GLOTTODIDACTICA XLIX/1 (2022)
ADAM MICKIEWICZ UNIVERSITY PRESS POZNAŃ
DOI: 10.14746/gl.2022.49.1.08

Hanna Komorowska
SWPS Uniwersytet Humanistycznospołeczny

Teacher language awareness or language teacher awareness?

Abstract. The paper outlines the development of the concept of awareness across various academic disciplines and examines terminological problems involved in analysing human cognition. Approaches to awareness in philosophy, developmental psychology, neuroscience and linguistics are discussed, as well as the career of the concept in Second Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Teaching (SLA / FLT). Learners' and teachers' language awareness is presented as a basis for the enrichment of the awareness concept by a number of psychological, sociological and pedagogical factors. Special attention is given to neglected aspects of teacher awareness, such as awareness of learners' thinking processes and teachers' awareness of classroom decision-making. Implications are sought for pre-service teacher education.

Keywords: awareness, consciousness, language learning, language teaching, teacher education.

1. INTRODUCTION

Data presented in recent research reports published by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD 2019a, 2019b; TALIS 2018) demonstrate that teachers are attracted to the profession by the ability to influence the development of children and young people and thus to make a contribution to the society, factors even more powerful in all 38 OECD countries than a secure job and a reliable salary. Yet, more than 50 per cent of teachers "felt unprepared for general pedagogy" and "struggled with teaching in a multicultural or multilingual setting" (OECD 2019a: 9), a clear call for enrichment of initial teacher education programmes. Due to the dramatic growth of expectations in the field of competences and skills, training student teachers for all possible professional contexts in which they may find themselves is no longer feasible. It seems reasonable to expect that building their awareness of what constitutes effective teaching as well as the difficulties they are likely to encounter may provide early support

Glottodidactica 49(1), 2022: 125–140.

before they engage in continuous professional development and later help them to identify their needs and select appropriate in-service training programmes.

In publications on language learning and teacher education, however, notions such as *knowledge*, *skills*, *competences* and *awareness* overlap (Council of Europe 2001, 2018a), which seriously limits possibilities to outline possible changes in the content of pre-service teacher education (Connerley & Pedersen 2005; Komorowska & Krajka 2021). The term *knowledge* is less prone to confusion as it is unequivocally connected with facts, though not necessarily their comprehension, which means that the common usage of the term refers to *declarative knowledge* only. *Skill* understood as know-how may, although not necessarily, imply knowledge on which it is based. Using the term *skill* to describe the ability to function in a way appropriate in a given situation causes an overlap with *procedural knowledge*, which does not presuppose any conscious realisation (Ullman 2015). In teacher education publications, the Council of Europe defines *competence* as "the ability to mobilise and deploy relevant values, attitudes, skills, knowledge and / or understanding in order to respond appropriately and effectively to the demands, challenges and opportunities that are presented by a given type of context" (Council of Europe 2018b: 32). Competence thus understood involves "the selection, activation, organisation and co-ordination of relevant psychological resources which are then applied through behaviour in such a way that the individual adapts appropriately and effectively to a given situation" (Council of Europe 2018b: 32). The terms *awareness* and *consciousness* are not defined in the European policy documents, therefore their meaning and usage call for an analysis.

2. THE CONCEPT OF AWARENESS ACROSS TIME AND DISCIPLINES

Discussing the meaning and the use of the concept is particularly difficult due to the different terms existing in European languages, e.g. the word *Bewußtsein* is used in German *coscienza*, *consapevolezza* or *sensibilità* in Italian, *conscience* or *sensibilisation* in French, *świadomość* in Polish and *consciousness* or *awareness* in English. Usually, when more than one word is used, synonyms tend to be used interchangeably (Komorowska 2014).

In the history of Western philosophy, *awareness* of objects and phenomena can only be gained by *awareness of oneself*, a circular movement with which Plato in his *Timaeus* dialogue postulates the need for a soul to turn to itself for self-understanding. The term *consciousness* was used by Descartes to argue that every thought is conscious at the moment it appears because of its reflexive property. Half a century later Locke broadened the scope of the term claiming

that one can be conscious of past thoughts, and thus consciousness is a means to consolidate the history of a given individual into a uniform sense of the self. Schopenhauer added the concept of *subconsciousness*, earlier reserved for physiological mechanisms and emotions, to assert that human will or subconscious motivation governs activity, although our conscious mind remains unaware of its power, a concept later expanded by Freud. Possibilities to investigate consciousness opened with the work of Wundt, who introduced the idea of using introspection for the purpose, a method justified by Brentano's theory that consciousness is always *consciousness of* or *about* something. Husserl postulated consciousness of phenomenological experiences, thus opening the path for the analysis of *awareness*. In philosophy, therefore, awareness is more often associated with introversion and consciousness with the observation and experience of the world (Gazzaniga 2018).

