

PERSPEKTYWA METADYSKURSYWNA I TEORETYCZNA

*Władysław T. Miodunka**

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6392-4786>

THE ACHIEVEMENTS AND DEVELOPMENT PROSPECTS OF TEACHING POLISH AS A NON-NATIVE LANGUAGE

(THIS ARTICLE WAS TRANSLATED FROM POLISH BY JAKUB WOSIK)

Keywords: achievements, prospects, development, teaching Polish as a non-native language, discourse community, discourse of teaching Polish as a non-native language

Abstract. The discussion begins by indicating the strengths and weaknesses of teaching Polish as a non-native language today while focussing on how approaches to individual issues have changed. The main body of the article, devoted to the achievements of, and development prospects for, teaching Polish as a non-native language, is divided into three parts. The first includes remarks on the necessity to engage in further research into such subdisciplines of teaching Polish as a non-native language as the acquisition of Polish as a foreign and a second language, the preparation and evaluation of materials for teaching Polish as a non-native language, computer-aided teaching PFL, the reality of Polish studies in different countries and world regions, and the history of teaching Polish as a foreign language. The second part applies to the development of teaching Polish as a heritage and second language within the context of its development as a foreign language. The third part refers to people working for the growth of teaching Polish as a non-native language, and offers a discussion of the outcomes of a study by Grażyna Zarzycka of the discourse community of researchers and instructors of Polish as a non-native language and the discourse of teaching Polish as a non-native language itself.

1. THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF TEACHING POLISH AS A NON-NATIVE LANGUAGE TODAY

1.1. When I summarised the situation of the field of teaching Polish as a non-native language in the age of globalisation and informatisation, during the 4th Congress of Polish Studies Abroad at the Jagiellonian University, I enumerated its

*w.miodunka@uj.edu.pl, Jagiellonian University, Faculty of Polish Studies, Chair of Polish as a Foreign Language, ul. Grodzka 64, 31-044 Kraków.

strengths and weaknesses. The former aspects of the field at that time included: 1) references to European standards within the CEFR framework when training language instructors, developing of curricula, and preparing teaching aids; 2) provision of university-grade forms of education for future teachers of PFL in the form of 2-year master's studies or post-graduate studies; 3) preparing works which summarise our knowledge on various aspects of teaching Polish as a foreign language, which exist in university textbooks; 4) reinforcing the community of the researchers of teaching Polish as a non-native language by including academics who defend their doctoral theses and complete their habilitation procedures; and 5) integration of foreign Polish researchers with Polish centres of Polish studies (Miodunka 2010, p. 51).

I considered the following as the weaknesses of the field: 1) a lack of a clear policy of the Polish state in terms of teaching PFL and teaching Polish as a second language; 2) the impact of the conviction about the superiority of Polish studies training in preparation for teaching PFL, and the ignoring of the achievements of applied linguistics and of teaching Polish as a non-native language; 3) reducing the changes occurring in the field of teaching Polish as a non-native language to labels assigning new names to old practices, without ever considering the entire European system within which those practices occur; 4) the belief that an enthusiastic amateur may achieve more than a well-prepared specialist familiar with European standards and the achievements of teaching Polish as a non-native language viewed globally; and 5) the conviction that successful teaching of PFL at the university level can occur without an academic background or without research into teaching Polish as a non-native language, including without comparative studies (Miodunka 2010, pp. 51–52).

1.2. Now, nearly a decade since I uttered those words, I believe that I overdid it with works summarising the achievements of teaching Polish as a non-native language, in terms of teaching the parts of the language system, and individual skills, not to mention the approaches, methods and techniques being used. Such works are essential, but, basically, they are a thing of the future as Adriana Prizel-Kania's study *Rozwijanie sprawności rozumienia ze słuchu w języku polskim jako obcym* (2013) only heralded the new direction of works which should be pursued.

Furthermore, when I was discussing the strengths of teaching Polish as a non-native language, I was particularly impressed by the achievements in the methodology of teaching and learning PFL, which has continued to defend itself well, which was proven emphatically in Chapter 2 of *Glottodydaktyka polonistyczna* (Miodunka 2016, pp. 59–130). At that point, I had not been thinking consistently within the categories of the subdisciplines of teaching Polish as a non-native language, which if finally considered, will change the field's entire image. That is emphasised by the titles of Chapters 2 and 3, in which only the methodology of

teaching PFL was defined as an *existing subdiscipline*, while others were deemed as *developing* (Miodunka 2016, pp. 59–300). Clearly, then, first the emergence of the subdisciplines and the later consistent reference to them in analyses has been radically altering the vision of the entire output of teaching Polish as a non-native language.

1.3. As I return now to the strengths and weaknesses of teaching Polish as a non-native language, I must admit that I see them somewhat differently. The vision of the strengths has changed less significantly, though their hierarchy has undergone a considerable change. This is how I now see the strengths of teaching Polish as a non-native language:

An increasing integration of foreign centres of Polish studies with Polish centres of Polish studies. The process, which started with the establishment and registration of Stowarzyszenie “Bristol” Polskich i Zagranicznych Nauczycieli Kultury Polskiej i Języka Polskiego jako Obcego [Bristol Association of Polish and Foreign Teachers of Polish Culture and Polish as a Foreign Language] in Warsaw on 22 April 1997, has been unfolding successfully, and after nearly 20 years it culminated during the 6th World Congress of Polish Researchers and Instructors, which was held at the University of Silesia in Katowice in June 2016. One should remember that both ideas originated in the heads of foreign and not Polish Polish teachers: the idea to create the Bristol Association was proposed in 1995 by Donald Pirie, of the University of Glasgow, and the idea to organise another Congress of Foreign Polish Studies as a World Congress of Polish Researchers and Instructors was proposed by professor Tokimasa Sekiguchi of the University of Tokyo (see Miodunka 2016, pp. 315–328).

Making up for the set-backs visible in teaching Polish as a foreign language in the 1960s, 70s and 80s, and reaching the current level of development of teaching Polish as a non-native language, which has been proven by, e.g. *Glottodydaktyka polonistyczna* by W.T. Miodunka (2016). The progress occurred through the transfer of the achievements of general teaching of Polish as a non-native language, and the teaching of world languages, into teaching Polish as a foreign language, and by referring to European standards within the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (CEFR – ESOKJ, 2003) when training language instructors and developing curricula, and when preparing teaching aids.

The rapid development of the university-based forms of training of future teachers of Polish as a foreign and second language in the form of post-graduate studies, 2-year master’s studies, and 3-year bachelor’s studies. All those forms of education emerged through the initiatives of particular academics, and they constitute the achievements of individual universities. Young specialists, well versed in teaching Polish as a foreign and second language, are not sufficiently utilised either in the Polish education system or in teaching Polish abroad—that is mostly hindered by legal regulations for which individual ministries are responsible.

The consolidation of the community of teachers of Polish as a non-native language through, on the one hand, the emergence of a new generation of well-educated specialists, the most talented representatives of which undertake doctoral studies, develop and defend valuable and sometimes seminal doctoral dissertations, and, on the other, as academics who specialise in teaching Polish as a non-native language complete the habilitation process and acquire the positions of university professors (see Gębał 2018a, pp. 48–60).

The development of compendia and monographs gathering our knowledge in various aspects of teaching Polish as a non-native language, which can be used as university textbooks for students preparing to become teachers of Polish as a foreign and second language (see Miodunka 2016, pp. 66–107). The authors of such works should not, however, fall into complacency and they should remember that we live in a time of rapid change, and that they should consider those changes in the textbooks, which should be updated approximately every five years.

1.4. I consider the following as the weaknesses of teaching Polish as a non-native language:

Lack of consistency in the policies of the Polish state in terms of the promotion and teaching of Polish in the world. As indicated in the subchapter *Polityka językowa w zakresie promocji i nauczania polszczyzny w świecie* [Language policy in terms of the promotion and teaching of Polish in the world] (see Miodunka 2016, pp. 216–226), there have been developed in Poland numerous theoretical and policy-oriented works which refer to the subject. The problem is that the representatives of appropriate Polish state bodies are not familiar with those works, nor do they intend to read them or apply them in practice. Thus, those valuable works are not reflected, even in the slightest, in the social practice.

