Tomasz Róg

The shaping of applied linguistics and the emergence of glottodidactics

MUZEUM HISTORII POLSKI

Tomasz RÓG

The Shaping of Applied Linguistics and the Emergence of Glottodidactics

Abstract:
This article focuses on the development of glottodidactics understood as a scientific discipline concerned primarily with teaching and learning foreign languages, as well as language acquisition, foreign language teacher training, and the design of teaching materials. We investigate the origins of glottodidactics and its gradual isolation from applied linguistics, we look at its research areas and problems it encounters as it emancipates from other sciences. Finally, our attention is turned to the achievements of glottodidactics in Poland.

Introduction

A point strongly advocated in the article is that glottodidactics is a relatively young scientific discipline whose roots can be traced back to applied linguistics (AL), and which aims at emancipating itself from other humanistic sciences. As the term 'glottodidactics' is a characteristic development of Polish studies in the field, the author wishes to issue a proviso that the article concentrates largely on the advances of Polish linguists, referring to foreign influences only when necessary. The article begins with a discussion on the (frequently unclear) links between pure and applied linguistics. A necessarily cursory treatment of the immense subject will allow us to fathom the heart of the matter without delving into its intricacies. It will also help direct the discussion towards glottodidactics whose conceptualisation will be necessary for a better understanding of its interdisciplinary nature that gives it the liberty to draw from related avenues of enquiry. Subsequently, the theoretical underpinnings will elaborate upon the models of glottodidactics, its subject matter, and research areas. These pertain predominantly to the study and science of foreign language learning/teaching. By discussing the dispute between theoreticians about the primary concerns of glottodidactics, we will investigate these problems from different angles. In order to give the article a critical edge, the author will make frequent remarks on his

perception of the problems discussed in the line of argument and will close it with a set of comments on the status of glottodidactics.

1. From linguistics to glottodidactics

In order to ground our discussion in general linguistics it seems relevant to investigate the theoretical framework of glottodidactics. This framework, in turn, should rest on solid foundations of rigorously controlled scientific research. Accordingly, the following part of the article aims at presenting the emancipation of glottodidactics from linguistics as autonomous scientific discipline. At the outset, we shall briefly discuss linguistics as the broad field into which our subject matter falls and differentiate between pure and applied linguistics. Next, the scope of our investigation shall be shifted to glottodidactics – a field closely related to applied linguistics (also treated as its subfield by some theoreticians). Whether the objectives of the article are clear, the hypotheses fitting, and the conclusions appropriate, will hinge on situating it adequately within the chosen field of science.

1.1. The concepts of language and linguistics

The main concern of the present article was drawn from the developments of linguistics. Many definitions of the field have been developed, some very closely related to its subdisciplines and some more general. W. Doroszewski (quoted in J. Kida 1999: 93) once said that linguistics is a "humanistic link of all sciences[1]" and as such, it encompasses complex disciplines of varying subject matters and methodologies. The necessary elements of any science, as T. Siek-Piskozub (2007) accentuates, are its subject, object, and the results of its research. It was F. Grucza, who notably said (2010: 124) that in order to establish the object of linguistics one would have to establish the objects of its core elements: phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, etc. The terminological discord can, however, be seen as a merit since linguistics has long established the quest for its object its obligatory task. By doing so, it outraces other humanistic or social sciences that repeatedly contend with the problem of pinpointing their objects of enquiry.

Whilst proposals of the scope of linguistics are mounting, in this article we shall narrow our investigation to the Polish context that will allow us to better understand the origins of glottodidactics. One of the "fathers" of glottodidactics in Poland, F. Grucza stressed the necessity to redefine the concept of language as such in order to define the boundaries of linguistics. Following his line of reasoning, (real) language should not be treated as entity separate from human beings. According to his anthropocentric view of linguistics (which dates back to the 1970s), the tendency of idealising language and perceiving it as functioning

---

[1] All translations from Polish are mine, TR.

independently of human beings ought to be abandoned. Language is not an ideal, abstract system, it is not contained in dictionaries or any external corpora, nor is it contained in its external realisations such as words, sentences or utterances.

F. Grucza (1993: 31) calls for humanising both language and linguistics, and voices the need to include psycho-, neuro-, and sociolinguistics as the core elements of the science. In his understanding, language is practical knowledge serving people to create and substantialise (manifest) structures of utterances, use them to realise specific aims, to subscribe certain values to them and to identify analogous utterances expressed by other people. As such, language is inextricably connected with an individual. In fact, the two constitute an inseparable whole in a manner comparable to human and his mind.

As the consensus between different linguistic definitions of language (such as Aristotelian, Saussurian, Sapirean, Chomskyan and so forth) seems unattainable, the specific view advocated by F. Grucza shall be adopted for the purposes of our investigation. Our main motivation lies in the fact that placing an individual, not language, at the core of investigation marked a fundamental shift in linguistic sciences and influenced the shaping glottodidactics. We shall return to this premise later in the article.