In psychology, *consciousness* is viewed as constructing meaning, while the term *unconscious* or *subconscious behaviour* refers to involuntary behaviours, slips of the tongue or symbolic nervous activities, whose meaning is not immediately obvious for the acting individual. It may refer to what is not yet a conscious part our mind, though it may also indicate a distinct part of subjective life which aggressively opposes reflection (Bielik-Robson 2000). In Jungian approaches, the temporal aspect of individual unconsciousness embraces what was conscious in the past and later became forgotten, or what being seen remains unnoticed, but also what is being formed as thoughts, emotions or plans to become part of consciousness in the future (Jung 1981: 382).

Developmental psychology views consciousness as developing gradually from absence of self-consciousness to self-awareness via five levels, i.e. confusion, situation, identification, permanence and self-consciousness as measured by mirror image tests (Rochat 2003). Awareness then develops gradually from the level of *basic awareness* of sensual perceptions in early infancy, through *social consciousness* emerging in first contacts with other people and *cognitive consciousness* when a child explores their own perspective embarking on first attempts to compare it with the perspectives of others. Successive levels follow: *reflective consciousness* thanks to linguistic development of a three-year-old enables sharing activity and discourse, *narrative consciousness* when autobiographic memory of a four-year-old makes it possible to integrate experiences into stories and thus slowly develop *cultural consciousness*, usually appearing towards the end of preschool period (Nelson 2007). A lower level of consciousness of an individual does not, however, guarantee its level of complexity which grows throughout the whole life span of an individual. Complexity of consciousness depends on age, sensitiveness, reactivity, rapport with adults, although cultural differences are a significant mediating factor (Białecka-Pikul 2012). As can be seen from the

above, developmental psychology associates awareness with senses, reserving the term *consciousness* for issues considered more complex than bodily perceptions.

Contemporary neurocognitive approaches to the concept of *awareness*, used interchangeably with *consciousness*, is viewed as a subjective sense of a number of instincts or memories present at a given time in a living organism (Gazzaniga 2018), although concepts of *anoetic*, *noetic* and *autonoetic consciousness* overlap with those of memory and self-knowledge (Vandekerckhove & Panksepp 2009). Awareness is no longer considered a single function located in a particular place in the brain, but is conceptualised as an aspect of multiple cognitive functions, where the loss of one changes and reduces the content, but does not deprive an individual of awareness. It is especially important in the analysis of other people's intentions described by what they want to achieve and for what reason, i.e. of the *theory of mind*. Within each brain module information travels from a lower to an upper layer in the brain architecture where it is integrated to finally yield the result we refer to as *awareness*. Dysfunction of one module does not change the functioning of other modules, but affects the durability of awareness and causes distortions noticed by the others (Siegel 2016, 2020).

How far we can rely on our awareness is a controversial issue. Psychologists cherish no illusions. Neurocognitive research on post-stroke *hemispatial neglect* demonstrates that patients suffering from the syndrome not only behave as if the left side of their body did not exist, but also eliminate it from their episodic memory. Another example of the unreliability of awareness can be found in the state of exhaustion when a healthy organism produces a *feeling of presence (FoP) of a third* man, a phenomenon reported by a number of climbers. Symptoms of Alzheimer's disease and senile dementia also make us doubt the reliability of subjective awareness (Gazzaniga 2018).

3. APPROACHES TO AWARENESS IN SLA / FLT

The term *consciousness* has not easily found its way into applied linguistics, unlike *awareness,* its synonym, which made a spectacular career in Second Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Learning. The term *awareness* had originally been used to refer to language only, therefore the term *language awareness* (LA) was used. Its triumphant path through the field started with Eric Hawkins's *Awareness of language: An introduction*, a book published in 1984.

The ground for the concept's promotion was prepared by two decades of discussions on the role of language in education and ways to develop better communication skills in the standard language of schooling, often a second or

third language for many pupils with home languages other than English. Solutions were sought in the *Language across the curriculum* (LAC) approach. Discussions culminated in the UK government report *A language for life* (1975), often referred to as *The Bullock report* which, among others, called for the improvement of literacy teaching in British schools. Methods of implementing the idea into the everyday work of schools were presented in a widely read publication *Language across the curriculum. Implementation of the Bullock report in the secondary school* (Marland & Barnes 1977) and later by a seminal publication by Michael Marland (1982) promoting LAC as a method of integrating language with other subject areas via sensitising pupils to functions, uses and varieties of language, thus referring to the concept of awareness.

