

Annales Universitatis Paedagogicae Cracoviensis

Studia ad Didacticam Litterarum Polonarum st Linguae Polonae Pertinentia 8
(2017)

ISSN 2082-0909

DOI 10.24917/20820909.8.17

Jolanta Fiszbak

Contemporary methods of language training for
background development of the school work on the language concept.

Part I. Methods in the didactics of language learning

The school work on language, indicated in the title of discussion, should be understood in two ways: as a work of communicating the knowledge of mother tongue to the student or as a work on the development of his personal language in such a way that it can meet all of its transceiver needs resulting from the use of this medium in family, social, cultural and professional life. The problem of linguistic education is currently of particular interest due to the clearly noticeable reduction in the linguistic level of high-school graduates. We also see the search for such a concept that would be most effective against the challenges of ever-changing reality. Despite the fact that we have been experimenting for more than twenty years, we are basically in the beginning of the road started by war on language education, as Piotr Zbróg called the discussion of this section of Polish as an object¹, and we know only that the 1998 reform included speech and writing exercises and language learning, but after the reform the focus was on developing and improving communication competence².

Lowering the linguistic level of high-school graduates is due to a number of factors, including the delay in the language learning system caused by the change in school structure, cuts in hours, withdrawal from the traditional model (the division of language education into learning about a language and speaking exercises), and also - what may seem paradoxical – it is the effect (attempts) of the return to pragmatics. The search for new concepts has resulted in proposals for a communication approach³ in the training of written speeches by Agnieszka

¹ P. Zbróg, *Wojna o kształcenie językowe*, Kielce 2005

² J. Nocoń, *Uczenie o języku polskim po 1998 roku – prognozy i koncepcje dydaktyczne*, [in:] *Uczeń w świecie języka i tekstów*, eds. J. Nocoń, E. Łucka-Zajac, Opole, pp. 27-30.

³ It is also worth mentioning the earlier texts, eg. B. Dyduch, M. Jędrzychowska, Z.A. Kłakówna, H. Mrazek, I. Steczko, *To lubię! Polish language textbook for class 4. Teacher's Book*, Kraków 1994; H. Mrazek, *Praktyka językowa w szkole podstawowej*, „Nowa Poliszczyzna” 3, 1997; H. Mrazek, *Komunikacyjny model nauczania. Rozwijanie języka dziecka w klasach IV-VIII. Umiejętności i wiedza*, „Nowa Poliszczyzna” 1, 1998; W. Martyniuk, *Cele edukacji językowej*, „Nowa Poliszczyzna” 4, 1999; W. Martyniuk, *Praca z tekstem w nauczaniu języka*, „Nowa Poliszczyzna” 2, 2000; H. Mrazek, *Komunikacja językowa i nauka o języku w podręcznikach gimnazjalnych do kształcenia językowego*, [in:] *Podręcznik jako narzędzie kształcenia polonistycznego w gimnazjum*, eds. Z. Uryga, H. Kosętko, Cracow 2002 (Editor's note).

Contemporary methods of language training for background development of the school work on the language concept

Rypel⁴, And in the study of the language of Piotr Zbróg⁵, and more recently by the text-centered approach of Jadwiga Kowalik⁶ and performative-cultural by Marek Pieniżek⁷. At school, however, none of these concepts have taken root and continue in programs and textbooks, except perhaps only I like! Zofia Agnieszka Kłakówna⁸, notices the tendency towards the traditional model.

In this situation it is worth to pay attention to the existing and already tried method of language training in the didactic. We are well aware of the literary and cultural education methods, we also see their continuous development⁹, but language learning methods provide a variety of problems. In the case of the language knowledge transfer, teachers share elements of the "problematic method". This, however, most often does not show any common features with this method and more often corresponds to the often used "lecture elements" that usually turn into dictation of information¹⁰. School language knowledge is therefore often referred to in a deductive way¹¹, while language exercises are performed mechanically and are limited to textbook tasks and instructions¹². It should also be noted that over the last quarter of the century, the activating methods appeared. Their number is so large that they have distracted the attention from the methods used so far¹³. Considerable influence on this situation has had an identifying them as effective methods that guarantee success and affect students' interest in the subject matter of the lesson.

The purpose of the proposed considerations is to guide and organize the already existing methods in language education. Before there are extracted and described methods to implement the communication or text-centered concept, reference should be made to already existing and proven teaching methods. Perhaps their recognition will allow teachers to find themselves in new proposals or be the basis for other arrangements. Further discussion will include: 1) an outline of the views development on school learning about language, 2) methods used in language learning didactics and 3) the conclusions of the discussed methods review¹⁴.

⁴ A. Rypel, *Nauczanie komunikacyjne w kształceniu uczniowskich wypowiedzi pisemnych. Problemy. Badania eksperymentalne. Implikacje dydaktyczne*, Bydgoszcz 2007.

⁵ P. Zbróg, *Wojna o kształcenie językowe...*,

⁶ J. Kowalikowa, *Od słowa do zdania, od zdania do tekstu – od tekstu do zdania, od zdania do słowa*, [in:] *Szkolna polonistyka zanurzona w języku*, eds. A. Janus-Sitarz, E. Nowak, Cracow, pp. 17-43.

⁷ M. Pieniżek, *Uczeń jako aktor kulturowy. Polonistyka szkolna w warunkach płynnej ponowoczesności*, Cracow 2013, pp. 206-216.

⁸ It is worth noting that the textbooks *To lubię!* are created by the entire team: B. Dyduch, H. Mrazek, I. Steczko, Z.A. Kłakówna, M. Potaś, and at the high school level, also by: P. Kołodziej, E. Łubieniewska, W. Martyniuk, E. Szudek, J. Waligóra (Editor's note).

⁹ Let's call even the method developed and described by Marek Pieniżek Pupil as a cultural actor (the same, *Uczeń jako aktor kulturowy...*, there, pp. 168-189).

¹⁰ These comments were made on the basis of the documentation credits the continuous practice of students of Polish philology, performing the teaching specialization.

¹¹ Such conclusion are prompted by the observation how did the students prepare their own lessons. Language theory dictation seems to be commonly widespread. It also appeared previously, but it was not regular. After the remark that dictating the message is the worst way to communicate knowledge, the outraged trainee asked with reproach: How to do this otherwise?