The Polish state's officials' consistent disregard for the arguments raised by professionals and following the opinions of all kinds of politicians. This opinion applies, unfortunately, to all governing officials, regardless of their political affiliations. Polish politicians disregard in unison the arguments and achievements of specialists and, to make matters worse, they are eager to, and efficient at, creating false "authority figures" of whom specialists have never heard before. They usually use the argument that it is time to give young people a chance, which has an underlying political argument: young people may be unaware of many issues, but they are politically pliable and they are eager to fulfil every, even the least measured, decision only to propel their professional careers.

The ignorance among the representatives of ministries of the fact that state universities, having been given autonomy and ensured self-reliance, have for many years utilised that autonomy by focussing on, e.g. teaching Polish as a foreign language in practice, and on preparing Polish and foreign students for the profession of teachers of Polish as a foreign language. Thus, the vision of an **all-**

-purpose Polish teacher consolidated in ministry documents lags over 25 years behind the existing university practice in Poland.

The fact that a significant group of specialists in teaching Polish as a non-native language are not aware that private schools engaged in teaching PFL have been gaining more and more teaching experience, and that in some terms they have surpassed universities in terms of their achievements in teaching Polish as a non-native language. If one compares the achievements of university centres of teaching Polish as a non-native language to the achievements of some private schools, one might conclude that the employees of university centres are content with permanent employment and a decent fulfilment of their teaching obligations, while the employees of private schools have to be innovative to first make their mark on the education market, and later to beat their competitors by drawing the required number of learners without whom they could not exist. The passive attitudes of some representatives of university centres do not result in any adverse outcomes as long as the Ministry of Science and Higher Education directs most foreign scholarship holders to those schools. Should the Ministry apply more severe selection criteria in the future, the existence of some university-based centres may be threatened.

The detrimental conviction still maintained by many instructors that successful teaching of Polish as a foreign language at the university level may occur without an academic background, i.e. without studies into teaching Polish as a non-native language, including comparative studies. *Glottodydaktyka polonistyczna* by W.T. Miodunka (2016) constitutes proof of how the vision of the role of Polish among the children and teenagers from Polish communities abroad has changed since researchers first focussed on their Polish, their Polish-foreign language bilingualism, and their changing identities.

Clearly, the first three weaknesses of teaching Polish as a non-native language refer more to the representatives of specific ministries than to academics who research teaching Polish as a non-native language, its theory and practice. One could reduce them to a statement that the representatives of the ministries are unaware of the achievements of teaching Polish as a non-native language either in reference to the country as a whole or to individual university centres; thus, they are oblivious to two facts: a) how many achievements of teaching Polish as a non-native language could be used for promoting Polish abroad; and b) further development of some of the initiatives in teaching Polish as a non-native language is not possible without the engagement and will of ministries, as those initiatives apply to the citizens of foreign countries in whose cases, universities' scopes of activity are limited.

2. THE PROSPECTS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF RESEARCH INTO TEACHING POLISH AS A NON-NATIVE LANGUAGE

Fulfilling research activities proves that a centre is mature and – by being an element of its existence – it determines a centre's position. That applies to university units, even if they were established exclusively for teaching purposes.

(Dąbrowska 2014, p. 255)

2.1. There is no doubt that the change in the perception of teaching Polish as a non-native language from one which was dominated by the methodology of teaching Polish as a foreign language to an interdisciplinary science which consists of various subdisciplines has emphatically expanded its potential area of study. I have experienced that myself as, when writing this article, I returned to my earlier publications, only to notice their limitations resulting from considering teaching Polish as a non-native language mainly within the framework of teaching methodology. My final remark applied to the weak and strong aspects of teaching Polish as a non-native language.

Framing it as an academic discipline composed of ten subdisciplines has immediately revealed the gaps in our knowledge on individual aspects of the process of teaching Polish as a non-native language. Those were briefly outlined in *Glottodydaktyka polonistyczna* in the reflections summarising the discussion of the individual disciplines. There I stated, e.g. that individual subdisciplines were at different stages of development and that many of those mostly lacked synthetic works and monographs summarising their outputs (Miodunka 2016, pp. 246–248). Such works would surely enable each of those disciplines to become properly established.

The previous studies within teaching Polish as a non-native language excessively focussed on the process of teaching Polish as a foreign language, forgetting about the essential process of learning it, which changes depending on the mentality, culture and tradition of learning in a country. This aspect will certainly demand more attention in the future. Future studies in the Far East seem particularly important, i.e. in countries where Polish studies have been developing surprisingly well, in China in particular.

It must also be stated that textbooks for teaching Polish as a foreign language have considered to a minor extent the needs of learners in this respect and usually have lacked any tips on how to learn Polish or prepare for exams. Some exceptions were discussed in *Glottodydaktyka polonistyczna* (Miodunka 2016, p. 343).

2.2. In the conclusion of Chapter 3, I wrote that information compendia which would establish the separate subdisciplines were still to be developed for:

- the acquisition of Polish as a foreign and a second language,
- the linguistics of teaching,

- preparation and evaluation of the materials for teaching Polish as a non-native language,
- computer-aided teaching of Polish as a foreign and a second language,
- the situation of Polish studies and of teaching Polish as a foreign language in individual countries and regions of the world, and
- the history of teaching Polish as a foreign and a second language.

2.2.1. In referring to each of them, I would like to first stress the significance of studies into the **acquisition of Polish** by learners who speak different languages: Slavic languages, (Indo)European languages, and, finally, oriental languages the structures of which are (much) different from that of Polish (see Seretny 2011). To appreciate how pressing the need for such studies is, consider the fact that teaching Polish as a non-native language has not yet deemed them necessary, limiting insights only to general remarks by teachers of Polish as a foreign language, which, even if they were valuable, are sometimes (very) superficial. The existing literature includes only a few works which could be considered as the seeds of such studies referring to polyglots who speak several languages. The existing studies have referred to the analysis of the level of proficiency in Polish as an outcome of the process of acquiring it over a long or short period. Yet the process itself, spread over time, has never been studied. Therefore, **I wish to especially indicate the lack of longitudinal studies covering a period of between a year to several years, which would document the process of acquiring Polish as a foreign or a second language, either by an individual or by a group of people** (e.g. pupils and students in beginner groups studied on a regular basis over several years). One excellent example of a longitudinal study was conducted by M. Głuszkowski (2011) of the Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń.

2.2.2. It would seem that teaching Polish as a non-native language, dominated by Polish researchers who possess academic degrees and titles, should possess a very strong **domain of teaching-focussed (also teaching Polish as non-native language) linguistic studies**. The reality is quite different. We especially lack contrastive grammar compendia intended for specific groups of learners; we also lack other related teaching aids. Considering the existing output in this respect, one must conclude that its advantage is that it has managed to avoid any factual deterioration, yet those aids need refreshing and updating in terms of their editing and appearance, depending on the needs of individual groups of learners.

2.2.3. I have often raised my concern about the very difficult situation of the area of **preparation and evaluation of the materials for teaching Polish as a non-native language**. It is so severe due to the fact that there is not a single general work devoted first to the process of preparing and then of evaluating teaching aids offered on the market. One cannot be satisfied with partial remarks, even those most apt regarding the teaching of individual parts of the language

system, individual skills, socio-cultural competence, or Polish culture and reality. We need general evaluations of groups of textbooks, e.g. those which fulfil the communication-oriented approach or the future task-oriented approach. Another option would be to compare pre-established criteria of all the textbooks being used at individual levels: for beginner, intermediate and advanced learners, or for individual European levels: A1, A2; B1, B2; C1, C2.

Grzegorz Zarzeczny's *Dyskurs glottodydaktyczny w wybranych podręcznikach do nauczania języka polskiego jako obcego. Badania korpusowe* (forthcoming) may become a major input into the evaluation of the materials for teaching Polish as a non-native language. The author has focussed on textbooks for teaching PFL published in the USA and the United Kingdom after the Second World War, which are known well to Polish teachers of Polish as a non-native language who have had the opportunity to work in one of those countries. Treating them as a study group is a major novelty, just as is subjecting them to a corpus analysis, a method which has almost never been used in the study of teaching Polish as a non-native language.

2.2.4. As for **computer-aided teaching of Polish as a foreign and a second language**, there need to emerge both monographic studies which would discuss and analyse individual aspects of that kind of education, and easily accessible and user-friendly related teaching materials. Sadly, though, it seems that young proponents of CALL would rather develop computer-aided teaching materials than study their application and the efficiency of teaching while using them, or thoroughly analyse them.