The British Language Awareness Movement of the 1980s used the definition of language awareness proposed by the Centre of Information on Language Teaching (CILT), which conceptualised it as "a person's sensitivity to and conscious awareness of the nature of the language and its role in human life" (Donmall 1985: 7). The movement inspired by Hawkins's ideas soon succeeded in bringing the issue of language to the attention of educational administration as evidenced by two major reports, i.e. the *Kingman Report* (1984) and the *Cox Report* (1988), which also promoted the concept of explicit *Knowledge about the language* (KAL). In the 1990s, *language awareness* came to be viewed as a continuum extending from intuitions allowing the learner to judge the grammaticality of a sentence, through the ability to locate the error and correct it to the knowledge of the grammatical rule which explains it (James 1999). The cognitive aspect of both LA and KAL was considered dominant.

Later approaches enriched the concept of language awareness by moving it beyond languages and conceptualising it as including social, political and cultural factors. Five domains of LA were postulated, i.e.:

- affective domain concerning motivations and beliefs about languages and cultures,
- cognitive domain referring to rules, categories and patterns underlying the use of language,
- social domain relating to diversity, mobility and intercultural processes,
- power domain related to political relationships in discourse,
- performance domain concerning language in use, communication strategies and ability to talk about the language (James & Garrett 1991).

Considering relatively low levels of foreign language proficiency among school learners, the set of postulates above was deemed appropriate for L1 and / or the language of schooling. The definition of language awareness proposed by the Association of Language Awareness (ALA) was therefore modified and became somewhat less ambitious; it read, "language awareness is explicit

knowledge about language and conscious perception and sensitivity in language learning, language teaching and language use" (ALA 2009). Awareness thus moved closer to KAL (*knowledge about the language*), a concept introduced in the *Kingman Report* in 1988, though enriched by sensitivity.

Fuzzy concepts of language awareness opened the way for disagreement and misunderstandings. Controversy arose over the relationship between language awareness and unconscious learning with the latter being frequently identified with implicit learning, yet Truscott argues that implicit learning can be both conscious and unconscious and warns against another aspect of the confusion, one "between awareness of form and awareness of task that involves use of the form" (Truscott 2015: 140). The role of consciousness is also controversial. Schmidt in setting forth his Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt 1990) considered noticing (equivalent to attention and consciousness) crucial for the conversion of input into intake and thus central to language learning. Following Krashen (1981), Truscott and other researchers, however, argued for the central role of unconscious learning identified with acquisition to which conscious processes can only partly contribute (Truscott 2015).

Important aspects of language awareness nevertheless achieved consensus. There is unequivocal agreement as to the role of the context of learning as well as of the value the learner ascribes to what is being noticed in the learning process. The diminishing role of attention in developing a learner's habitual reactions also proved to be an uncontroversial issue.

Soon new aspects of language awareness attracted the attention of researchers. These were:

- *learner metalinguistic awareness*, which encompasses the ability to focus on form, switch from form to meaning, categorise word into parts of speech and explain functions of words in a sentence, awareness of their morphology and cognates (Ellis 2005; Michońska-Stadnik 2013; Otwinowska-Kasztelanic 2011; Jessner 2014);
- *learner metacognitive awareness*, which encompasses not only task planning, management of work on a task and self-evaluation, but also the understanding of similarities and differences between the current tasks and the previous ones as well as selecting and using strategies appropriate in a given context, i.e. general reflection on language and its use (Jessner 2014; Trendak 2016);
- *learner multilingual awareness*, based on the monitoring system for all the languages appropriated by the multilingual speaker, encompassing cross-linguistic awareness e.g. of commonalities between languages and the role of L1, but also encompassing sociolinguistic aspects, such as preferences for certain languages in certain social contexts, awareness of preferences

of interlocutors and abilities to code-switch depending on the assessment of the situation (Jessner 2006, 2014; Wach 2018).

Not much, however, is known about learners' awareness of their intellectual fundament on which communication can be developed. Empirical studies focus mainly on accuracy and fluency issues as well as anxiety and willingness to communicate, while very few research projects allow students to reflect on other difficulties they face during spoken interaction. In a project conducted by Droździał-Szelest, subjects report running out of ideas, an inability to support their argument or refute their interlocutor's arguments and also problems with understanding the interlocutor's point of view (Droździał-Szelest 2011: 142–143). This places extra responsibility on the teacher and his / her own language awareness, without which the development of learner language awareness would not be possible.

