its generic sense, i.e. pedagogics that confronts the learner with problems to solve facilitating him the access to the necessary and sufficient information and resources (lato sensu) through methodologies that defend that the student must have the conditions which lead him to personal discovery, i.e. methodologies centered in the intellectual and physical participation of the student-learner in
his learning through the manipulation and the research against the passive reception of knowledge (LEGENDRE, 1993: 843) so that the learner can construct his knowledge by acting, groping, trying, creating hypothesis, verifying…

Within the perspective that defends the construction of the knowledge and contents by the student-learner in a (completely or at least relatively) independent way, emerges, in the context of the Portuguese higher education, the pedagogic formula defined as « personal tutorial guidance session » – hereafter designated as TS –, i.e. in the scope of the working sessions/hours based on the teacher-student present or distanital meeting – collective sessions/hours (category – hereafter designated as CS – which regroups the theoretical sessions/hours and theoretical-practical sessions/hours sub-categories), laboratory sessions/hours, field work sessions/hours, tutorial sessions/hours and internship (hours) – all the sessions/hours where there is an academic and/or professional teacher accompaniment whose role is to assure the personalised adjustment of the student's learning process regarding the support that shall promote the construction through research and the handling of knowledge and contents by the student-learner's himself, so that the subject of the educational situation can acquire and/or develop reasoning and autonomous capacities and competences.

On the generic contexts of the Portuguese higher education teaching in universities and particularly at UM and within the implantation of the Bologna Process, to ensure, in the scope of a training evaluation, the follow up of the introduction and implantation of the teaching-learning process of the Bologna Model courses, the active pedagogics, so as to verify if the teaching paradigm is being replaced by the learning paradigm, i.e. if and at what extend do the instruction/transmission teaching methodologies, whose agent is the teacher, are being put aside or at least reduced and the construction/discovery methodologies, that stand on the student’s (pro) active action, emerge and, if not, progress so as to surpass those that defend the traditional pedagogics, the main research question of this study is a question with two different aspects: according to the students’ perceptions, are the curricular units teaching-learning process of the Bologna Model courses actually described by the emergency and the implantation of the active pedagogics against de traditional pedagogics and if not, at what extend do the TS contribute for the renewal paradigm.

The students’ perceptions of the implantation of the personal tutorial guidance sessions at the University of Minho

This study is based on a population of second year students of the first Cycle of the Bologna Model Courses at UM which schooling period of reference include the first and the second semesters and the first semester of the 2006/2007 and 2007/2008 school years respectively.

This study had the participation of 450 (44,5%) from a total of 1 011 students (from Sciences, economic and social Sciences, social Sciences, Education and Psychology, Engineering and Architecture, Languages and Human Sciences and Childhood and elementary Education). The categories sex, student/worker statute were before disregarded due to the combination of the data from the literature adapted to each case, that does not indicate significant correlations of those categories with the results obtained on the teaching component evaluations (DAS & DAS, 2001; FELDMAN, 1983) and because the UM's PEA questionnaire does not attribute great significance to those categories on the corresponding global results.
To obtain the data to accomplish the purpose of this study, and considering the functional importance of the questionnaire, indicated on the scientific references presented earlier, and as a predominant resource to collect corresponding privileged information by the generality of the scientific studies that refer the issue of the teaching dimension evaluation on the institutions that accomplish this evaluation, the study defends this modality of questionnaire, and introduces the anonymity of the respondents to release them form several constraints attached to the nominal identification of the participants (BRAVO, 1991).

While questionnaire (duly certified) aiming to verify, based on the students’ perceptions of the teaching-learning process, if and at what extend is the traditional pedagogics is being replaced by the active pedagogics, recurring to the pedagogic formula TS, within a global/transversal perspective of the curricular units of the UM’s first Cycle Bologna Model Courses with regard to the reference period previously indicated and considering the global induction, that the study wants to obtain through the questionnaire, has since the beginning a syncretistic character of the teaching-learning process, since the corresponding global vision isn't based on the combination of partial inductions by curricular unit, as the questionnaire asks immediately the students-respondents to induct the generic/transversal nature concerning the previously indicated pairs (which is essentially due to ethical reasons associated to the public disclosure of the identifying results of the pairs curricular unit/teacher, which reserved knowledge is consecrated to the UM in the context of the institutional evaluation process of the respective teaching-learning process). The final version of the tool deploys in three sections.

The A and B sections gather in each ensemble, six items presenting the statements reciprocally and inversely symmetric conceptually, since these indicators raise, within a synthetic approach and a contrastive perspective, traditional and active pedagogic paradigms associated respectively to the anterior polar temporal and contemporary dimensions to/of the Bologna Mode at UM and where the students-respondents are asked to indicate for each item and with regard to the CS and TS categories the respective degree of agreement or disagreement (Table 1).