2.2.5. In the case of **the situation of Polish studies and the field of teaching Polish as a foreign language in individual countries and regions** of the world, one could discuss various detailed studies which usually apply to the situations at specific universities, but we lack works which generalise observations, e.g. at the level of a country or of a region consisting of several countries. It seems, however, that mutual contacts lead to various reflections and comparisons of the situations of Polish studies in two or more countries of a region. The publication of such studies would bring us closer to gaining general knowledge.

One example of such a study was the article by T. Sekiguchi *Bristol, Kongresy, SPTK... Przyczynek do historii organizowania międzynarodowych wspólnot polonistów* (2013). Polish readers first and foremost require clarification of the SPTK abbreviation, which is used by Polish researchers in the Far East as commonly as in Poland a person might use such abbreviations as *UW*, *UMCS*, *UJ*, *agd* [University of Warsaw, Maria Curie Skłodowska University, Jagiellonian University, household appliances]. This abbreviation expands to the Meetings of Polish Studies from Three Countries (*Spotkania Polonistyk Trzech Krajów*), i.e. Polish researchers from China, Japan, and Korea, which have been held on a regular basis since 2007 in one of the three countries. Each meeting has been documen-

ted with a volume comprising academic papers delivered during the meetings. T. Sekiguchi's work was published in the volume *Spotkania Polonistyki Trzech Krajów – Chiny, Korea, Japonia* published by the Department of Polish Studies, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies (HUFS) in Seoul (2013), a meeting which was special in many respects as it was attended by Anna Komorowska, then First Lady of the Republic of Poland.

2.2.5.1. The first part of Sekiguchi's article was devoted to the histories of Polish studies outside of Poland, specifically of the Polish studies at Hankuk University of Foreign Studies in Seoul and of the Polish studies at the Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, established in 1987 and 1991, respectively.

The Polish Department, HUFS, is currently a major centre of Polish studies in the world. Thus, that forces one to draw a parallel between the success of the Korean economy and the dynamic development of Korean centres of Polish studies (...) The wave of democratisation and liberalisation set Poles and Koreans free at almost the exact same time in the 1980s and 90s. The two nations have continued to meet, and their paths cross in the arena of the global economy. Korean Polish researchers are active at that intersection. (...)

Paradoxically, liberalisation in Poland and its accession to the EU have permanently decreased the presence in the Japanese press of Poland, whose image has continued to become blurry in our country (...). **The attractiveness of socialism as something exotic is no more there; the euphoria of solidarity is long gone; Poland has left the hot current political scene and transitioned to the historical world, or in other words: it simply became one of the many European countries.** Additionally, the Polish economy still lacks global brands with products which would be recognisable in the everyday lives of the Japanese. Therefore, Polish studies in Japan could still be referred to as "art for art's sake". They are projects for the mind, not for prospering financially.

(Sekiguchi 2013, pp. 16–17)

If there was anyone who started reading his article with the conviction that the two Polish studies in the neighbouring countries of the Far East had similar origins, stories and *raison d'être*, after completing reading it they would know that it is not the case at all. Both must be viewed differently as they emerged and operated in different countries, societies, social mentalities, and in different realities. Sekiguchi saw the future of Polish studies in Japan more within the framework of European studies and not Slavic studies, with the reservation "that then they could lose their form somewhat organisationally, if you will, of a *nationally sovereign unit*, which we used to refer to through the generalising term *polonistyka* [Polish literary and linguistic studies]" (Sekiguchi 2013, p. 18). Thus, the author touched upon a problem applicable not only to Polish studies in Japan but also in other countries where *polonistyka* or *studia polskie* (Polish studies) are no longer affiliated with Slavic studies, but rather with European studies viewed as regional studies. If that is what is happening, one needs to realise that the traditionally perceived Polish studies are losing their *raison d'être* in the new situation,

referred to in short using that name. It has also become necessary to search for new terms, e.g. *studia polskie*, which could refer better to the reality, no longer promising a *nationally sovereign unit*.

2.2.5.2. The second part of this engrossing article offers an analysis of the integration of Polish researchers and instructors at several levels, e.g. Polish researchers and instructors domestically and abroad, and Polish researchers and instructors working on a daily basis in other countries and at different universities. One should note that, while not emphasising that fact, Sekiguchi acted as a proponent of the *Polish studies without borders* slogan, which was the main slogan of the 4th Congress of Foreign Polish Studies in 2008 at the Jagiellonian University. He discussed the histories of several initiatives aimed at a grass-roots organisation of Polish researchers and instructors regardless of their specialisations, academic interests and the countries where they worked: the Bristol Association, the Congress of Foreign Polish studies, Międzynarodowego Naukowego Komitetu Studiów Polonistycznych [the International Academic Committee of Polish Studies], Międzynarodowe Stowarzyszenie Studiów Polonistycznych [International Association of Polish Studies], etc.

His voice in this matter has been extremely important as, since the very beginning, i.e. since the 1995 International Conference of Polish Researchers and Instructors held in Warsaw, professor Sekiguchi has been one of the major, most visible and most active promoters of this social movement. It is no exaggeration to refer to it as a *social movement*, as despite the relatively small number of people initially engaged in it (approx. 12 people, out of whom 8 were members of the Founding Committee of the Bristol Group) **they were the right people who established the right group at the right time**. They were the right people because they were **aware of the need to engage in grass-roots activities**, something many Polish researchers and instructors in Poland had not realised, as if the needs of global Polish studies could be seen more clearly from a distance. Today, one can see it more clearly than 20 years ago and, therefore, one has to agree with Sekiguchi “that the most important outcome of the conference (at the University of Warsaw in 1995 – note by W.M.) was the establishment of the Bristol Group, even if it was a surprise child of the conference” (Sekiguchi 2013, p. 18).

In discussing the histories of individual initiatives and his participation in them, Sekiguchi formulated probably his most important conclusion about the importance of the work of Polish researchers and instructors abroad and about their identities:

It is us, the non-Poles who promote Polish culture outside of Poland, and we give it its actual shape. We do that, however, as per the needs of the Japanese. One could even venture a metaphor that **we create Poland. But we do that in the local tongue, not in Polish. And that Japanese Poland is, naturally, different from the Polish Poland.**

(Sekiguchi 2013, pp. 19–20; emphasis – W.M.)

What is worth emphasising is Sekiguchi's declarative statement as a representative of all Polish researchers and instructors abroad that it is they who create Poland in their countries of operation: they decide about the selection of those elements of Polish culture which are worth displaying in their countries; they translate them into their languages and/or describe them in their languages to make them comprehensible for people not prepared for receiving that content; they undertake the huge risk of promoting Polish language and culture, without having any certainty as to whether the risk will be worth it; and, finally, they devote their whole professional lives to this culture. **Through that devotion, a great majority of the success of Polish culture abroad is, in fact, their achievement!**

In the conclusion of his article, Sekiguchi openly indicates a complex suffered by foreign Polish researchers and instructors stating that "a Polish researcher and instructor outside of Poland has long struggled with the problem of being a "minority" in the academic world, and that syndrome also applied to the students of Polish studies" (Sekiguchi 2013, p. 21). It is clear that a Polish researcher and/or instructor struggling with the problem of being a minority in the academic world needed integration: first with Polish researchers and instructors from neighbouring countries, later with Polish researchers and instructors from their particular part of the world, and, finally, with Polish researchers and instructors from around the world, including with Polish researchers and instructors in Poland. Integration is necessary not only for Polish researchers and instructors affiliated with universities, but also beginner Polish researchers and instructors, and students only just starting to learn Polish and exploring the various areas of Polish culture. "I am genuinely pleased by the fact that at those conferences we no longer meet fellow Polish researchers and instructors only from Europe, but also from Korea and China" stated professor Sekiguchi (Sekiguchi 2013, p. 21).

I have discussed Sekiguchi's article quite thoroughly to indicate how a comparison of the situations of Polish studies in two neighbouring countries may lead to raising problems which are general or even existential for many centres of Polish studies in the world, and for global Polish studies.