4. FROM LANGUAGE AWARENESS TO TEACHER AWARENESS

In the 21st century, the cognitive domain, one of the five areas James and Garrett listed in 1991, is still the most frequently emphasised (Svalberg 2007), although social and critical issues have become increasingly important, especially for teachers. *Teacher language awareness* is, therefore, viewed as encompassing not only knowledge of the language and about the language, but also know-how related to the use of strategies raising learners' language awareness and shaping "the critical posture leading him / her to question underlying context-specific societal power relations" (Breidbach, Elsner & Young 2011: 13). This approach enriches the concept of teacher language awareness by social, educational, cultural and political aspects as well as by awareness of language from the learner's perspective (Andrews 2007), which renders the term inadequate and calls for its change into *teacher awareness*.

Pinho, Gonçalves, Andrade and Araujo e Sà (2011) list four types of diversity-oriented teacher awareness to be developed during pre-service education,

- *sociolinguistic awareness*, understood as knowledge of uses of language, language variation and its social context;
- *sociocultural awareness*, defined as understanding and sensitivity to contexts which influence worldviews and lifestyles enabling to promote intercomprehension;
- *linguistic culture*, seen as knowledge about world languages and cultures, plurilingualism and multilingualism;
- *self-awareness as speakers*, *learners and teachers*, viewed as teachers' reflection on their own knowledge, attitudes, experiences and skills (Pinho et al. 2011: 43–45).

Teacher awareness, formerly augmented by a broader concept of language awareness, has thus been extended to include *teacher self-awareness*. Developing this kind of awareness has become one of the most important aims of pre-service teacher education and is now viewed as embracing the awareness of one's own strong and weak points, needs, interests and their sources, external factors affecting the learning process, predispositions and individual characteristics. It also includes awareness of the degree of influence on one's own individual characteristics, self-evaluation relating to progress made, conditions of success or failure, identifying and assessing difficulty as well as understanding one's place in a learning group (Smuk 2016).

Hélot stressed the need to introduce one more concept, i.e. that of *teacher multilingual awareness*, which "does not actually involve the acquisition of language skills but focuses more on education for linguistic tolerance" (Hélot 2008: 377), an approach later expanded by Canagarajah (2018) and permeating pre-service teacher education practice in Austria (Hinger, Hirzinger-Unterrainer & Schmiderer 2020). Two more types of awareness need to be discussed here, i.e. awareness of learner's thinking processes and awareness of decision-making processes, as until the present they have not been given enough consideration.

5. NEGLECTED ASPECTS OF TEACHER AWARENESS

5.1. Awareness of learner's thinking processes

The first of those attracting insufficient attention is *awareness of learner's thinking processes*. Theoretical foundations for awareness raising programmes focused on students' cognition have been laid with the development of the *theory of mind* concept, although the term itself entered the language of psychology long ago, i.e. in the late 1970s (Premack & Woodruff 1978). Today the term refers to the ability to foresee and understand the behaviour of another person on the basis of that person's false conviction, i.e. a skill to differentiate between propositional content as the state of reality (*It is here*) and propositional attitude as the representation of reality in the mind (*I think it is here*). It encompasses a mindreading ability to mentalise and reflect not only on one's own and other people's thinking (Apperly 2011; Schaffer 2010), but also on one's own and other people's emotions, which enables an individual to understand that both cognition and affect underlie human behaviour. The ability to reflect on the thinking processes is indispensable to develop self-knowledge (*savoir-être*), pose questions and set forth hypotheses as well as effectively communicate with others (Smuk 2016).

Awareness of one's own feelings and thinking processes is, however, insufficient in caring professions. In the teacher's work, trying to understand how one would feel being one's own student in a given situation may be crucial for educational success. Assisting students in gradually developing a skill to take other people's perspective is a path not only to collaboration in the classroom, but also to the significant growth of their critical and empathetic thinking. The so-called *causal talk*, during which situations in the classroom are discussed and explained, is one of the ways to achieve this goal alongside integrating it with language teaching, e.g. with reported speech practice. Learners need to be able to engage in *recursive thinking*, during which the result of thinking becomes content of another thinking cycle (*I think that he thinks that I…*), a skill to be developed during communicative language practice.

5.2. Awareness of decision-making processes

Another aspect that has not received sufficient attention in training programmes is *teacher awareness of decision-making processes*. Educators have long reminded teachers how important it is to identify what students need to know, what social action takes place in the classroom and what meanings learners ascribe to it (Cazden & Mehan 1989; Erickson 1986). More than half a century ago, an American psychologist and educator Arthur Combs stated that human intentions are more important than behaviour people exhibit and that human interaction is based on interpretations people make. He thus considered developing perception skills and awareness raising to be more important in teacher education programmes than equipping trainees with measurable didactic skills (Combs 1972).