Table 1: Comparative/contrastive synopses of the sections A and B of the Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before the implantation of the Bologna model (Section A)</th>
<th>The teaching-learning process has given/gives priority/primacy ...</th>
<th>Since the implantation of the Bologna model (Section B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... to theoretical knowledge teaching.</td>
<td>... to the confrontation of the students with real situations-problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... to the teachers’ oral transmission of knowledge.</td>
<td>... to the students’ discovery of knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... to the accumulation of knowledge.</td>
<td>... to the students’ reflexive (re)construction ok knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... to the separation of the learning and evaluation processes.</td>
<td>... to the activities from practical situations to theory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... to activities from theory to practice.</td>
<td>... to the integration of the evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Traditional pedagogics</strong></th>
<th><strong>Active pedagogics</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Paradigm centered on the teaching dimension)</td>
<td>(Paradigm centered on the learning dimension)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In these two first sections of the questionnaire, and considering the purpose of the study to determine the perceptions – as results (and not as operations) – concerning this teaching-learning process, the tool uses a classification scale by addition, commonly designated as Likert scale, that presents a continuum between a very unfavourable (1) pole and a very favourable (6) pole, so as to collect the point of view of each student-respondent concerning an ensemble of items through the indication of the agreement/disagreement degree regarding the respective affirmations.

The C section of this tool presents two tables which indicate six pairs of verbs alphabetically disposed in two groups and within a reciprocally antonymic or at least dichotomic point of view, as significantly representative of the generic/transversal behavioural operations of the most paradigmatic students and teachers regarding the traditional and active pedagogies, since each pairs of verbs is equally associated to the temporal polar dimensions already presented on the previously described A and B section, and where we ask each student-responder to carry out hierarchic classifications, regarding the student and teacher and the CS and TS categories, of six pairs of verbs by decreasing order, more specifically through numbers 1 (most important) to 6 (the least important), the pairs of verbs that best correspond to the behavioural operations more frequently used by students and teachers in the scope of the traditional and active pedagogies (Table 2).

![Table 2: Contrastive synopses of the paradigmatic behavioural operations of the traditional and active pedagogies – Categories: student and teacher](image)

According to the feedback from the tool’s validation process and regarding the first three corresponding versions, the final version of the questionnaire presents, in this section, pairs of verbs (which inventory and selection emerge from their indication, individual in a first stage and by homologous reference groups of students-responders on a second stage), aiming to supply the reciprocal precision of pairs of lexemes’ signification, since the registry of a single verb has revealed the tendency to instigate amongst students-learners a reinforced extensive imprecision of the corresponding signification as consequence of the lexical vulgarization principle, which impact on the students-learners’ vocabulary from the questionnaire requires the specific lexicological reciprocal charge of each lexeme regarding the linguistic/disciplinary context from the questionnaire to be the subject on the conceptual plan of a possible reduction process of the corresponding terminological amplitude and the ambiguity.
The questionnaire process management is accomplished on the first semester’s last week of the 2007/2008 school year. The distribution and the collection of questionnaires were insured by each student-delegate of the curricular year of each student-respondent group and the filling of the questionnaire was accomplished in five days at a non predetermined site, advising about the need that the questionnaire should be filled individually by each student/respondent without discussing/debating the content of the tool and/or adjusting/comparing the corresponding answers with anyone, namely with any of their pairs.

The global results of the items on A and B sections – which internal consistency index corresponds to the alpha of Cronbach .85 –, reveal, synthetically, as an average (which emerges from additive treatment of the partial scores affected by the weighting coefficients corresponding to the ordinal identification numbers of the homologous scale degrees consecrated in the questionnaire and of the respective arithmetic division by the corresponding number of effective responders at each item, dully associated to the exclusion of the respondents that used the with no opinion/does not answer options of the scale), the central tendency of the numeric data ensemble associated to each item, since this numeric indicator is that which UM defends to treat/appreciate within a global perspective of the respective PEA questionnaire’s results.

The results of the A section, were the formulation of the items puts the teaching-learning process in perspective according to the traditional pedagogics paradigm (Chart 1), indicate that for the students-respondents (1) the teaching and the oral transmission of theoretical contents by teacher emerge like the majority/preponderant practices at the heart of the teaching-learning process of the SC, (2) the memorization and accumulation operations associated to the content memorization and cumulation operations, respectively, reveal a regression tendency, although lesser in the second case on the TS table, (3) the activities that involve applying the theory to the practice mark – surprisingly – a reinforced presence within the TS and (4) the exclusion of the evaluation process of the corresponding learning process continues to be a significant practice in the frame of the two types of session.
The teaching-learning process gives priority/primacy to theoretical knowledge teaching.

to the teachers’ oral transmission of knowledge

to the students’ memorization-learn by heart

to the accumulation of knowledge

to activities from theory to practice

to the separation of the learning and evaluation processes

The results of the B section, where the items formulation relieves from the teaching-learning process corresponding to the active pedagogics paradigm (Chart 2), signal (1) a significant frequency of progression of the operations that try to confront the intervenients of the educational situations-problems so as to stimulate the (re)construction and the (inter)relation of contents by the intervenients, namely from an inductive approach, on the two types of sessions, even if these initiatives are more frequently applied on TS and (2) the persistence of the tendency to separate the evaluation process from the corresponding teaching process on CS and TS.
The teaching-learning process gives priority/primacy ...