¹² Por. E. Horwath, *Obraz lekcji z zakresu kształcenia językowego w gimnazjum*, „Polonistyka. Innowacje” 2, 2015, pressto.amu.edu.pl/index.php/pi/article/view/4190/4256, DOA 11.09.16.

¹³ During one of the discussions the Autumn School of Teachers in Cracow (2016) it was pointed out that the old names contained old methods, and the only indication of their novelty was the nameless addition, Who in fact should not be entitled to separate another independent existence (another method of another name).

¹⁴ In the second part of the article, methods of developing linguistic skills will be presented in a system analogous to that presented in this discussion.

Concluding preliminary considerations, it is still necessary to explain what we will understand by the teaching method. Polish teaching did not come up with a clear and consistent definition of the teaching method¹⁵. This concept includes how pupils and teachers interact with each other during the lesson in order to fulfill the intended didactic and educational purposes. Taking into account existing definitions, we can assume that teaching method is the one chosen and applied consciously, including activities scheduled in logical order, repetitive in similar situations, taking into account the subjective aspect (student and teacher condition) and the matter (teaching content and degree of difficulty) of the teaching-learning process, which serves to shape the world of values and the comprehensive development of the student's personality¹⁶. The choice of the method from the existing to achieve the objectives, regardless of what it was called¹⁷, depends on and is from the prevailing didactic system, knowledge condition of parental discipline and subject didactic, the development of pedagogical and psychological sciences, the accepted philosophy of education and developed learning concepts (theoretical assumptions underlying this process).

The development of views on the school's language learning, which is a department of language training, occupies a lot of space in didactic literature¹⁸. Knowledge of the language aroused a huge interest because of the usefulness (or not) of linguistic theory for the pupil's language shaping (his language skills). Trying to unravel this problem and embed it in a historical context, was often referred to the past, recalled the achievements of predecessors¹⁹. This interest is evident, moreover, to this day²⁰. It is worth noting, however, that both the interwar period and the sixties, seventies and eighties definitely differ in terms of linguistic problems of the Poles as a whole (other problems are overlooked) and are quite different from the contemporary ones. In the interwar period there were educated elites but also a wide range of illiterate people living in non-literate culture. Over a hundred years of captivity in Poland, the influence of the languages of the partitioning countries has been impressed on the Polish language. Finally, the Polish society was a multiethnic society. In the middle and late PRL period, they complained about the general decline of the linguistic culture of Poles, which was paradoxically related to the society literacy. The school curriculum included a fight against the dialect, which was discontinued in the 1980s and began to focus on secondary illiteracy. Present

¹⁵ Por. K. Ratajska, *Metody kształcenia literackiego w szkole*, [in:] *Z literatury i kultury w szkole*, ed. E. Cyniak, Łódź 1994, p. 44; A. Zabrotowicz, *O metodach ogólnodydaktycznych w nauczaniu języka polskiego (lekcje literackie)*, [in:] *Nowoczesność i tradycja w kształceniu literackim. Podręcznik do ćwiczeń z języka polskiego*, ed. B. Myrdzik, Lublin 2000, p. 83.

¹⁶ See definition of teaching method: T. Kotarbiński, *O pojęciu metody*, „Zeszyty Filozoficzne Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego” 1957, p. 5; K. Kruszewski, *Metoda kształcenia: od zmiany do sposobu jej wywołania*, „Kwartalnik Pedagogiczny” 3-4, 1982, p. 55; W. Okoń, *Słownik pedagogiczny*, Warszawa 1987, p. 174.

¹⁷ In the interwar period, the terms "method, form, system" were used interchangeably (K. Lausz, *Materiały pomocnicze do nauczania metodyki literatury*, Warsaw 1981, p. 61.) Today we also use synonyms of the method, calling it, for example, a way, a trick/ methodical trick, technique, strategy, but in principle, the concepts, methods and strategies should not be confused.

¹⁸ See, eg. J. Podracki, *O poglądach na cele nauczania gramatyki polemicznie, czyli w obronie tradycji*, „Polonistyka” 1970; M. Jaworski, *Metodyka nauki o języku polskim*, Warsaw 1978, M. Iwanowicz, *O koncepcjach i metodach kształcenia językowego*, [in:] *Z dydaktyki kształcenia językowego w szkole*, ed. S. Gala, Łódź 1996, pp. 39-58; J. Fiszbak, *O celach szkolnej nauki o języku*, [in:] *Z dydaktyki...*, there, p. 7-28, and other. Dorobek polskiej myśli dydaktycznej sprzed 1980 roku odnajdziemy w opracowaniu *Przewodnik po tematach i literaturze z dydaktyki języka polskiego*, ed. E. Cyniak, Łódź 1981.

¹⁹ See, eg. *Wybór prac z metodyki nauczania języka polskiego*, ed. B. Wieczorkiewicz, Warsaw 1964.

²⁰ Z. Pomirska, *Zmiana czy długie trwanie? Dylematy związane z metodami kształcenia językowego*, the paper presented at the conference „Polonistic Education— Metamorphosis” (Lublin 26-27.09.2016).

Contemporary methods of language training for background development of the school work on the language concept

day surprises the unification of the general language and the return to oral culture, different to the one which was attended by the illiterate Poles of the Second Polish Republic. Probably they correct the reason that, despite over two hundred years of linguistic tradition, we are constantly struggling with the problem of shaping the linguistic ability of the youngest generations.

The interest in mother tongue instruction and mother tongue education began with the activity of the National Education Commission, founded in 1773. The reform carried out by it, has made Polish as a language of lecture and self-taught subject in schools of all levels. It has fostered the development of Polish didactics and has created convenient conditions for writing textbooks for student and teacher. The oldest textbook in the mother tongue is Grammar for National Schools (1778-1783) Onufry Kopczyński and his methodical manual Notes for Teachers. Kopczyński's grammar created the framework of Polish linguistic terminology and as the most well-known textbook influenced the progeny. In the nineteenth century, other textbooks were created and used, such as the First Rules of Polish Grammar of Józef Mroziński 1822 (the textbook considered the best grammar of Poland in the first half of the 19th century²¹), and Science of the Sentence by Stanisław Gruszczyński (Poznań 1681), whose views on the grammar teaching can be considered very innovative for those times²².