2.2.6. The history of teaching Polish as a foreign and a second language has been divided into the early history, which started, based on today's knowledge, in the first half of the 16th century, and the more recent history, which has been unfolding since the latter half of the 20th century. The more recent history is studied relatively often and eagerly, as it applies to the histories of university centres of teaching Polish as a non-native language in Poland. The seasoned chairs of those centres made sure they were leaving behind not only efficiently operating institutions, both in respect to teaching and research, but also specific visions of their documented histories. When considering collective volumes discussing the histories and the achievements of individual centres, one notices the absence of works which refer to centres focussed on teaching Polish as a non-native language

at the John Paul II Catholic University in Lublin, Adam Mickiewicz University, the University of Opole, and, surprisingly, the University of Silesia.

A new look at the history of teaching Polish in the world was offered in W.T. Miodunka's article *Rozpowszechnianie, zachowywanie i nauczanie języka polskiego w świecie w latach 1918–2018* (2020). The author began his discussion by focussing on the approach of the changing Polish state to the Polish community abroad, proceeded to discussing the support of the state in the teaching of Polish as a heritage language in Polish ethnic schools around the world, and, finally, the state's engagement in the development of teaching PFL at Polish universities. The author analysed the state's efforts in the context of the interest of foreign universities in developing centres for Polish literary and linguistic studies and for Polish studies.

The study of the early history of teaching Polish as a foreign language is more challenging for researchers as it requires more inquiry and archival research, as well as familiarity with works devoted to the history of the demographics of Polish lands, the settlement history in those lands, regional histories associated with individual border cities and towns which were once inhabited by many foreigners, etc. Many works devoted to the early history of teaching Polish as a foreign language have been developed at the University of Wrocław under the direction, and with the major personal engagement, of professor Anna Dąbrowska, which might indicate that the summations of those works would be developed at that centre. That has been confirmed by Dąbrowska's article entitled *Glottodydaktyka polonistyczna w SJPiK. Kierunki badań naukowych* (2014), which includes the following conclusion to the part devoted to the history of teaching Polish as a foreign language: "The works which have been published so far form thematic series. As a natural continuation of those, there are three monographs being developed devoted to the history of teaching Polish as a foreign language, which will crown a certain stage of the studies" (Dąbrowska 2014, p. 264).

The approaching 100th anniversary of teaching Polish as a foreign language, which began in the early 1920s, also triggers some favourable expectations. That jubilee should encourage Polish researchers from various countries to prepare studies similar to that of Benešova, Rusin Dybalska and Zakopalova, entitled *90 let pražské polonistiky – dějiny a současnost. 90 lat praskiej polonistyki – historia i współczesność* (2013).

2.2.7. As for the **comparative study of language teaching**, the main factor in its creation was the realisation of its existence, one which appeared in works by Przemysław E. Gębał, and the assignment of the name of the comparative study of language teaching to this study method. One could even assume that more comparative studies have been conducted without researchers realising they belonged to a stream which is currently referred to as the comparative study of language teaching. This hypothesis is certainly confirmed by Sekiguchi's seminal article, which I have discussed above.

It should be stressed that the comparative study of language teaching could be practised as a subdiscipline of general language teaching or as a method of studying language teaching conducted within individual subdisciplines. This differentiation could also be consolidated by assigning two separate meanings to the term *comparative study of language teaching*:

1. “The comparative study of language teaching is a subdiscipline of non-native language teaching which, within the theoretical and empirical dimension, consists of the comparative analysis of the means of organising and applying the elements of language teaching within various educational systems within the context of their underlying conditions of historical, socio-economic, political, and cultural natures” (Gębał 2013, p. 95; cf. Miodunka 2016, pp. 238–246).
2. The comparative study of language teaching is a method of study conducted as part of a subdiscipline of non-native language teaching, in which researchers utilise their knowledge of language teaching of at least two modern languages and of European standards of language teaching (cf. Gębał 2018b, p. 127).

2.2.8. The fact that Gębał’s monograph *Modele kształcenia nauczycieli języków obcych w Polsce i w Niemczech* (2013) has proven a major work for the **pedeutology of Polish studies** does not mean that there is no need to pursue the issue further. Quite the contrary—if one realises that the book applied to training future teachers of Polish as a foreign and a second language, one will conclude that it opens extensive opportunities for further research.

It is surely necessary to study if and how many graduates of post-graduate, master’s and bachelor’s studies undertake work in teaching Polish as a foreign and a second language. Whether they engage in that type of work in Poland (in state or private schools) or abroad. And whether and how their work abroad impacts the further development of teachers of Polish as a foreign language. The issue is worth studying as one might assume that it is the experiences and studies fulfilled abroad that have had a fundamental impact on the future development of the comparative study of language teaching, as it was in my case (cf. Gębał 2014).

It is also important to discuss the Polish market of teaching Polish as a foreign language: Who decides to open a school of Polish as a foreign language, and why? How, within the context of the work, do they evaluate their specialist studies in the field? Do the graduates of the studies pursue teaching of Polish as a foreign or second language as their careers, or is it for them just a one-time (short-term) affair? If a graduate of our studies does not undertake a career as a teacher of Polish as a foreign language and decides to pursue work as a school teacher, do the teaching principles and methods which they learnt during their studies help them in their work? When and how does the so-called occupational

burnout occur? Clearly, there are still many unanswered questions, and those questions are important for the developing field of teaching Polish as a non-native language.

2.2.9. **The methodology of teaching Polish as a foreign or a second language** has recently been losing its dominant position, becoming one of the several subdisciplines of teaching Polish as a non-native language, though I always stress that it is the only subdiscipline which exists in the minds of a majority of the practitioners and theoreticians of teaching Polish as a foreign or second language, which gives it a strong position. It is, in my opinion, more autonomous than the methodologies of teaching other world languages pursued in Poland, as within the last 25 years it has been developing not directly impacted by Polish linguistics or pedagogy. That autonomy, and the openness of young specialists in teaching Polish as a non-native language for developing academic studies, allow one to be hopeful that a future dictionary of general Polish language teaching could be developed by members of the community of researchers of Polish language teaching in cooperation with outstanding representatives of other domains of specialised language teaching in Poland. It is clear that the valuable initiative by Aleksandra Szulc to publish such a dictionary twice (in 1984 and in 1994) should be continued now that more than two decades have passed, decades which have been rich in events which have directly influenced language teaching in Poland, which were extremely important for the development of general language teaching and the teaching of foreign languages in Poland.

Bear in mind that until recently the methodology of teaching Polish as a foreign or a second language, preoccupied with teaching Polish, has not applied appropriate attention to the process of learning our language, an omission which must be addressed in the future. Furthermore, there are few studies focussed on the effectiveness of individual methods and approaches in teaching Polish as a foreign language. A good example of such a study is the analysis of the effectiveness of the task-oriented approach in teaching and learning Polish as a foreign language developed by Iwona Janowska in her work *Podejście zadaniowe do nauczania i uczenia się języków obcych. Na przykładzie języka polskiego jako obcego* (2011, pp. 303–354). According to her study, the effectiveness of tasks and the task-oriented approach was evaluated by learners as follows: 25% of study subjects considered them as very effective, 44% as effective, 19% as rather effective, 8% as rather ineffective, and 4% as ineffective. “Most respondents (69% – W.M.),” Janowska argued, “evaluated tasks as an effective or a very effective form of learning” (Janowska 2011, p. 344). Her study showed one more thing clearly: **One cannot expect that a single method or approach will be equally good for all people.** I am directing this remark to those instructors, especially beginners, who expect the now popular teaching aids to be equally good and effective for everyone. I can immediately tell them that that is impossible!

In relation to the development of the process of certification of proficiency in Polish as a foreign language in 2004–2018, one must note that there exists an extensive collection of exam sets, by the end of 2015 totalling over 10,000 tests, which would enable one to conduct quantitative research. The model quantitative study in teaching Polish as a foreign language is Anna Seretny's monograph *Kompetencja leksykalna uczących się języka polskiego jako obcego w świetle badań ilościowych* (2011).

The ability to conduct quantitative research using large representative datasets has been stressed because earlier such research was impossible due to the limited number of learners of Polish as a foreign language, both in individual centres and throughout Poland. That does not mean, however, that good qualitative research or even case studies are not necessary anymore. As an example of qualitative research, consider two chapters of Monika Stawicka's book devoted to the application of an educational project as viewed by its participants, and the benefits resulting from participating in the discussed *English + +* project (Stawicka 2015, pp. 3–186).