Teachers make many small-scale decisions during each class and often must make significant ones, i.e. those which bring about lasting effects as well as side-effects difficult to foresee. Awareness of causes, contexts and consequences of these decisions is crucial for the educational effectivity. Bargh and Morsella (2008) stress that most human decisions are made on a subconscious level and far fewer are made intentionally. Subconscious decisions may prove either emotionally generated or based on former understanding and automatised knowledge. Therefore, it seems justified to help teacher trainees gain as much knowledge and understanding during their pre-service teacher education as possible in order for them to be able to operate effectively in the future. Presentation of cognitive processes underlying classroom decision-making could form a solid basis for further didactic skills development.

In the analysis of teacher thought processes temporal distinctions prove important. *Preactive* thought processes take place before classroom interaction,

i.e. before teacher's *interactive* thoughts and decisions, while *postactive* ones occur after interaction. Both are mediated by a teacher's subjective theories and personal beliefs. Teacher awareness is often demonstrated in interactive decision-making, leading to changes in the course of the lesson. During interactive decision-making, perception shapes interpretation, which in turn forms the basis for anticipating or predicting possible consequences of a given course of action; action then leads to reflection on what has actually happened. Teachers declaring full awareness of their decision-making more often ascribe their departure from the former plan to student-generated behaviour than to their own thinking or behaviour; sometimes the change results from learner behaviour which is perceived as not within tolerance, while sometimes it may be a student question or a sign of the lack of understanding. Methods of inquiry aimed at identifying those processes include thinking aloud, stimulated recall, journal keeping, observation, questionnaires and interviews. Yet, researchers can never be sure of the resemblance of teacher declarations to actual interactive decisions taken in the classroom.

Teacher awareness of their decision-making as well as the type of behaviour resulting from particular decisions change with time, thus enabling researchers to distinguish expert from non-expert teachers, i.e. groups usually differentiated on the basis of a combination of researchers' and students' assessments. Main differences between the two groups of teachers can be seen in how they perceive the educational context and, as a consequence, how they classify particular situations as a) those calling for an automatised or routinised course of action and b) those which need special attention, in-depth analysis and conscious processing. Experts, unlike non-experts, use the so-called *chunking*, i.e. grouping similar situations together into larger categories, and then differentiating between broad categories rather than between individual cases. The picture of the situation is, therefore, simplified and more meaningful. Chunking and differentiating skills can be developed due to teachers' *selectivity*, i.e. the ability to register salient rather than insignificant features of the situation, which allows them to develop cognitive structures referred to as *schemata*, significantly facilitating perception, ascribing meanings to events, remembering and problem-solving, and thus classroom decision-making. Trainees should, therefore, be trained in analysing classroom situations based on their descriptions before they embark on practice teaching.

Types of stimuli eliciting conscious processing and decision-making differ as well: non-expert teachers concentrate on classroom discipline problems, while experts pay much less attention to behaviour, concentrating on the achievement of lesson goals. Although negative student cues tend to cause interactive thinking in both groups of teachers, experts tend to react more frequently to positive ones.

Interactive thinking about consequences differs as well: expert teachers focus their cognitive processes on the long-term significance of a particular decision, while non-experts tend to pay attention to immediate effects of their behaviour. For this reason focusing on didactic skills to plan and conduct a lesson seems to be a better predictor of effective classroom management than lengthy training in shaping learners' behaviour, although basic information about classroom management models is obviously useful.

The rate of decision-making differs, too: expert teachers are characterised by higher awareness levels and rapid judgment in contexts immediately classified as routine situations, while non-experts take more time taking decisions in situations the former group considers typical. In complicated situations, expert teachers tend to rely less on routine schemata, avoid overconfidence and take more time for reflection, while non-experts tend to react more impulsively. This difference is consistent with the present psychological knowledge of rapid habitual behaviour developed during the evolutionary process as invaluable in dangerous situations, in which hesitation would slow action and endanger lives, and the value of reflection in safe contexts, when the best of several options needs to be carefully selected.

Analysis of awareness levels of expert and non-expert teachers understandably overlaps with the study of successful and unsuccessful teachers (Szplit 2019; Tsui 2003, 2009), groups usually differentiated based on learning outcomes of their students, which makes the categorisation process more objective, while also leaving important educational factors beyond the scope of research. Here again successful teachers' higher awareness correlates with flexibility in decision-making. Linking theory and practice, i.e. building knowledge base underlying awareness of classroom events and developing the ability to use it in the situation is usually considered a *sine qua non* condition of teachers' success measured by their students' scores on achievement tests (Berliner 2001; Peterson & Clark 1978; Ropo 2004; Shavelson & Stern 1981).