The nineteenth-century school was dominated by the herbartist system and also the science of language was under its influence. In teaching, a lecture and reproductive erotemic method (questioning) were used, by means of which the student's level of mastery of the knowledge was checked²³. The development of a pupil's thinking in harmony with the herbartist pedagogy could only be made while acquiring knowledge. School-based language learning was primarily attributed to normative goals, seeing the link between grammar and language skills. However, Kopczyński's position was not explicitly normative; The linguists referred to above were also skeptical about the normative objective. Gruszczyński, for example, paying attention to the need to know the language and building it on the background of the whole language system and the need for a coherent arrangement of grammatical material, was inclined to achieve autonomous objectives²⁴.

The return to the language learning objectives was at the beginning of the twentieth century influenced by the active school. This was also connected with the development of linguistic knowledge. In a breakthrough for the school's language learning article published in the collective work Currents in Mother Tongue Teaching²⁵, Jan Baudouin de Courtenay drew attention to cognitive, educational and formal values in language teaching. He saw means to develop a pupil's mind in it, prepare it for self-examination of reality, and issue judgments about it²⁶. This view was shared by other linguists, such as Stanisław Szober²⁷, Jan Rozwadowski²⁸ or Zenon Klemensiewicz, who emphasized that the realization of a formal goal is an instruction for

²¹ M. Jaworski, *Metodyka...*, p. 14.

²² J. Podracki, *O poglądach...*, p.46.

²³ S. Nalaskowski, *Wybrane zagadnienia teorii metod nauczania*, Toruń 1988, p. 9.

²⁴ J. Podracki, *O poglądach...*, there.

²⁵ *Prądy w nauczaniu języka ojczystego: a group work*, ed. S. Szober, Warsaw 1908.

²⁶ J. Baudouin de Courtenay, *Znaczenie języka jako przedmiotu nauki szkolnej*, [in:] *Wybór prac z metodyki...*, there, p. 15.

²⁷ S. Szober, *Znaczenie pedagogiczno-wychowawcze języka ojczystego jako przedmiotu wykładowego*, [in:] *Wybór prac z metodyki...*, p. 15; (the article first published in 1911 in „Nowe Tory”).

²⁸ J. Rozwadowski, *O nauce języka w szkole i o rzeczach pokrewnych*, „Język Polski” 1, 1926, p.29.

a teacher who transferring knowledge about language²⁹. They also drew attention to the limited impact of linguistic knowledge on language skills. Definitely against the normative goals they expressed themselves: J. Baudouin de Courtenay, S. Szober, J. Rozwadowski³⁰. Others, for example Henryk Gaertner and Z. Klemensiewicz³¹, emphasized the modest influence of language learning on linguistic efficiency. Some linguists, as Kazimierz Nitsch and later Witold Doroszewski³², however, stood in defense of this goal.

It seems that the problem of the influence of language learning on linguistic competence has not been resolved to date. It is considered from another point of view, emphasizing the need for language pragmatism in the school and limitation of language knowledge (discussed below). The interwar period significantly influenced the development of language learning methodology. Negating the normative goal of learning the language has contributed to the development of methodology for speaking and writing exercises. They emphasized their role in developing linguistic proficiency (eg J. Rozwadowski, H. Gaertner, Z. Klemensiewicz³³), while the exposition of autonomous objectives - the need to learn language theory and to treat language proficiency as an essential component of general education³⁴ led to a shift in the concept of education the transition from the herbartist system (traditional school) to the deweyowski's (active school). Although it was not without resistance³⁵.

An important role in this process was played by Klemensiewicz's didactic thought and his lesson teaching knowledge of the language, he used the advantages of a traditional school (sorting out the material and incorporating it into a compact system of knowledge already acquired) and the active one ((solving language problems to get the message) in which, creating a coherent whole³⁶. The concept of language lesson proposed by him corresponds to the lesson of introducing new material and problem-solving lessons, and as a language lesson, it finds supporters to this day. Similarly, the transfer of the school knowledge of the language was seen by H. Gaertner³⁷. He emphasized that "the basic forms of language learning [methods - note J.F.] are forms of search, or heuristic". At the elementary school (ending approximately 12 years of the student's life), it was not allowed to use the methods given, in his view; The method of lecture could only appear in junior high school and only when heuristics could not be applied. It was only possible to use it in high school, mainly as a way to prepare students for future use in university lectures. However, Gaertner stated that the lecture could be used at this school

²⁹ Z. Klemensiewicz, *Cel nauczania gramatyki*, [in:] this same, *Ze studiów nad językiem i stylem*, Warsaw 1969, pp. 261-262; (the article first published in 1927).

³⁰ J. Baudouin de Courtenay, *Znaczenie języka...*, there; S. Szober, *Zasady nauczania języka polskiego w zakresie szkoły powszechnej i gimnazjum niższego*, Lwów-Warsaw 1923, pp.138-240; J. Rozwadowski, *O nauce języka...*, there, p.15.

³¹ H. Gaertner, *Dydaktyka nauki o języku ojczystym*, [in:] *Wybór prac z metodyki...*, there, p. 32; Z. Klemensiewicz, *Cel nauczania gramatyki...*, there, p. 255.

³² K. Nitsch, *Kilka słów o celach nauczania języka polskiego*, [in:] *Wybór prac z metodyki...*, p. 27 (the article was published in 1921.); W. Doroszewski, *Myśli i uwagi o języku polskim*, Warsaw 1937, p. 26.

³³ J. Rozwadowski, *O nauce języka...*, there, p. 15; H. Gaertner, *Dydaktyka nauki o języku ojczystym...*, there, pp.32-33; Z. Klemensiewicz, *Cel nauczania gramatyki...*, there, p. 252.

³⁴ See, eg. S. Szober, *Znaczenie pedagogiczno-wychowawcze języka ojczystego...*, there, p. 21.

³⁵ J. Rozwadowski in „Język Polski” – for example– ha was against the new trends and asked when the student would learn if he was to be an investigator (this same, *O nauce języka...*, there).

³⁶ See, eg. Z. Klemensiewicz, *Dydaktyka nauki o języku ojczystym. Zasady i zagadnienia*, Lwów-Warsaw 1929; this same, *Sposoby wprowadzania, opracowania i utrwalania nowego materiału*, [in:] *Wybór prac z metodyki...*, there, pp. 68-85.