The global results of the C section relate to the student category (Table 3), that, as is the case of the treatment given to the A and B sections, even with the adaptations from the hierarchic classification of the six pairs of verbs by decreasing order (1-6) accomplished by the students-respondents, are part of an additive process of partial scores affected by the weighting coefficients inversely correspondent to the ordinal identification numbers of the hierarchic position previously indicated, followed by the arithmetic division by the corresponding number of effective students-respondents for each item/pair of verbs, reveal synthetically, as an average, the central tendency of the numeric data ensemble associated to each pair of verbs which determine, in a decreasing order, the hierarchic position of the six pair of verbs globally more representative of the behavioural operations most frequently patented by the students at the heart of the teaching-learning process developed in the frame of the CS and the TS, although the memorise/learn by heart pair obtains results which indicate that those intellectual operations are not preponderant on CS or on TS, in the case of the second type of session that fact sends the operations most adequate to a tutorial type teaching-learning process to a subordinate position against the intellectual operations which occupy the two first positions of the classifications, since these allow the teaching paradigm.
Table 3: Classification of the students’ behaviour / Average in decreasing order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In collective sessions (CS)</th>
<th>Verb pairs globally more representative of the most frequently patented behavioural operations by students</th>
<th>In tutorial sessions (TS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Averages in decreasing order (max. : 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hear – listen</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apply – execute</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>question – ask</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>propose – prospect</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research – discover</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>memorize – learn by heart</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Traditional pedagogics**  
(Student-taught: passive receptor of knowledge)  
**Active pedagogics**  
(Student-learner: active constructor of the knowledge)

Upon a treatment similar to that previously performed for the student category, the global results of section C concerning the teacher category (Table 4) synthetically point out, always as an average, the central tendency of all the numerical data related to each pair of verbs that determines in decreasing order the hierarchic position of the six pairs of verbs that most globally represent the behavioural operations most frequently done by teachers within the teaching-learning processes developed in the frame of CS and TS: the scores show that verb pairs representing behavioural operations of teachers within the paradigm of traditional pedagogics — determine-prescribe, teach-impregnate and expose-instruct — mark a fairly significant presence within TS, although it should be enhanced that the expose-instruct duo no more occupies the prime position rations held in CS and that the teacher tries, in TS sessions, to hear-listen more to the students than in CS sessions.
Table 4: Classification of the teachers’ behaviour / Average in decreasing order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In collective sessions (CS)</th>
<th>Verb pairs globally more representative of the most frequently patented behavioural operations by teachers</th>
<th>In tutorial sessions (TS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Averages in decreasing order (max. : 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expose – instruct</td>
<td>3,9</td>
<td>3,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teach – impregnate</td>
<td>3,8</td>
<td>3,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suggest – propose</td>
<td>3,6</td>
<td>3,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>determine – prescribe</td>
<td>3,4</td>
<td>3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hear – listen</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>3,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animate – accompany</td>
<td>2,7</td>
<td>2,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traditional pedagogics
(Teacher-instructor : agent transmitter of knowledge)

Active pedagogics
(Teacher-assistant : subsidiary agent in the construction process by the subject of knowledge)

From the confrontation of the classifying order of the behavioural operations by students and teachers regarding the types of work session held, one has to recognize that the verb pair that represents traditional pedagogics still state their presence in TS, which is a sign that tutorial approach is still not really rooted in TS, although the designation of this type of session points to the development of such approach in terms of the method orientation of the teaching-learning process.

Given the discrepancy of the obtained results, on one hand, in sections A and B of the questionnaire, showing a tendency, although shy, of evolving behavioural operations, from both students and teachers, going towards the implementation of the paradigm of active pedagogics with TS, and on the other hand, in section C of the tool, in which the data reveal that behavioural operations, both of students and teachers, within the teaching-learning process put into practice in the frame of TS are still serving the paradigm of traditional pedagogics. The study has suffered an extension that, for a matter of accuracy, has taken the form of semi-structured interviews to a sample of students-respondents to the Questionnaire, of which the conclusions are summarized as follows: although mostly every curricular unit includes, in the concerning institutional teaching program, as many learning results as specific time periods for the occurrence of TS, the inquired students stated that TS are blurred, in practice and in general, with the meetings, quite occasional and of variable, mostly short duration, initiated by the actors of the educational situation, between the students and the teachers, taking place in the offices of the educational situation agents, whose first aim is to obtain information and – remarkably – instructions, not to respond to the needs of a project-oriented learning process, but rather to ensure the acquisition and/or the consolidation of the subjects studied in the CS, conducting to an absence of field tutorial
practices corresponding to the intentions stated in the institutional teaching programmes, particularly due both to the inexistence of effective pedagogical instruments and to the lack of teaching method preparation of teachers concerning a tutorial approach to the teaching-learning process.