One initiative which might expedite language learning studies is the project of developing an internet database of teaching Polish as a non-native language undertaken by the instructors and students of the School of Polish Language and Culture for Foreigners, University of Wrocław. It was thus described by Grzegorz Zarzeczny in the volume *40 lat wrocławskiej glottodydaktyki polonistycznej*:

The main objective of the “JPJO. Przewodnik Bibliograficzny” website is to develop and make available a comprehensive database of bibliographical information describing the entirety of the output of teaching Polish and Polish culture to foreigners, regularly updated by users. Through it, anyone engaged in teaching Polish as a non-native language, regardless of their place of operation, will have at their disposal an increasingly more comprehensive common tool and a source of information on the academic achievements in the discussed domain from various countries. **The synergy achieved thus is invaluable, especially considering the fact that Polish studies are blossoming in many countries.**

(Zarzeczny 2014, p. 404; emphasis – W.M.)

I absolutely wish to join the author in his optimism, as for several years I studied the works developed within the field of teaching Polish as a non-native language as I was developing a compendium of knowledge regarding its achievements (Miodunka 2016). As I was re-reading many works, I was forced to change my original evaluations of them: years later some works gained additional significance, while other which had originally been deemed unrivalled, having been placed within the new context, gained major competition. Individual evaluations and reflections were dominated by astonishment that the general output of teaching Polish as a non-native language is so quantitatively extensive and so qualitatively significant. And that the field draws so many young talented academics, who, in a complex-free manner, engaged in studies of Polish as a foreign or a second language, which fit the context of European and global studies.

3. THE PROSPECTS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHING AND LEARNING POLISH AS A HERITAGE AND A SECOND LANGUAGE

Bilingualism is a blessing from God that no parent should deny a child.
(Norman Davies)

3.1. In my discussion of Roman Laskowski's book *Język w zagrożeniu* (2009), I indicated the process and the results of the acquisition of Polish among children of Polish descent in Sweden (Miodunka 2016, pp. 146–153). In the conclusion of his book, the author states openly that by writing about language in danger he was aware of the fact that he was writing about an extremely important and current social issue, i.e. how Polish children who are raised in families of European migrants in EU Member States learn about the Polish language. Allow me to quote his words contained in the final paragraph of his monograph:

Regardless of the country of residence of their parents, children face the same problems: adjusting to life in two different cultural contexts, and the necessity of learning how to live in two different languages. The problem already applies to at least tens of thousands of Polish children, and the issue in the coming years will grow exponentially. **Some talk of nearly two million Poles, mainly young people, who within the past few years found work in EU Member States** (...) How many parents will return to Poland, and how many will decide to stay in Ireland, France, or Germany? Tens of thousands of today's "EU orphans" are bound to soon become part of the Polish diaspora. **Those children and their families need conditions which would help them keep their language and encourage them to maintain their relationship with their homeland and culture.**

(Laskowski 2009, p. 226; emphasis – W.M.)

In writing that, the researcher not only indicated a major social issue which applies to tens of thousands of people, but also highlighted the need to create conditions for children and their parents so that they could retain their Polish language and identity in the second and further generations. He pleaded for appropriate educational initiatives among teenagers, which is obvious, but also among their parents, stressing their influence on retaining their ethnic language. It is worth noting that Laskowski did not restrict himself to only pleading; he undertook actions to create a group of specialists in social, psychological, cultural, and linguistic issues among Polish teenagers abroad at the Polish Academy of Learning in Krakow; he viewed the group as an organised lobby working to engage in actions leading to Polish immigrants in the EU and their children retaining Polish. As its leader, he authored letters which were sent to the heads of applicable institutions and to the Wspólnota Polska Association arguing for specific changes. Despite his deteriorating health, he used all his strength to participate in conferences in Poland and abroad where he indicated to the participating members of the Polish community

how important the issue of teenagers retaining the Polish language was. In February 2014, he was one of the originators, together with the representatives of the Polish community abroad and with linguists, who established in Edinburgh, Scotland, the Association for the Promotion of Polish Language Abroad (APPLA). In July 2014, with help from the international organisation Bilingualism Matters, the Association launched a campaign promoting bilingualism under the motto “Give your children your mother tongue”.

I indicated that Laskowski did not limit his efforts to writing a monograph, but he also initiated a broad project promoting bilingualism among Polish teenagers abroad, because I myself had the pleasure to participate in it and see for myself his work; he knew that it was necessary to start with the diagnosis he proposed in his monograph and proceed to action, that it was necessary to undertake educational efforts among Polish teenagers abroad and their parents, and that there was no time to waste. The significance of the project is clear to anyone who realises that only approx. 30% of Polish teenagers living in the United Kingdom participated in classes organised by Polish Saturday schools, which have been experiencing a real boom. That information also means that as many as 70% of the teenagers do not attend any Polish school. That is because their parents, Polish or mixed couples, decided that it was more important for their children to focus on achieving proficiency in English, a fact which determines their future education and success in their careers in that country. Therefore, the parents decided that Polish, even if they had emigrated not long ago and knew Polish well, was something they could sentence to oblivion as a less important language or even a negligible language in their future lives in the EU. Parents think so, and make such decisions, because they are completely unaware of the EU’s educational policy which recommends multilingualism, the first step to which is bilingualism or plurilingualism (see Szul 2003; Gębal 2013, pp. 40–59; Wróblewska-Pawlak 2014). That is why the project to help parents realise the value of bilingualism as an advantage necessary for utilising all the opportunities the EU offers has been so important (see Laskowski 2013).

3.2. The latter half of 2015, through the efforts of the Polish University Abroad in London (PUNO), saw the release of a book intended for the parents of Polish children in the UK entitled *Po polsku na Wyspach. Poradnik dla rodziców dzieci dwujęzycznych* edited by Katarzyna Zechenter (2015). The book’s editor thus wrote about the situation of the Polish language in the United Kingdom:

The 2013 Census indicated that Polish is the second most popular language (after English) used in England and Wales. Furthermore, Poles constitute England’s second largest ethnic group. Such a situation is comforting for our compatriots who have decided to live in the UK. Many of them wish their children also spoke Polish despite living in the United Kingdom. Only some of those children attend Polish schools, i.e. the so-called Polish Saturday Schools managed by the Polish Educational Society. However, **many children stop speaking Polish as early as two years after arriving in the UK, and since their**

parents are convinced that their command of Polish will not be useful for them, they do nothing to prevent that from happening.

(Zechenter 2015, p. 7; emphasis – W.M.)

Driven by her conviction about the value of bilingualism, Zechenter prepared the collection of works on bilingualism to offer it to the parents of children who had the chance of becoming bilingual if they preserved the command of Polish they had acquired at home. She argued that: “The handbook indicates in a practical accessible manner the benefits of migration, integration and operating in two cultures, i.e. Polish and English, and the future professional benefits resulting from bilingualism associated with, e.g. the constantly growing demand for bilingual specialists in England and Wales” (Zechenter 2015, p. 12).

The book, which comprises nine chapters, discusses the notions of migration and integration in the country of settlement (Zechenter), the issue of selecting a language/languages which a child is supposed to use and the benefits they gain from becoming bilingual (Nowosielska), the role of parents and guardians in raising children in migration conditions (Stochniol), the differences between Polish schools and British schools in the context of the British system of education (Howe), the opportunities for teaching Polish outside the Polish school (Zechenter), and it includes remarks intended for the parents of Polish children who are not of Polish descent on how to support their children’s bilingualism (White), as well as information on how important one’s command of various languages is both in undertaking business studies and in later business activities (Holland, Sodhi). Chapter 8 entitled *Po co ten polski? Historie prawdziwe* [Why would you need Polish anyhow? True stories] (Zechenter 2015, pp. 129–150) is unique; it includes 22 statements by bilingual people who speak Polish, talking in Polish and English about the benefits of knowing (many) languages. Those people are old and young, of Polish and non-Polish descent, and they once had different attitudes to learning languages, but, despite that, they now know several languages. Their testimonies are genuine as they speak the language they know, i.e. Polish, which has not been corrected in any way. They talk about the value of multilingualism using their own examples, which makes their statements different from those included in the previous chapters, which include particular supportive arguments which, even though provided using very accessible language, were still delivered by professionals: teachers, lecturers, and professors.