³⁷ H. Gaertner, *Dydaktyka nauki o języku ojczystym*, [in:] *Wybór prac z metodyki...*, there, p. 65.

Contemporary methods of language training for background development of the school work on the language concept

stage if heuristic methods can not be used. He also pointed out the need to use an induction in-school learning about the language³⁸.

The period of war and occupation and the postwar years did not promote the development of didactic ideas for obvious reasons. The situation changed in the sixties. It was already previously referred to the pre-war achievements, now they have been refined and developed. Normativism indicated previously found supporters of continuing the work of linguists: W. Doroszewski and Z. Klemensiewicz; Later, Jan Tokarski, Michał Jaworski and Piotr Bąk joined them³⁹. Emphasizing the normative goal of learning about language also resulted from social needs; As a result of the literacy of society and universal access to schools, the linguistic level of Poles has decreased. Classroom knowledge of the language could promote the work on the dissemination of the linguistic norm.

Literature in the field of language learning can be divided into three groups at this time. It included - let us call it - the Polish language grammar⁴⁰, methodological studies devoted entirely to language education or addressing issues of language science alongside other methodological problems⁴¹, and textbooks for pupils accompanying textbooks for teachers supporting his work at a certain level of education⁴². The number of publications compared to the pre-war period is significantly lower. There is also a noticeable decrease in the interest in school didactics between academic teachers and the almost complete lack of research on the teacher-trainers didactic process. All this has significantly influenced the development of language learning.

Shortly after the political transformation in 1989, a discussion on the school language education began that was concerned with its shape at the time - the excess grammar at school, the focus on language theory, as well as the goals of school language learning. It was emphasized that the acquisition of theoretical knowledge did not affect a linguistic efficiency. The unwillingness to school science of language could be due to two reasons. First of all - from

³⁸ There, pp. 63-64.

³⁹ J. Tokarski, *Nauczanie gramatyki w szkole*, Warsaw 1966, this same, *Gramatyka w szkole*, Warsaw 1972; M. Jaworski, *Metodyka nauki o języku polskim*, 1978, Warsaw; P. Bąk, *Podstawy metodyczne nauczania gramatyki*, „Polonistyka” 1, 1976, pp. 30-34.

⁴⁰ Z. Klemensiewicz, *Zarys składni polskiej*, Warsaw 1963; W. Doroszewski, B. Wieczorkiewicz, *Gramatyka opisowa języka polskiego z ćwiczeniami*, part 1-2, Warsaw 1959; M. Jaworski, *Podręczna gramatyka języka polskiego*, Warsaw 1974; P. Bąk, *Gramatyka języka polskiego; zarys popularny*, Warsaw 1977; J. Podracki, *Składnia polska; książka dla nauczycieli, studentów i uczniów*, Warsaw 1997.

⁴¹ Apart from the mentioned in the text also: J. Kulpa, *Nauczanie języka polskiego w szkole podstawowej*, Warsaw 1947; Z. Klemensiewicz, *Wybrane zagadnienia metodyczne z zakresu nauczania gramatyki*, Warsaw 1959; J. Dańciewiczowa, *Metodyka nauczania składni w szkole podstawowej*, Warsaw 1962; J. Sosnowski, *Metodyka nauczania języka polskiego w kl. V-VIII: script from the lecture and exercises material*, Warsaw 1964; J. Kulpa, W. Pasterniak, *Metodyka nauczania języka polskiego w klasach V-VIII*, Warsaw 1977; M. Mytnik, W. Piotrowski, A. Szczepanek, *Materiały pomocnicze dla nauczycieli języka polskiego klas V - VIII: propozycja strukturalizacji dzieła literackiego i materiału gramatycznego na lekcjach języka polskiego*, Koszalin 1981; A. Stypka, *Ćwiczenia gramatyczne w klasach 4-8*, Warsaw 1987; M. Nagajowa, *Nauka o języku dla nauki języka. Poradnik metodyczny dla nauczycieli języka polskiego*, Kielce 1994.

⁴² M. Pęcherski, *Przewodnik metodyczny do podręcznika gramatyki i pisowni dla klasy V*, Warsaw 1960; J. Dembowska, Z. Saloni, P. Wierzbicki, *Wskazówki metodyczne do nauczania języka polskiego: klasa VI*, Warsaw 1964; J. Dembowska, M. Jaworski, Z. Strzelecka, *Nauczanie języka polskiego w klasie VI*, Warsaw 1971; M. Pęcherski, *Przewodnik metodyczny do podręcznika gramatyki i pisowni dla klasy VII*, Warsaw 1958; M. Nagajowa, S. Sufinowa, J. Tokarski, *Nauczanie języka polskiego w klasie VII*, Warsaw 1977; I. Bajerowa, *Wskazówki metodyczne do nauczania języka polskiego w kl. VIII: gramatyka*, Warsaw 1966; M. Knothe, J.S. Kopczeński, *Metodyczny poradnik nauczania języka polskiego w klasie VIII szkoły podstawowej*, Warszawa 1969; M. Knothe, J. Tokarski, *Nauczanie języka polskiego w klasie VIII*, Warsaw 1972.

the inadequate teaching of it, limited to the isolation and classification of grammatical phenomena⁴³ and, as Maria Nagajowa put it, analyzes of dead language preparations. It was a boring science, which was dead on the ground, causing the student not to combine knowledge with the phenomena that accompanied him every day. The second reason, equally important, though rarely raised, was the inconsistency between school grammar and university grammar. This first stuck its roots in the nineteenth century and did not keep pace with the changes that have taken place in science, which made it somewhat anachronistic. Linguistic theories, although not taught, have, however, emerged in school practice, bringing school education closer to the university⁴⁴.