Differences between expert and non-expert teachers, between successful and unsuccessful ones, correspond to those between novice and experienced teachers. Yet, generalisations must be treated with caution, as not all teachers demonstrate professional progress in the course of their career, therefore, neither age nor length of experience guarantee teaching effectiveness. Experience does not always equal expertise, hence the concept of *experienced non-experts* introduced by researchers specialising in expertise-oriented studies (Chi 2011; Day *et al.* 2006; Tsui 2003). What is more, expert teachers are identified as such by other expert teachers based on unclear criteria, as imprecise as those used to appoint selected teachers to function as evaluators engaged in the appraisal of their colleagues.

An important finding should not, however, be overlooked: although reflection hinders novice or non-expert teachers' efficiency, knowledge and analysis make them more analytical. Morine and Vallance (1975) were the first to notice that successful teachers mention fewer aspects which they take into consideration during interactive decision-making, while less successful ones list more factors. Analysing a vast spectrum of factors may be beneficial for the so-called *postactive thought processes* and, in this way, is perhaps an indispensable intermediary stage between learning to teach and teaching effectively.

All this means that knowledge lies at the roots of teachers' awareness of classroom events and of their own emotions, and that the process of developing teaching efficiency is similar to that of developing habits in the process of moving from theoretical knowledge through practice to subconscious reactions. Two models of teacher education seem, therefore, to be the most appropriate here, i.e. the applied science and the reflective ones (Komorowska & Krajka 2021; Wallace 1995).

6. CONCLUSION. IMPLICATIONS FOR LANGUAGE TEACHER EDUCATION

In applied linguistics, the term *awareness* is often used interchangeably with the term *consciousness*, although some researchers understand consciousness not only as awareness but also as intentionality, control or attention (Schmidt 1994). Both terms have come to cover much broader areas moving from language awareness to sociocultural and political aspects and later to *self-knowledge* and *self-awareness* (Smuk 2016). Yet, even this new addition does not exhaust the concept of teacher awareness, which also needs to encompass educational aspects connected with the person of the learner.

The content of initial teacher education needs to be structured in a way which enables trainee teachers to develop not only language awareness, but also awareness of values and social, economic and political aspects of education in multicultural and multilingual communities, aspects stressed by the European Commission (2016). Another field of shaping and / or raising future teachers' awareness includes principles underlying the functioning of school and awareness of what constitutes effective teaching. Fundamental duties of teacher educators listed at the end of the 20th century by Richards and Lockhart (1994), such as increasing trainees' awareness of the teaching aims, the context of teaching, values, cognitions underlying teacher decision-making, its consequences and other possible measures taken to attain educational objectives, were soon expanded to include awareness of factors associated with the person of the learner, e.g. students' needs, goals and difficulties, awareness of individual

differences, awareness of individualised teaching methodologies and strategies of behaviour modification (Komorowska & Krajka 2020).

Pedagogical developments in the 21st century have added a vast area of factors related to the person of the teacher himself / herself, i.e. self-awareness, awareness of personal and linguistic needs, awareness of one's own strengths and limitations as well as awareness of options for future professional development (Smuk 2016).

A variety of solutions can be used to select from in designing initial teacher training curricula: awareness raising can be achieved via discussions, debates, interactive lectures, workshops, teaching practicum logs, post-lesson dialogues with school-based mentors and university-based teacher educators. In-service teacher education programmes launched within the frames of continuous professional development (CPD) benefit from the use of case studies, analyses of critical incidents and strategies such as asking critique questions of the type "what did not happen because something else happened" (Tripp 2012). In particular, the analysis of critical events is crucial for awareness raising. Teachers, however, need to be aware not only of the value of personal and professional development, but also of the fact that not all factors are under their full control.

REFERENCES

Andrews, S. (2007). *Teacher language awareness.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Apperly, I. (2011). *Mindreaders. The cognitive basis of "Theory of Mind"*. Hove: Psychology Press.

Bargh, J.A. / Morsella, E. (2008). The unconscious mind. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 3* (1), 73–79.

Berliner, D.C. (2001). Learning about learning from expert teachers. *International Journal of Educational Research, 35*, 463–482.

Białecka-Pikul, M. (2012). *Narodziny i rozwój refleksji nad myśleniem*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Bielik-Robson, A. (2000). Nieświadomość – kreacja kartezjanizmu. In: A. Motycka / W. Wrzosek (eds.), *Nieświadomość jako kategoria filozoficzna [Unconsciousness as a philosophical category]* (pp. 26–30). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo IFIS PAN.

Breidbach, S. / Elsner, D. / Young, A. (2011). Language awareness in teacher education: Cultural-political and social-educational dimensions. In: S. Breidbach / D. Elsner / A. Young (eds.), *Language awareness in teacher education* (pp. 11–19). Frankfurt (a. M.): Peter Lang.

Canagarajah, S. (2018). Translingual practice as spatial repertoires: Expanding the paradigm beyond structuralist orientations. *Applied Linguistics, 39* (1), 31–54.