The handbook concludes with a chapter which includes practical information for the parents of bilingual children who need help. In it, Zechenter discusses bilingual websites, games, and forms of entertainment for children, internet repositories in various domains, audiobooks and online Polish literature, the basic internet addresses, and the major British libraries with collections of Polish content.

The fourth cover page of the handbook includes a statement about the value of bilingualism by Professor Norman Davies, the most recognised Polish historian of non-Polish descent, which serves as the motto of this part of my article.

3.3. Previous discussions and studies have led to the emergence of three branches of teaching Polish as a non-native language: teaching Polish as a foreign language, as a second language, and as a heritage language. The most advanced of those is the teaching of Polish as a foreign language. The entire theoretical-methodological and practical output of 1950–2015 was summarised in W.T. Miodunka's monograph *Glottodydaktyka polonistyczna. Pochodzenie – stan obecny – perspektywy* (2016).

The teaching of Polish as a heritage language started developing much later, only in 2003, and since 2010 there have emerged seminal works by such authors as E. Lipińska and A. Seretny (2012), H. Pułaczewska (2017), and A. Żurek (2018), and the collective volume edited by J. Besters-Dilger, A. Dąbrowska, G. Krajewski and A. Żurek (2016). We mainly owe the rapid progress in heritage language teaching to studies conducted in Germany, which were based on reliable methodological bases and extensive material. It was extremely fortunate that professor Besters-Dilger, a European authority figure when it comes to the study of Slavic languages as heritage languages, joined the research efforts, as, thus, Polish studies have a chance of becoming prominent in the research world.

The issue of passing Polish on to a new generation of children and youths raised in Polish migrant families outside Poland has dominated the focus of teaching and learning Polish as a heritage language because the group of young people is extremely numerous; because the awareness-raising campaign directed at Polish parents and parents in mixed families has drawn many people from the Polish communities abroad and academics; because it is a very well-documented initiative; and because it is an initiative which can become successful by utilising the modern means of communication.

3.4. That does not, however, mean that I consider the other problems of teaching Polish as a foreign and as a second language, e.g. the issues related to curricula and aid for foreign children who attend Polish schools or children who belong to national and ethnic minorities, as less significant. Certainly, one should also focus on re-immigrant children who have lived abroad for several years, learning the language of the area where they lived while retaining their command of Polish, and afterwards return to their place of origin in Poland and attend Polish schools. Their language problems may be invisible for their parents and some teachers if the children speak “like normal Poles”. It is true they know spoken Polish well, but they have developed intellectually and linguistically for several years in a different language and as a result they lack Polish specialised lexis necessary to understand texts about Poland's history and geography, not to mention Polish literary texts. They usually know the lexis, but in the other language, which is why, without proper exercises and help from their teachers, they will not be able to use it. In such a situation, talking in Polish about specialist topics is difficult for them, and even more so writing in Polish about such topics due the related complex

syntax and style. It is fortunate that Gębał gathered and analysed many problems related to teaching Polish as a second language in his book *Podstawy dydaktyki języka polskiego jako drugiego. Podejście integracyjno-inkluzyjne* (2018a).

4. THE DISCOURSE COMMUNITY OF THE TEACHERS OF POLISH AS A NON-NATIVE LANGUAGE

Representatives of the youngest generation display the biggest desire to climb the Mt. Olympus of teaching Polish as a non-native language. Those who face the greatest difficulties – first and foremost, the difficulty in acquiring a university position.

(Zarzycka 2016, p. 31)

4.1. Finally, I would like to return to the interesting study by Zarzycka, which she discussed in her article *O wspólnocie dyskursywnej glottodydaktyków polonistycznych* (2016). I believe this return is completely justified in an article discussing, among other things, the beginnings of academic reflection on teaching foreigners Polish as a foreign language, on the development of the various forms of that education at various Polish university centres, and the related development of academic studies conducted at those centres, a development which today basically covers all universities throughout Poland. The 1990s heralded the beginning of the integration of the community of domestic specialists in teaching Polish as a foreign language with Polish researchers and instructors abroad. **The integration led to a symbolic event, i.e. the organisation of the 2016 World Congress of Polish Researchers and Instructors by the University of Silesia in Katowice. The event would not have been possible if there had not existed a discourse community of Polish researchers and instructors worldwide.**

When discussing the origins and significance of the term *discourse community*, Zarzycka first recalled the term *speech community* introduced by Dell Hymes (1974), an American sociologist, and popularised in Poland by Stanisław Grabias in the well-known monograph *Język w zachowaniach społecznych* (1994). The term *discourse community* was proposed by John M. Swales in the monograph *Genre Analysis. English in academic and research settings* (1990). Swales tried to indicate the differences between a speech community and a discourse community, associating the existence of discourse communities with the academic community, a fact of which one should take note. Speech communities usually form as a result of primary socialisation, they use a common language (a common language variety), and the same rules of group communication which exist in everyday communication, which leads to group solidarity. The family is the most basic example of a speech community; one's affiliation to it is a result of one's birth (children, grandchildren) or adoption (spouses of children). That is why researchers have

agreed that speech communities are inward as they “absorb” from the outside people who have decided to join a family. At the other extreme there are discourse communities, which gather people bound by affairs not related to their everyday lives but rather their careers, e.g. the research they conduct, their teaching practices, etc. Individuals join discourse communities based on their qualifications, which they have acquired through training, or based on their education. Other features of discourse communities include clearly defined communication goals, and established rules of inter-group communication which must be utilised when seeking information or evaluation of one’s own actions or the actions of others. Specific objectives are fulfilled by the members of a discourse community using selected styles while utilising lexis which includes specialist terminology. There are also specific rituals for accepting a new member or for joining a discourse community; another feature of such a community is the fact that it gathers experts, less specialised members, and complete novices. A discourse community has an outward character as its members have a sense of autonomy and uniqueness (Zarzycka 2016, pp. 15–17).

Those general principles could be also applied to the community of teachers of Polish as a non-native language. It consists of people who have acquired philological education, nowadays who have additionally completed specialist courses in teaching Polish as a foreign and a second language. They are also required to possess several years of experience gained while teaching Polish language and culture to foreigners. Those are, however, only threshold requirements applied to all novices interested in teaching Polish as a non-native language, as there is the option to achieve a greater awareness of the problems of teaching Polish as a non-native language through legally-defined methods of acquiring the academic degrees of doctor and habilitated doctor, and the academic title of professor. Those are defined by Polish legal regulations which refer to the academic career in applied linguistics. Individual universities employ specialists engaged in teaching PFL either in teaching positions (instructor, lecturer, senior lecturer) or in teaching and research positions (graduate teaching assistant, assistant professor, university professor, and full professor), a fact which is regulated on the one hand by regulations included in the Higher Education Act, and, on the other, by regulations included in university statutes. Additionally, universities apply their own policies of filling managerial positions at specific administrative units (teaching-oriented colleges or centres; research-oriented departments, chairs, institutes, and faculties). A position achieved at a university may translate into a person having the same position in the nationwide community of teachers of Polish as a non-native language, but that does not happen by default as the position depends on the discourse activity of the person, i.e. whether they participated in academic conferences and on the quality of the papers they presented there, and it depends on the number and quality of their academic publications. Since teaching Polish as

a non-native language is a new domain of science, an “up-and-coming” domain, what counts more are the information compendia and monographs being developed within it (regarding teaching Polish as a non-native language as a whole or within specific disciplines) rather than collections of works referring to various topics and fulfilling to a larger or lesser extent the qualities expected of academic works. Discourse activities are documented and rendered available to the public, regardless of when a specific document was published. That is why it is possible to alter original evaluations of individual works as sometimes a work interpreted in a particular manner upon its release may acquire additional significance after some time, when considered in a new political, social, and academic context. That final remark is particularly significant in reference to works focussed on language teaching, a domain which has continued to gain significance within the past two decades: first in relation to Poland’s planned accession to the EU, later, since 1 May 2004, to the actual accession, and, finally, the release of a Polish version of the European standards of language teaching included in the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (ESOKJ, 2003).

The predecessors of the current community included Warsaw-based linguists who were the first to focus on the nature of teaching foreigners Polish, later the representatives of applied linguistics, a domain which was not widely respected or popular in Poland, except at a few universities, and, finally, the creators of the term *glottodydaktyka* (teaching non-native languages) and its further promoters, including the creators of the studies of teaching Polish as a non-native language which operate at various universities. Those scholars include people who had already passed and those who are still active, not only older researchers, but also young academics with already considerable achievements. Finally, there are not only Polish researchers, but also researchers from other countries whose achievements in the field of teaching Polish as a non-native language are noteworthy.