The war for language training, introduced in the beginning, began around the mid-nineties and involved moving the focus from linguistic theory to linguistic pragmatism. In 1994, M. Nagajowa emphasized the need for a linguistic knowledge in the school, which would serve to develop linguistic skills and suggested that the grammar of theoretical and normative grammar be replaced by functional grammar. He opposed the building of theoretical consciousness as an end in itself⁴⁵. In the same year, Kordian Bakuła opposed the excess grammar at school in "Polonistyka". He proposed to emphasize linguistic pragmatism and the training of communication competences. In his opinion, the knowledge of the language and the practice of speaking and writing had to be linked to the linguistics of the text⁴⁶. The proposal to limit the scope of school grammar caused a turbulent discussion in the "Polonistyka"⁴⁷. Further attempts to reform school language education were subordinated to language pragmatics and communication skills in the transceiver aspect, the development of text-processing competence including. There are at least works by P. Zbróg, A. Rypel or J. Kowalikowa's latest proposal, which emphasized that after years of neglect and criticism, the 2008 Curriculum Framework appreciates language learning, with greater emphasis on language usage and their effects, than for autonomous purposes⁴⁸. A slightly different character was devoted to the development of reading skills, the work of Regina Pawłowska⁴⁹, covering them comprehensively in the system of Polish language education and taking into account the communication aspect of language training in transversal and retaining skills, it is worth emphasizing the traditional approach to the structure of language training.

Let's pause briefly with the concept of P. Zbróg. His model of language training is based on the conviction that "about language and communication should be as far as possible [subcl. J.F.] speak globally, bringing together the selected aspects of each communication situation"⁵⁰. The starting point for work on the lessons should be communication situation, taking into account the components: language (and in the framework of its stylistic and lexical and grammatical and spelling aspects) and non-linguistic (with verbal and cultural aspect). The

⁴³ Zob. M. Pieniżek, *Uczeń jako aktor kulturowy...*, pp. 206-207.

⁴⁴ Zob. E. Horwath, *Teorie językoznawcze w szkolnej dydaktyce*, [in:] *Szkolna polonistyka zanurzona w języku*, eds. A. Janus-Sitarz, E. Nowak, Cracow 2014, pp. 63-86.

⁴⁵ M. Nagajowa, *Nauka o języku dla...*, Kielce 1994, p.11.

⁴⁶ K. Bakuła, *Szkolną naukę o języku trzeba zmienić*, „Polonistyka” 5, 1994, pp.274-281.

⁴⁷ S. Gajda, *Trudne upotrzebnienie*, „Polonistyka” 6, 1996, pp. 240-241; F. Nieckula, *Usunąć język polski z „języka polskiego”?*, „Polonistyka” 4, 1995, pp. 214-220; this same, *Primum non nocere*, „Polonistyka” 6, 1996, pp.241-242; J. Puzynina, *Gramatyka na 10 głósów*, „Polonistyka” 6, 1996, pp.238-239; T. Zgółka, *Barbarzyńca w (szkolnym) ogrodzie*, „Polonistyka” 4, 1995, p. 213-214.

⁴⁸ J. Kowalikowa, *Od słowa do zdania...*, there, pp.20-21.

⁴⁹ R. Pawłowska, *Lingwistyczna teoria nauki czytania*, Gdańsk 1992, later published under the expanded title: *Czytam i rozumiem Lingwistyczna teoria nauki czytania*, Kielce 2009; R. Pawłowska, *Metodyka ćwiczeń w czytaniu*, Gdańsk 2003.

⁵⁰ P. Zbróg, *Wojna o kształcenie językowe...*, p.82.

Contemporary methods of language training for background development of the school work on the language concept

grammatical component (language knowledge "less or more closely related to communication content") with the communication situation would be not only occasionally combined. It should be considered as a purposeful, planned and developing language knowledge. Grammatical contents should be introduced into teaching units in such a way as to form a coherent logical whole in the course of education. However, the author notes that integration of language contents with communication ones due to the specificity of language learning is not always possible. Recalling the teaching methods used in the study of language, as well as (in the second part of this article) methods of learning language skills, reference is made to the teaching strategies proposed by Wincenty Okoń⁵¹. They refer to the activities that accompany the natural learning of the child through the acquisition of knowledge (strategy A), problem solving (strategy P), exercise (strategy O) and emotions (strategy E). The choice of method depends on the purpose, the content of the teaching, the age of the students, the level of their knowledge and skills, and the maturity of the independent work, the available teaching resources, and the time available to the teacher (other criteria may be mentioned, but these seem to be the most important). Methods in strategy A and strategy P are ones of learning reality. Learning about linguistic theory and language knowledge can be done through the acquisition of knowledge as well as problem solving (problem-solving). This may also be the method used to influence reality included in the strategy O - exercise and in the strategy E - covering learning through experiences.

A review of linguistic methods in the field of language learning, we are starting with delivery methods, which does not mean that they should be considered the most important. It is worth recalling the previously mentioned sentence of H. Gaertner, who argued that the basic methods of language learning are searching methods and induction process. Nothing in this regard has changed to this day.

Among the methods of knowledge assimilation which serve to impart language knowledge, the most often mentioned are: talk, pedagogical narrative, lecture, description, and explanation⁵². However, work with a book should be replaced with another name - for example, exploratory work, because the textbook, dictionary vocabulary and popular science publications are not currently the only knowledge carriers. They can also be videos that convey knowledge, online lectures, thematic blogs, streaming (live streaming media, eg web conferencing). This method is important for pupils for several other reasons: it develops the ability to use various information sources, shapes the ethics of using available sources, accustomed to reliably refer to the authors, orders you to give up ethically or informally questionable sources, accustomed to using legal sources because they can not be invoked, allows you to explore online resources and traditional sources, teaches you to use messages from different sources, prepares for self-education, develops the ability to focus in general and focus on the goal, shapes the efficiency of quotation and learning⁵³.

⁵¹ W. Okoń, *Wprowadzenie do dydaktyki ogólnej*, Warsaw 2003, p. 316-318; on pp. 318-324 you can find the lesson models characteristic to different strategies.

⁵² Por. W. Okoń, *Wprowadzenie do dydaktyki...*, pp.252-258 (Among the delivery methods the discussion is also mention, which is one of the methods of problem-solving teaching); F. Szlosek, *Wstęp do dydaktyki przedmiotów zawodowych*, Radom 1998, p. 91; M. Nagajowa, *ABC metodyki języka polskiego dla początkujących nauczycieli*, Warsaw 1990, p. 77.

⁵³ It is worth paying close attention to the fact that nowadays young people, are being "satisfied" with the "technique" copy-paste or collect xerographic prints instead of take notes, and the consequences of this procedure. Consequently, the student has no knowledge, the ability to write a note, or can not learn. He is expected to dictate or send slides at the lectures, which generally he do not use anyway.