Cazden, C.B. / Mehan, H. (1989). Principles from sociology and anthropology: Context, code, classroom and culture. In: M.C. Reynolds (ed.), *Knowledge base for the beginning teacher* (pp. 47–57). Oxford / New York: Pergamon Press.

Chi, M.T.H. (2011). Theoretical perspectives, methodological approaches, and trends in the study of expertise. In: Y. Li / G. Kaiser (eds.), *Expertise in mathematics instruction: An international perspective* (pp. 17–39). New York: Springer.

Combs, A. (1972). Some basic concepts for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *23* (3), 286–290.
Connerley, M.L. / Pedersen, P.B. (2005). *Leadership in a diverse and multicultural environment. Developing awareness, knowledge and skills*. London: Sage.
Council of Europe (2001). *Common European framework for languages: Teaching, learning, assessment.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Council of Europe (2018a). *CEFR 2018. Companion volume with new descriptors.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
Council of Europe (2018b). *Competences for democratic culture*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
Day, C. / Stobart, G. / Sammons, P. / Kingston, A. / Quing, G. / Smees, R. / Mutjaba, T. (2006). *Variations in teachers' work, lives and effectiveness (VITAE). Research report RR743*. London: Department of Education and Skills.
Donmall, B.G. (1985). *Language awareness: NCLE reports and papers 6.* London: CILT.
Droździał-Szelest, K. (2011). Oral skills awareness of advanced EFL learners. In: M. Pawlak / E. Waniek-Klimczak / J. Majer (eds.), *Speaking and instructed foreign language acquisition* (pp. 131–148). Cham: Springer.
Ellis, N. (2005). At the interface: Dynamic interactions of explicit and implicit language knowledge. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 27*, 305–352.
Erickson, F. (1986). Classroom discourse as improvisation: Relationships between academic task structure and social participation structure in lessons. In: L.C. Wilkinson (ed.), *Communicating in the classroom* (pp. 153–181). New York: Academic Press.
European Commission (2016). *Cultural expression and awareness handbook*. Brussels. European Union Publishing.
Gazzaniga, M.S. (2018). *The consciousness instinct. Unravelling the mystery of how the brain makes the mind.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
Hawkins, E. (1984). *Awareness of language: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Hélot, C. (2008). Awareness raising and multilingualism in primary education. In: J. Cenoz / N. Hornberger (eds.), *Encyclopaedia of language and education* (pp. 371–384). New York: Springer.
Hinger, B. / Hirzinger-Unterrainer, E.M. / Schmiderer, K. (2020). A cross-linguistic and multilingual pre-service teacher education program: Insights from the Innsbruck model of foreign language teacher education. In: P. Mickan / I. Wallace (eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language education curriculum design* (pp. 274–288). London / New York: Routledge.
James, C. (1999). Language awareness: Implications for the language curriculum. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 12* (1), 94–115.
James, C. / Garrett, P. (1991). The scope of language awareness. In: C. James / P. Garrett (eds.), *Language awareness in the classroom* (pp. 3–20). London: Longman.
Jessner, U. (2006). *Linguistic awareness in multilinguals. English as a third language.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Jessner, U. (2014). On multilingual awareness or why the multilingual learner is a specific language learner? In: M. Pawlak / L. Aronin (eds.). *Essential topics in applied linguistics and multilingualism* (pp.175–184). Cham: Springer.
Jung, C.G. (1981). *Collected works.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Kingman, J.F.C. (1988). *Report of the Committee of inquiry into the teaching of English language* (*The Kingman Report*). London: HMSO.
Komorowska, H. (2014). Language awareness: From "embarras de richesse" to terminological confusion. In: A. Łyda, / K. Szcześniak (eds.), *Awareness in action* (pp. 3–20). Berlin et al.: Springer Verlag.
Komorowska, H. / Krajka, J. (2020). *The culture of language education.* Frankfurt (a. M.): Peter Lang.