When I think about the discourse community of the teachers of Polish as a non-native language, I wonder about the position of the authors of teaching aids: textbooks for individual levels of proficiency, aids for teaching individual parts of the Polish language system, aids for teaching specific language skills, textbooks for teaching specialist languages, textbooks for children and teenagers, general and specialist dictionaries, etc. On the one hand, everyone knows how important the successful development of new teaching aids is for both teachers and learners, but, on the other, we know that the appeal of specific aids passes rather quickly and with it the recognition for their authors, especially if they have devoted themselves completely to the development of the teaching aids forgetting about their research and academic activities. In such a situation one might be concerned that, despite their considerable achievements, which have helped teaching Polish as a non-native language develop, those authors do not have the appropriate real influence on the discourse of teaching Polish as a non-native language. I empha-

sised that because the input of the authors of teaching aids for teaching Polish as a foreign and as a second language is not emphasised sufficiently.

4.2. Zarzycka's article is important not only because it introduced the notion of the discourse community of the teachers of Polish as a non-native language, but also because it indicated what its members think about the existence of the community and about how it functions. Using a survey, the author studied 35 respondents employed at 9 academic centres in Poland and abroad. She divided them into three groups: group A comprised 18 persons with over 20 years of experience in teaching and/or researching PFL; group B comprised 6 persons with a dozen or so years of experience; and group C comprised 11 persons with a few years of experience, who represented *the next generation in teaching Polish as a non-native language*. The entire group of respondents consisted of 28 women and 7 men, which according to Zarzycka "appropriately reflects the women-to-men ratio in teaching Polish as a non-native language."

One of the more interesting parts of the article is an analysis of the answers to specific questions; the researcher provided fragments of actual answers identifying them by assigning each one to the representatives of all three groups. As I strongly recommend the reading of the entire article and to indicate its excellent value, I wish to quote the summary of the survey study, as the author included in it the main elements of all the answers:

The achieved results enable one to draw the conclusion that the teachers of Polish as a non-native language feel that they mainly form "a single profession-based community which is also a community of interests." The community's driving force is the dialogue which unfolds in academic fora or during other meetings of teachers of Polish as a non-native language, as well as major projects in teaching Polish as a foreign language (e.g. PFL certification procedures). **This broadly-defined community of Polish language teaching includes persons who actively and regularly participate in the academic dialogue within teaching Polish as a non-native language (e.g. at conferences), and the members of smaller communities:** the Bristol Association of Polish and foreign teachers of PFL, the Team of Authors of Tasks and Examiners (ZAZIE) associated with the State Commission of Certification of Proficiency in Polish as a Foreign Language (PKPZjO), and local subgroups associated with language schools. Some are only members of local communities, while others of various ones. The most active members propagate key thoughts and solutions. Thanks to them, teaching Polish as a non-native language develops. That can be expressed as follows: "the core of the community of Polish language teaching" is a group of their representatives. They are "academics engaged in the academic development of the discipline." That is the "Mt. Olympus of Polish language teaching." For a person to be included in the core of the community of Polish language teaching, one must participate in the academic, specialist dialogue with the representatives of the community. A person enclosed within their own microcommunity will not be recognised by the active members of the community as a member (even if the person is convinced otherwise). **The person has to want to participate in the dialogue and become known to others as a person who is worth listening to.** Of course, there would be no harm if such a person were introduced to the community by a person who is important in it (by a master). Interestingly enough, the representatives of the youngest generation display the

biggest desire to climb the Mt. Olympus of Polish language teaching. Those who face the greatest difficulties – first and foremost, the difficulty of acquiring a university position.

(Zarzycka 2016, p. 31; emphasis – W.M.)

For me, the most optimism is carried by the ending of the conclusion as it indicates that the representatives of the next generation have the biggest desire to climb *the Mt. Olympus of Polish language teaching*. Optimism because it proves how ambitious the next generation, i.e. the people who will define the future of teaching Polish as a non-native language, is. I wish them success in everything they intend to achieve, as I know that their successes will actually be the successes of teaching Polish as a non-native language.

4.3. Zarzycka returned to the issue of the discourse of Polish language teaching in the article *Dyskurs – dyskursologia – glottodydaktyka polonistyczna* (2018), in which she discussed the essence of the discourse of Polish language teaching, studies focussed on it, and the works the authors of which referred to the notion of discourse. She thus summarised her discussion: “discourse-oriented themes are poorly represented in the reflections of the researchers of teaching Polish as a non-native language. Even though there is a distinct narrow group of authors who approach the topic of the discourse of Polish language teaching directly, that does not necessarily mean that discourse-oriented themes have not been discussed indirectly in other works” (Zarzycka 2018, p. 38).

The quoted article ends in questions intended as indicators of the directions of discourse-oriented studies of teaching Polish as a non-native language. Consider the major ones:

1. Has Polish language teaching featured any major debates? (...) What were the underlying reasons for them? Was Polish language teaching (has it been) “a space where discourses clashed”?
2. Do researchers and practitioners of teaching Polish as a non-native language speak with one voice or with many? (...)
3. How do the relations of power develop within the discourse community of Polish language teaching? (...)
4. What key topics have been raised in teaching Polish as a non-native language? Have they been associated with social debates (e.g. with the post-colonial discourse, feminist discourse, political discourse, etc.)?

(Zarzycka 2018, pp. 38–39)

I am certain that the question about the major topics which have been raised in teaching Polish as a non-native language was answered by my book *Glottodydaktyka polonistyczna* (2016), which identified the subdisciplines of teaching Polish as a non-native language, referring not only to the models of non-native language teaching by Pfeiffer (2001) and Gębal (2013), but mainly to earlier publications, the major ones of which were discussed in the book (see Miodunka 2016, pp. 59–248). As I was re-reading some of them, I changed my original opinions of

them, or even appreciated those aspects which I had previously missed. That was the case with A. Burzyńska's 2002 monograph (Miodunka 2016, pp. 192–195) or with Zarzycka's 2000 article (Miodunka 2016, pp. 100–102). In the quoted article, Zarzycka indicated one of my works and discussed it in conjunction with a work by Piotr Garncarek on the cultural space in teaching PFL (2006) and a work by Gębal on the Krakow school of comparative study of teaching Polish as a non-native language (2014). She correctly deemed the three works as meta-discussions (Zarzycka 2018, p. 38). I would additionally stress their significance for the development of the discourse of Polish language teaching, especially considering the fact that each of them has been further discussed and analysed (my monograph received valuable critical remarks from Zarzycka (2017) and Gębal (2018b)).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Benešová M., Rusin Dybalska R., Zakopalová L., 2013, *90 let pražské polonistiky – dějiny a současnost. 90 let pražské polonistiky – historia i współczesność*, Praha.
- Besters-Dilger J., Dąbrowska A., Krajewski G., Żurek A. (eds.), 2016, *Utrata i odzyskiwanie języka polskiego. Językoznawcze i glottodydaktyczne aspekty niepełnej polsko-niemieckiej dwujęzyczności*, Łódź.
- Burzyńska A., 2002, *Jakże rad bym się nauczył polskiej mowy... O glottodydaktycznych aspektach relacji „język a kultura” w nauczaniu języka polskiego jako obcego*, Wrocław.
- Dąbrowska A., 2014, *Glottodydaktyka polonistyczna w SJPiK. Kierunki badań naukowych*, in: A. Dąbrowska, U. Dobesz (eds.), *40 lat wrocławskiej glottodydaktyki polonistycznej. Teoria i praktyka*, Wrocław, pp. 255–276.
- ESOKJ – *Europejski system opisu kształcenia językowego: uczenie się, nauczanie, ocenianie*, 2003, Warszawa.
- Garncarek P., 2006, *Przestrzeń kulturowa w nauczaniu języka polskiego jako obcego*, Warszawa.
- Gębal P.E., 2013, *Modele kształcenia nauczycieli języków obcych w Polsce i w Niemczech. W stronę glottodydaktyki porównawczej*, Kraków.
- Gębal P.E., 2014, *Krakowska szkoła glottodydaktyki porównawczej na tle rozwoju glottodydaktyki ogólnej i polonistycznej*, Kraków.
- Gębal P.E., 2018a, *Podstawy dydaktyki języka polskiego jako drugiego. Podejście integracyjno-inkluzyjne*, Kraków.
- Gębal P.E., 2018b, *Rozwój teorii i praktyki nauczania języka polskiego jako obcego i drugiego w latach 1950–2015. Uwagi na marginesie "Glottodydaktyki polonistycznej" W.T. Miodunki*, "Język Polski" XCVIII, issue 2, pp. 123–134, www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=691160
- Głuszkowski M., 2011, *Socjologiczne i psychologiczne uwarunkowania dwujęzyczności staroobrzędowców regionu suwalsko-augustowskiego*, Toruń.
- Grabias S., 1994, *Język w zachowaniach społecznych*, Lublin.
- Hymes D., 1974, *Foundations in Sociolinguistics. An Ethnographic Approach*, Philadelphia.
- Janowska I., 2011, *Podejście zadaniowe do nauczania języków obcych. Na przykładzie języka polskiego jako obcego*, Kraków.
- Laskowski R., 2009, *Język w zagrożeniu. Przystawanie języka polskiego w warunkach polsko-szwedzkiego bilingwizmu*, Kraków.
- Laskowski R., 2013, *Język a tożsamość etniczna. Kształtowanie się poczucia narodowego młodej polskiej diaspory w warunkach wielokulturowości*, "LingVaria", 8, issue 2 (16), pp. 77–93, www.akademicka.pl/doi/10.12797/LV.08.2013.16.05