Teachers are eager to use delivery methods absolving the lack of time, and sometimes, that - as previously noted - even dictate messages, or recommends read them from the manual. As a consequence, they devote more time to linguistic issues than they intended, because they must constantly return to the seemingly already introduced messages and reinterpret them⁵⁴. The time criterion is therefore deceptive. On this "apparent simplicity" application of the methods of knowledge assimilation W. Okoń pointed out⁵⁵. Czesław Kupisiewicz observed, in turn, that the methods of knowledge assimilation exercise memory and knowledge but do not provide joy for scientific research and do not creative thinking develop⁵⁶. Thus, to a limited extent, they stimulate positive emotions during learning. It is also worth referring to the criterion of the availability of teaching resources and stressing that language is, in principle, the only and easily accessible means of reference in the lessons devoted to it, usable at every moment and in every situation, which at the beginning of XX many drew attention to J. Baudouin de Courtenay and S. Szober⁵⁷.

The use of teaching, delivery methods - which should be emphasized - fulfills important educational objectives. The pedagogical narrative and description, by focusing attention, listening to longer verbal messages and self-recording information, prepare a junior student to work with a lecture in the senior classes. However, the use of the lecture develops the ability to perceive and understand a longer expression and following the author's reasoning, practice concentration and prepare students for this method in the future.

More attention should also be paid to the talk, which is seen as a teacher's conversation with students, where some knowledge is introduced by the teacher, and some comes from the students⁵⁸. This method works well with younger learners, due to its nature (although it can be used at every stage of education) and the use of appropriately built questions will bring it closer to heuristic talk, and to problem-solving methods. It is worth to pay attention on it because we require students from fourth and fifth grade intellectual, verbal and reception activities that exceed its capabilities too often.

Problem-based instruction in strategy P is more attractive and interesting to the student than to get cut off by learning information. During the lesson using seekers methods, the student is active intellectually, verbally, and emotionally. The knowledge he gains becomes closer and more functional (he knows how to use it). Among the problematic methods are various of them, including simulation games⁵⁹. In the school language education most often heuristic and problematic method are used. A discussion can also be used in high school to promote language learning, for example, in bringing together the problems of general culture, such as, for example, influence of the adoption of Christianity on the Polish language development, a history of Polish contacts with other nations "written" in the language, development of the Polish versification as an evidence of the mother tongue development.

⁵⁴ We omit the consideration of the well-known problem of the memorizing knowledge efficiency, depending on the method used: the smallest in the case of delivery methods, the largest during action or message transfer. You also do not need to prove that memorizing messages is related to their understanding.

⁵⁵ W. Okoń, *Wprowadzenie do dydaktyki...*, p. 252.

⁵⁶ Cz. Kupisiewicz, *Podstawy dydaktyki ogólnej*, Warszawa 1984, p.130.

⁵⁷ See, eg. J. Baudouin de Courtenay, *Znaczenie języka jako przedmiotu nauki...*, p. 15; S. Szober, *Znaczenie pedagogiczno-wychowawcze języka ojczystego...*, p. 21.

⁵⁸ M. Nagajowa, *ABC metodyki...*, p. 68

⁵⁹ See, W. Okoń, *Wprowadzenie do dydaktyki...*, p. 259-266; F. Szlosek, *Wstęp do dydaktyki...*; K. Kruszewski, *Metody nauczania*, [in:] *Sztuka nauczania, Czynności nauczyciela*, part 1, ed. K. Kruszewski, Warsaw 1992, pp. 164-181; M. Nagajowa, *ABC metodyki...*, p. 77.

Contemporary methods of language training for background development of the school work on the language concept

It is worth noting that there were many misunderstandings around the heuristics. It is hard to say what has affected it: whether an alarm about the methodology⁶⁰ raised by Stanisław Bortnowski, or incorrectly understood questions collections created during the interwar period, such as Tadeusz Czapczyński's methodical analysis of "Pan Tadeusz"⁶¹. S. Bortnowski noted not a heuristics, but a pseudoheuristics. On the other hand, T. Czapczyński's publication was intended to help teachers in asking questions in general. We forget that this position was created during the transition from the herbartist lesson to the deweyowski's lesson, and teachers who had used the lecture had to start using search methods, based on the didactic question, they had problems with which.

In methodological publications, heuristics is also confused with the problematic method, while the latter is growing out of heuristics; It is a difficult method and can only be used in the work of the thirteen, fourteen-year-old students. Previously, it can successfully be replaced by heuristics⁶².

Comparison of heuristics and problematic method

Heuristics	Problematic method
1. A problem situation may arise but is not required; The lesson may begin with the teacher asking the main question (the main problem).	1. Creating a problem situation is obligatory.
2. The teacher formulates the main question and the questions (sub-problems) to resolve the main problem.	2. Problems and sub-problems are formed by students. Teachers can help them in their linguistic approach. Another variant assumes the choice of a problem out of several ready-made or so skillful posture by the teacher that the students will not feel impelled or coerced. The problem can also be formulated by the teacher, but it is recognized that this variant is the least motivated to work ⁶³ .
3. The organizational form of the class are collective work or group work. The use of group work comes to heuristics methods problematic because it increases students' self-reliance.	3. The organizational form of the class is a group work. Collective work can only occur in the first and last part of the lesson.
4. Limited autonomy of the students in relation to the problematic methods.	4. A large student autonomy.
5. By asking questions, the teacher knows where to go and what will be the end	5. The teacher can not be sure what direction the students will take and what their final effects will be.

⁶⁰ S. Bortnowski, *Alarm w sprawie metod nauczania*, „Polonistyka” 1, 1979, pp. 6-9.

⁶¹ See, eg. T. Czapczyński, *Metodyczny rozbiór „Pana Tadeusza” in the form of questions*, Warsaw 1925.

⁶² J. Fiszbak, *Metoda analizy heurystycznej a „metody aktywizujące” (voice in defense of tradition)*, „Acta Universitatis Lodzianis, Folia Litteraria Polonica” 8, 2006, pp. 505-519.

⁶³ Comp. M. Nagajowa, *ABC metodyki...*, p. 74.