Komorowska, H. / Krajka, J. (2021). *Cultural and social diversity in language teacher education*. Frankfurt (a. M.): Peter Lang.
Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.
Marland, M. (1982). *Language across the curriculum*. London: Heinemann.
Marland, M. / Barnes, D.R. (1977). *Language across the curriculum. The implementation of the Bullock report in the secondary school.* London: Heinemann.
Michońska-Stadnik, A. (2013). Awareness of derivational morphology and influence on vocabulary retention. In: D. Gabryś-Barker / E. Piechurska-Kuciel / J. Zybert (eds.), *Investigations in teaching and learning languages* (pp. 97–108). Cham: Springer.
Nelson, K. (2007). *Young minds in social worlds: Experience, meaning and memory.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
OECD (2019a). *How teachers learn: An OECD perspective.* Paris: OECD.
OECD (2019b). *Trends shaping education.* Paris: OECD.
Otwinowska-Kasztelanic, A. (2011). Cognate vocabulary and vocabulary learning strategies. In: J. Arabski / A. Wojtaszek (eds.), *Individual learner differences in SLA* (pp. 110–126). Cham: Springer.
Peterson, P.L. / Clark C.M. (1978). Teacher's reports of their cognitive processes during teaching. *American Educational Research Journal, 15*, 555–565.
Pinho, A.S. / Gonçalves, L. / Andrade A.I. / Araujo e Sà M.H. (2011). Engaging with diversity in teacher language awareness: Teachers' thinking, enacting and transformation. In: S. Breidbach / D. Elsner / A. Young (eds.), *Language awareness in teacher education* (pp. 41–61). Frankfurt (a. M.): Peter Lang.
Premack, D.G. / Woodruff G. (1978). Does the chimpanzee have a theory of mind? *Behavioural and Brain Sciences*, *1*, 515–526.
Richards, J.C. / Lockhart, R. (1994). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Rochat, P. (2003). Five levels of self-awareness as they unfold early in life. *Consciousness and Cognition, 12*, 717–731.
Ropo, E. (2004). Teaching expertise. In: P.A. Henny / R.B. Boshuizen / H. Gruber (eds.), *Professional learning. Gaps and transitions on the way from novice to expert* (pp. 1–16). Cham: Springer.
Rosenthal, R. / Jacobson, L. (1968). *Pygmalion in the classroom.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
Schaffer, R.H. (2006). *Key concepts in developmental psychology.* London: Sage.
Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *11*, 129–158.
Schmidt, R. (1994). Deconstructing consciousness in search for useful definitions for applied linguistics. *AILA Review, 11*, 11–26.
Shavelson, R.J. / Stern P. (1981). Research on teacher's pedagogical thoughts, judgments, decisions and behavior. *Review of Educational Research, 51*, 455–498.
Siegel, D.J. (2016). *Mind. A journey to the heart of being human.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
Siegel, D.J. (2020). *The developing mind. How relations and the brain interact to shape who we are.* New York: Guilford Press.
Smuk, M. (2016). *Od cech osobowości do kompetencji savoir-être – rozwijanie samoświadomości w nauce języków obcych [From personality traits to the savoir-être competence: The development of self-awareness in foreign language teaching/learning].* Lublin et al.: Wydawnictwo Werset / Instytut Romanistyki Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
Svalberg, A. (2007). Language awareness and language learning. *Language Teaching, 40* (4), 287–308.
Szplit, A. (2019). *Od nowicjusza do eksperta [From novice to expert].* Kielce: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jana Kochanowskiego.

TALIS (2018). *Teachers and school leaders as lifelong learners*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
Tołoczko, E. (2020). *Diagnosing critical incidents by teachers of English as a foreign language with reference to their domain expertise*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, the University of Warsaw.
Trendak, O. (2016). Raising strategic awareness as a prerequisite for successful strategy training. In: M. Pawlak (ed.), *Classroom-oriented research. Reconciling theory and practice* (pp. 261–274). Cham: Springer.
Tripp, D. (1993/2012). *Critical incidents in teaching: Developing professional judgment*. London et al.: Routledge.
Truscott, J. (2015). *Consciousness and second language learning*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Tsui, A. (2003). *Understanding expertise in teaching. Case studies of ESL teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Tsui, A. (2009). Distinctive qualities of expert teachers. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 15* (4), 421–439.
Ullman, M.T. (2015). The declarative/procedural model: A neurobiologically-motivated theory of first and second language. In: B. VanPatten / J. Williams (eds.), *Theories of second language acquisition: An introduction* (pp. 135–158). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Vandekerckhove, M. / Panksepp, J. (2009). The flow of anoetic to noetic and autonoetic consciousness: A vision of unknowing (anoetic) and knowing (noetic) consciousness. *Consciousness and Cognition, 18*, 1018–1028.
Wach, A. (2018). Trilingual learners' awareness of the role of L1 in learning target language grammar. In: M. Pawlak / A. Mystkowska-Wiertelak (eds.), *Challenges of second and foreign language education in a globalised world* (pp. 209–226). Cham: Springer.
Wallace, M.J. (1995). *Training foreign language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Wittrock, M.C. (1986). Students' thought processes. In: M.C. Wittrock. (ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 297–314). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Received: 06.12.2021; **revised:** 28.02.2022

HANNA KOMOROWSKA
SWPS Uniwersytet Humanistycznospołeczny
hannakomo@data.pl
ORCID: 0000-0002-9395-2734