- Lipińska E., Seretny A., 2012, *Między językiem ojczystym a obcym. Nauczanie i uczenie się języka odziedziczonego na przykładzie chicagowskiej diaspory polonijnej*, Kraków.
- Miodunka W.T., 2010, *Glottodydaktyka polonistyczna w dobie globalizacji i informatyzacji*, in: R. Nycz, W. Miodunka, T. Kunz (eds.), *Polonistyka bez granic. IV Kongres Polonistyki Zagranicznej*, vol. 2, Kraków, pp. 41–54.
- Miodunka W.T., 2016, *Glottodydaktyka polonistyczna. Pochodzenie – stan obecny – perspektywy*, Kraków.
- Miodunka W.T., 2020, *Rozpowszechnianie, zachowywanie i nauczanie języka polskiego w świecie w latach 1918–2018*, “Poradnik Językowy”, part 1: col. 1, pp. 7–25, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342281825_A_R_T_Y_K_U_L_Y_I_R_O_Z_P_R_A_W_Y
- Miodunka W.T., 2020, *Rozpowszechnianie, zachowywanie i nauczanie języka polskiego w świecie w latach 1918–2018*, “Poradnik Językowy”, part 2: col. 2, pp. 7–28, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342281959_Rozpowszechnianie_zachowywanie_i_nauczanie_jezyka_polskiego_w_swiecie_w_latach_1918-2018_Czesc_II_Polszczyzna_i_Polonia_w_swiecie_w_latach_1944-2018
- Miodunka W.T., 2020, *Rozpowszechnianie, zachowywanie i nauczanie języka polskiego w świecie w latach 1918–2018*, “Poradnik Językowy”, part 3: col. 3: pp. 7–33; http://www.poradnik.jezykowy.uw.edu.pl/wydania/poradnik_jezykowy.772.2020.03.01-W.T.%20Miodunka.pdf
- Pfeiffer W., 2001, *Nauka języków obcych. Od praktyki do praktyki*, Poznań.
- Prizel-Kania A., 2013, *Rozwijanie sprawności rozumienia ze słuchu w języku polskim jako obcym*, Kraków.
- Pułaczewska H., 2017, *Wychowanie do języka polskiego w Niemczech na przykładzie Ratyzbony. Dwujęzyczność dzieci z perspektywy rodziców*, Łódź.
- Sekiguchi T., 2013, *Bristol, Kongresy, SPTK... Przyczynki do historii organizowania międzynarodowych wspólnot polonistów*, in: *Spotkania polonistyki trzech krajów – Chiny, Korea, Japonia, Rocznik 2012/2013, HUFSS*, Seoul, pp. 15–22.
- Seretny A., 2011, *Kompetencja leksykalna uczących się języka polskiego jako obcego w świetle badań ilościowych*, Kraków.
- Stawicka M., 2015, *W poszukiwaniu nowej równowagi w nauczaniu języków obcych w szkole wyższej. Na przykładzie projektu edukacyjnego English++*, Kraków.
- Swales J.M., 1990, *Genre Analysis. English in academic and research settings*, Cambridge–New York.
- Szul R., 2003, *Europa językowa*, “Języki Obce w Szkole”, issue 6, pp. 5–26.
- Szulc A., 1984, *Podręczny słownik językoznawstwa stosowanego*, Warszawa.
- Wróblewska-Pawlak K., 2014, *O naturalnej dwujęzyczności i przekazywaniu języka dzieciom w sytuacji imigracji*, “LingVaria” 9, issue 1 (17), pp. 239–250, <http://www.akademicka.pl/doi/10.12797/LV.09.2014.17.14>.
- Zarzewny G., 2014, *Przewodnik bibliograficzny – baza danych glottodydaktyki polonistycznej*, in: A. Dąbrowska, U. Dobesz (eds.), *40 lat wrocławskiej glottodydaktyki polonistycznej. Teoria i praktyka*, Wrocław, pp. 397–408.
- Zarzewny G., (forthcoming), *Dyskurs glottodydaktyczny w wybranych podręcznikach do nauczania języka polskiego jako obcego. Badania korpusowe*, Wrocław.
- Zarzycka G., 2016, *O wspólnotcie dyskursywnej glottodydaktyków polonistycznych*, in: I. Janowska, P.E. Gębał (eds.), *O lepsze jutro studiów polonistycznych w świecie. Glottodydaktyka polonistyczna dziś*, Kraków, pp. 15–34.
- Zarzycka G., 2017, *Glottodydaktyka polonistyczna w procesie rozwoju. Rozważania na marginesie monografii Władysława T. Miodunki*, “Poradnik Językowy”, col. 8, pp. 56–73.
- Zarzycka G., 2018, *Dyskurs – dyskursologia – glottodydaktyka polonistyczna*, “Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Kształcenie Polonistyczne Cudzoziemców”, 25, pp. 27–42, <https://czasopisma.uni.lodz.pl/kpc/article/view/4304>.

- Zechenter K. (ed.), 2015, *Po polsku na Wyspach. Poradnik dla rodziców dzieci dwujęzycznych*, Londyn.
- Żurek A., 2018, *Strategie komunikacyjne osób dwujęzycznych. Na przykładzie polszczyzny odziedziczonej w Niemczech*, Kraków.

Władysław T. Miodunka

ROZWOJU GLOTTODYDAKTYKI POLONISTYCZNEJ PERSPEKTYWY

Słowa kluczowe: perspektywy, rozwój, glottodydaktyka polonistyczna, wspólnota dyskursywna, dyskurs glottodydaktyczny

Streszczenie. Autor rozpoczyna swe rozważania od określenia mocnych i słabych stron dzisiejszej glottodydaktyki polonistycznej, zwracając przy tym uwagę na to, jak zmieniało się jego podejście do poszczególnych zagadnień. Część zasadnicza artykułu, poświęcona perspektywom rozwoju glottodydaktyki polonistycznej, została podzielona na trzy części. Pierwsza z nich zawiera uwagi o potrzebie dalszych badań naukowych w zakresie takich subdyscyplin glottodydaktyki jak akwizycja polszczyzny jako języka obcego i drugiego, preparacja i ewaluacja materiałów glottodydaktycznych, wspomagane komputerowo nauczanie JPJO, sytuacja polonistyki w poszczególnych krajach i regionach świata, czy historia nauczania polszczyzny jako języka obcego. Część druga odnosi się do rozwoju nauczania polszczyzny jako języka odziedziczonego i drugiego na tle rozwoju jego nauczania jako języka obcego. Część trzecia artykułu odnosi się do ludzi pracujących na rzecz glottodydaktyki polonistycznej i przynosi omówienie rezultatów badań G. Zarzyckiej na temat wspólnoty dyskursywnej glottodydaktyków polonistycznych i samego dyskursu glottodydaktycznego.

Data wpłynięcia tekstu: 30.12.2019