<p>result of the work (but may overlook the interesting conclusions, interpretations, observations of the students, so he should always listen carefully to note these situations).</p>	
---	--

The source: own elaboration⁶⁴

Let's move on to strategy O. This includes activities involving learning through exercises, so the methods based on practical activities, binding theory to practice, and preparing to apply knowledge in solving practical tasks. Among the operational methods for language lessons, characteristic will be: the training methods (W. Okoń), the practical methods: demonstration, subject exercises (F. Szlosek)⁶⁵, the method of practical classes (M. Nagajowa)⁶⁶, the method of occasional exercises in efficiency (A. Dyduchowa)⁶⁷. The lesson model in this strategy has typical, for training methods, moments: the study of purpose of the action and one or more rules which may be applied in action, establishing the model of action, demonstration of the action perfectly made, first, thoroughly controlled student's attempts, exercises in the smooth execution of the whole operation⁶⁸.

Both the M. Nagajowa's method of practical classes and the method of occasional efficiency exercises by A. Dyduchowa refer to the integration of the Polish language as an object, which enables the use of linguistic knowledge in reading and teaching the pupil's language, for example, in writing, reading or reciting. The method of practical activities also serves to consolidate the knowledge learned by the student during language lessons. The students practice language skills, subordinated to the topic of the lesson and forming an integral part of the lesson unit (the method of occasional efficiency exercises⁶⁹), Or entirely devoted to consolidating a particular linguistic problem or broadening the knowledge of it (the method of practical classes).

The ludic methods within the E strategy, this is a group of methods teaching through fun. They are based on the experience and action of the students and often goes away from the worked out schemes. By using them, the teacher tends to trigger spontaneous expression, independent creativity and imagination. The activities characteristic of this group are based on the child's activities, which are autonomous and spontaneous for him, making the students' work like a source of joy. In terms of the science of language, to the ludic methods we include language games, such as charades, rebus, ross, word deletion, looking for a rhyme, reading words in a diagram, crosswords solving, word ordering, playing with speech- therapy rhymes, playing with rhymes about grammar, arranging poems to help memorize difficult information.

A review of the language learning methodology used, allows you to draw some interesting but not very constructive conclusions. First of all, attention is paid to their poverty.

⁶⁴ See also as above, p. 62.

⁶⁵ See W. Okoń, *Wprowadzenie do dydaktyki...*, pp. 269-272; F. Szlosek, *Wstęp do dydaktyki...*

⁶⁶ M. Nagajowa, *ABC metodyki...*

⁶⁷ A. Dyduchowa, *Metody kształcenia sprawności językowej uczniów – projekt systemu, model podręcznika*, Cracow 1988, pp. 112-120.

⁶⁸ W. Okoń, *Wprowadzenie do dydaktyki...*, p. 317.

⁶⁹ It is difficult, however, not to admit the reason of Z. A. Kłakówna, who questions the proposed actions by A. Dyduchowa as a method, taking into account all its objections. She emphasizes that this method is not an arbitrary way of doing things, but the way of achieving the goal and - according to T. Kotarbinski's definition - is a way of determining the composition and composition of repetitive actions. (See also, *O nauce tworzenia wypowiedzi pisemnych. Na marginesie opracowania Anny Dyduchowej*, „Nowa Poliszczyzna” 1, 2005, pp. 27-30.

Contemporary methods of language training for background development of the school work on the language concept

In the methodology of language learning, only general and didactic methods are known. There are mainly methods that can be used in working with an older learner. It is worth noting that we notice the advantage of the giving methods (five: talk, pedagogical lecture, lecture, exploratory work, description) over search methods (two: close to heuristics and problematic method), exercises (two: method of practical activities and method of occasional efficiency exercises; In principle, according to Z. A. Kłakówna only the first can be regarded as a method). There is also lack of valorization methods outside the ludic methods (group of methods). The problems raised here are so obvious that it is difficult to recognize them as particularly revealing. However, you are already thinking about it, although the discussion of the 1990s can be considered a bit late.

First of all it is important to consider why no autonomous method has been developed, the valorization method is missing, and most of the methods we use are most likely to work with older learners. The impact on this situation firstly had the didactic experience of the interwar period and the emphasis on autonomous goals in language learning. At that time, no specific method was developed for obvious reasons which has been characteristic only for the transmission of the language knowledge and served with a heuristics. This situation, in turn, had an impact on the post-war didactics. The significant difference in language learning between the two periods was that in the interwar years the linguistic content and autonomous goals were broadly implemented in the oldest classes: a gymnasium and a high school. However, after the war mainly in elementary school, which last two years were for the pre-war gymnasium. Lack of time prevented the language content realization in high school, what was repeatedly paid attention then. So it was scientific knowledge, too difficult for a student of ten or twelve years old. The same can be said about the methods of transmitting it, which have not changed.

This situation was not conducive to the development of autonomous methods, but forced the still repetition of the information in order to consolidate the knowledge acquired (tested during the school performance tests), So referring to the worked out formulas that once worked out. It is also possible to ask whether the postulate of functional teaching of M. Nagajowa and later of communicative and textual teaching can be fully realized, since it requires from the student a specific language knowledge. However, no one precisely defined, and the content of teaching in the program of the turn of the century did not differ much from their scope earlier. So we reached the conclusion formulated fifteen years ago by Maria Kwiatkowska-Ratajczak. She noted that despite the repetitive demands of the school's language proficiency since the late 1970s, there has been no transfer of theoretical findings to concrete solutions⁷⁰. And nothing has changed in this area to this day. Knowledge is still difficult, and the student has not been and is not essentially and intellectually prepared to take into consideration the language of the lesson. And there are few due to the fact that - as noted by Kordian Bakuła - each language user has a grammar in himself⁷¹.

It is also worth emphasizing not only the completely correct lack of methods that affect emotions, but also the lack of publications of this nature in the language learning field. Apart from the continuing parents and teachers interest in the Witold Gawdzik's works of: *Gramatyka na wesoło* (Warsaw 1969) and *Gramatyka na wesoło i na serio* (2001), we will not find others. This way of presenting content is almost completely alien to school textbooks. It seems that the

⁷⁰ M. Kwiatkowska-Ratajczak, *Metodyka konkretna. O wybranych problemach zawodowego kształcenia nauczycieli polonistów*, Poznań 2002, pp. 182-185.

⁷¹ K. Bakuła, *Szkolną naukę o języku trzeba zmienić...*

attempt to relieve from the science and seriousness of the school "grammar" would give better results than revolutionary change.