To (not) conclude...

The results of the study about TS suggest that students from the 1st Cycle courses in UM, when inquired about their perceptions about the corresponding teaching-learning process resulting from the Bologna Process, do not show a reciprocally proportional representation of their counter parts whose formulations are described as contrasting in the framework of a continuum assumed between the paradigmatic poles of traditional pedagogics and active pedagogics since, when the sum treatment of the averages corresponding by item of the groups (sections A, B and C) associated to these paradigmatic poles, their sum would attain a higher level than those of the scales according to which the students-respondents have declared their level of agreement or disagreement towards the presented items. The inexistence of a previously identified proportional correspondence, and object of a subsequent corrective treatment adjusted to such effect, at the time of face-to-face an personal contacts led by the study researchers with the students-respondents who participated in the instrument validation, as well as with those who attended to the interviews following the collection of the questionnaire results, mainly outgrows of the impact of the so-called lexical simplification of the students-respondents vocabulary or of the terminological, if not conceptual, imprecision, of the disciplinarily marked lexemes in the scope of the scientific domains of the reference courses.

However, the same global results suggest that the items that verbalise practices preferably outgrown of the traditional pedagogics paradigm, in general, not only reveal themselves predominant in the teaching-learning context of CS, but also persistently appear, sometimes dominantly (according to the results of section C of the Questionnaire) within the homologous process concerning the TS. One must also stress that the verbalisation items of the practices mostly outgrown from the active pedagogics suffer a positive perception enhanced in the context of the TS Teaching-learning process corresponding to the Bologna Model compared to its counterpart previous to the implantation of such model (Silva, Silva e Silva & Moreira, 2007). Nonetheless, still according to the perceptions of students-respondents, the existence of records, more discrete though, of such practices still occurs in the framework of the counterpart process of CS.

Despite the inexistence of a strict inverse proportionality, especially when the results outgrow of formulations presented as polar paradigmatic forms in pedagogical terms, like the co-existence, in the teaching-learning contexts of both CS and TS, of contrasting, sometimes even incompatible from a conceptual perspective, practices resulting from traditional and active pedagogics, the global results of this study suggest that practices more focused on the first and active role of the student-learner than on the leadership of the teacher and more prone to encourage, in the framework of a considered process, the discovery-construction-interrelation of knowledge by the student himself, through an inductive rather than deductive initiative and whose teaching-learning process should be integrated in its own development, in a perspective of reciprocal complementarity of formative and summative assessment, should be, globally and currently, object of reinforced and precedent execution consistent within the teaching-learning process of TS.
Although the global results suggest that tutorial approach is still does not primarily imposed in TS of most UM 1st cycle courses in conformity to the Bologna Model, one should enhance that the students’ perceptions in some few courses suggest a quite generalised use of such approach in those courses, of which the Course of Applied Biology is an example, for the results of sections A and B of the Questionnaire present average quantitative data between grade 5 and 6. Such results unequivocally associate the teaching and learning paradigms to CS and TS, respectively. A tendency also emerging, although still quite discreetly, in science and engineering courses, in contrast with letters and human and social sciences courses, in which such methodology standing is almost residual, if not inexistent.

As any other study, this work presents limitations resulting essentially, on one hand, of the fact that each student-respondent does not necessarily refer to the same reality to express the perceptions of the teaching-learning process, not only because of the differentiation of the corresponding curricular year, but also due to the synthetic approach of the questionnaire object, and on the other hand, of the inexistence of counterpart instrumental benchmarks. Thus, we will try to reduce, if not neutralise, such constraints in a near future in the context of continuation, extension and broadening of research in the framework of the generalised implementation of the Bologna Model in UM.
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Questions to debate

The global results of this study gave origin to two questions (which are, moreover, object of complementary studies already in course in UM):

– Which teaching and methodology skills should be transversally implemented/introduced in the individual (student) and agent (teacher) categories of the educational context so that appropriate procedures of the tutorial approach are adopted and executed in tutorial personal orientation sessions?

– Which factors determine or condition the significant generalisation of non adoption and non execution of tutorial approach procedures in the tutorial type personal orientation sessions in the so-called letters and social sciences courses, especially when compared to the science and engineering courses?