The unfavorable influence on the current situation of language learning at school also exacerbated the so-called activating methods, and⁷² the trends that appeared at the turn of the 20th and 19th century, to develop the creativity, ingenuity and autonomy of the student, which is positive in itself, but at the same time questioning the importance of knowledge. This led to a mechanical transmission of news about the language and diverted attention from the need to search for new teaching methods. The language knowledge based on patterns and formulas does not provide linguistic awareness, and this requires students to have a communication and textural conception. Finally - the rejection of knowledge as a value has made school education neglected its acquisition, which in turn has adversely affected the intellectual, verbal and reception activities of high school graduates. So it seems that in the field of language science we stood not so much at a crossroads (this situation could be said in the nineties of the twentieth century), as we got stuck in the dead point. We are looking for solutions, based on assumed linguistic consciousness of the student, which for obvious reasons, this may not have. Furthermore, nearly twenty years of erroneous practice has allowed us to forget that in the methodology of language learning there may have been imperfect but tried-and-true teaching methods (which does not mean that they can be returned to them unconditionally). The sense of exploring the knowledge of the mother tongue is completely lost with that. Especially because it is interesting and important for the language group using it and every educated person should possess it. The question about its scope continues to be open.

Bibliography (in the selection)

- Bakuła K., *Szkolną naukę o języku trzeba zmienić*, „Polonistyka” 1994, no. 5, pp.274-281.
- Baudouin de Courtenay J., *Znaczenie języka jako przedmiotu nauki szkolnej*, [in:] *Wybór prac z metodyki nauczania języka polskiego*, ed. B. Wieczorkiewicz, Warszawa 1964, pp. 15-18.
- Doroszewski W., *Myśli i uwagi o języku polskim*, Warsaw 1937.
- Dyduchowa A., *Metody kształcenia sprawności językowej uczniów – projekt systemu, model podręcznika*, Cracow 1988.
- Fiszbak, J. *O celach szkolnej nauki o języku*, [in:] *Z dydaktyki kształcenia językowego w szkole*, ed. S. Gala, Łódź 1996, pp. 7-28.
- Gaertner H., *Dydaktyka nauki o języku ojczystym*, [in:] *Wybór prac z metodyki nauczania języka polskiego*, ed. B. Wieczorkiewicz, Warsaw 1964, pp. 29-34.
- Horwath E., *Obraz lekcji z zakresu kształcenia językowego w gimnazjum*, „Polonistyka. Innowacje” 2, 2015, pressto.amu.edu.pl/index.php/pi/article/view/4190/4256, DOA 11.09.16.
- Jaworski M., *Metodyka nauki o języku polskim*, Warsaw 1978.
- Klemensiewicz Z., *Cel nauczania gramatyki*, [in:] *this same, Ze studiów nad językiem i stylem*, Warsaw 1969, pp. 261-262.
- Klemensiewicz Z., *Dydaktyka nauki o języku ojczystym. Zasady i zagadnienia*, Lwów-Warsaw 1929.
- Kowalikowa J., *Od słowa do zdania, od zdania do tekstu – od tekstu do zdania, od zdania do słowa*, [in:] *Szkolna polonistyka zanurzona w języku*, eds. A. Janus-Sitarz, E. Nowak, Kraków, pp. 17-43.
- Kupisiewicz Cz., *Podstawy dydaktyki ogólnej*, Warsaw 1984.
- Kwiatkowska-Ratajczak M., *Metodyka konkretna. O wybranych problemach zawodowego kształcenia nauczycieli polonistów*, Poznań 2002.
- Łojek M., *Rodowód i wartości metody problemowej w nauczaniu literatury*, Zielona Góra 1976.
- Nagajowa M., *ABC metodyki języka polskiego dla początkujących nauczycieli*, Warsaw 1990.
- Nagajowa M., *Nauka o języku dla nauki języka. Poradnik metodyczny dla nauczycieli języka polskiego*, Kielce 1994.
- Nocoń J., *Uczenie o języku polskim po 1998 roku – prognozy i koncepcje dydaktyczne*, [in:] *Uczeń w świecie języka i tekstów*, ed. J. Nocoń, E. Łucka-Zajac, Opole 2010, pp. 27-30.
- Okoń W., *Wprowadzenie do dydaktyki ogólnej*, Warsaw 2003.

⁷² See annotation 11.

Contemporary methods of language training for background development of the school work on the language concept

- Pawłowska R., *Lingwistyczna teoria nauki czytania*, Gdańsk 1992.
- Pieniżek M., *Uczeń jako aktor kulturowy. Polonistyka szkolna w warunkach płynnej ponowoczesności*, Cracow 2013.
- Podracki J., *O poglądach na cele nauczania gramatyki polemicznie, czyli w obronie tradycji*, „Polonistyka” 1970.
- Prądy w nauczaniu języka ojczystego*: praca zbiorowa, ed. S. Szober, Warsaw 1908.
- Ratajska K., *Metody kształcenia literackiego w szkole*, [in:] *Z literatury i kultury w szkole*, ed. E. Cyniak, Łódź 1994, pp. 44-77.
- Rozwadowski J., *O nauce języka w szkole i o rzeczach pokrewnych*, „Język Polski” 1, 1926.
- Rypel A., *Nauczanie komunikacyjne w kształceniu uczniowskich wypowiedzi pisemnych. Problemy. Badania eksperymentalne. Implikacje dydaktyczne*, Bydgoszcz 2007.
- F. Szlosek, *Wstęp do dydaktyki przedmiotów zawodowych*, Radom 1998.
- Szober S., *Zasady nauczania języka polskiego w zakresie szkoły powszechnej i gimnazjum niższego*, Lwów-Warszawa 1923.
- Wybór prac z metodyki nauczania języka polskiego*, ed. B. Wieczorkiewicz, Warsaw 1964.
- Zabrotowicz A., *O metodach ogólnodydaktycznych w nauczaniu języka polskiego (literature lessons)*, [in:] *Nowoczesność i tradycja w kształceniu literackim. Podręcznik do ćwiczeń z języka polskiego*, ed. B. Myrdzik, Lublin 2000, pp. 83-93.
- Zbróg P., *Wojna o kształcenie językowe*, Kielce 2005.

przełożyła Katarzyna Świączkowska