Prior to proceeding further, it is fitting to remark that the validity of anthropocentric linguistics was recognised by other researchers. Guided by the above-elaborated ideas, E. Wąsik (2007: 161–162) observed that post-structuralist linguistics transgressed the boundaries of its subject and opened up to embrace the relationships between language, culture, and organism. A human being began to be seen as an active subject of communication, immersed in their linguistic and cultural environment. This observation led to the conclusion that the environmental aspects of human life might have more profound consequences for communication than people's genetically-inherited traits. E. Wąsik, in turn, evokes (2007: 166) V. Yngve who, when working on his framework of *human linguistics*, discriminated between linguistics of people and linguistics of language. The former can be seen as coterminous with anthropocentric linguistics in the understanding expressed above. Among other researchers offering a similar human-centred viewpoint are Polish linguists such as Z. Wąsik 1986, W. Woźniakowski 1994, and A. Duszak 1998. By the same token, S. Grucza (2011: 150) points to the 'brain-based' (ergo human-centred) localisation of language, whereas B. Sadownik (2012) offers the idea that language is primarily a property of one's brain and secondarily of their mind. An idea which neatly synthesises these musings is P. Stelmaszczyk's (2011) observation that recent linguistic research shifted from examining the structure of language to examining the structure of mind.

To return to the question that we posed at the beginning of this section, namely what constitutes the subject of linguistic, it is worth looking at some of the most common misconceptions regarding the field. These have been outlined

by F. Grucza in his monograph of 1983 and in his subsequent works. First of all, the initial object of linguistic enquiry comprises people and their specific linguistic properties which (very broadly speaking) allow them to create, project, and receive utterances. Secondly, perceiving concrete languages as the main interest of this science is a common fallacy. What lies at the heart of the matter is human and his ability of producing/comprehending speech. Thirdly, it is a misunderstanding to treat any concrete human utterances as the subject matter of linguistics. The main aim of linguistics, as F. Grucza (2010: 33) aptly notes, is to understand what is contained in the creators and not their texts. Finally, linguistics should not endeavour to establish the theory of language, but to put forward a reliable theory of linguistic communication.

1.2. Terminological discord concerning the scope of applied linguistics

Discrimination between pure and applied linguistics (AL) is necessary so as to narrow down the research area in the remainder of the present article. This is not to say that the two are separate branches of general linguistics. In fact, they are its integral and complementary constituents. At the outset, however, it needs to be stressed that different understanding of AL in different countries results in varied perspectives regarding its subject matter. For the purposes of the present article, as stated in the introduction, we shall follow the school of thought represented by Polish theoreticians (F. Grucza in the most part). Broadly speaking, pure and applied linguistics, having the same object of inquiry, approach it from two different perspectives. As F. Grucza (2009: 35) clarifies, pure linguistics poses primary and AL poses final questions regarding this subject. AL does not seek its own theories rather it verifies the ones worked out by pure linguistics. By doing so, it may draw attention to the necessity of generating further or missing theories. The main aim of pure linguistics is to discover the nature of interpersonal linguistic communication (how it is conditioned and what rules govern it) while the primary aim of AL is to discover what happens to this communication if it is subject to outside intervention, and how it can be manipulated and transformed.

Historically speaking, one should bear in mind that the notion of AL was introduced in the works of August Friedrich Bernhardi, particularly in his book "Angewandte Sprachlehre" (1803). A. Bernhardi made the distinction between applied and pure linguistics using the example of mathematical sciences and advocated the view that AL should examine the use of language as a tool for reflecting the reality. As such, language should be used in science and poetry. A similar terminology was used by Polish linguist Jan Baudouin de Courtenay in his lecture of 1870 in Petersborough. J. Baudouin de Courtenay was of the opinion that AL should use the knowledge acquired by pure linguistics in solving the problems of other disciplines, mythology, prehistory, ethnography, ethnology, and anthropology, to name a few (Z. Wąsik/E. Wąsik 2008: 139). In the very gist, J. de Courtenay did not consider AL as pertaining to a concrete subject matter, but

rather as an approach to investigating different fields. Such an understanding was sustained in the works of his contemporaries (H. Hirt, O. Dittrich, A. Tomson). In Europe, during the interwar period, AL was associated with language standardisation. A sudden growth of interest in AL can be associated with the development of the audio-lingual method by American linguists (*inter alia* by L. Bloomfield, C.F. Hockett, T.A. Sebeok) for the purposes of American army in the 1940s. Consequently, the understanding of AL, particularly in the Anglophone world, was, and still is, very often narrowed to foreign language teaching. Understood in this way, the term AL appeared first in the title "Language learning: a journal of applied linguistics" in 1948. The first academic centre dealing with the discipline was the School of Applied Linguistics established in Edinburgh in 1957. In the U.S., it was the Centre for Applied Linguistics founded in Washington, D.C. in 1959. In Poland, Zakład Językoznawstwa Stosowanego (Institute of Applied Linguistics) was set up in Poznań in 1964. The term AL in the present state is very broadly associated with practical dimensions of human communication. However, despite the existence of autonomous educational institutions, journals, and conferences devoted to the field, vocalising its precise definition constitutes a formidable challenge.

Simply put, AL concerns retrieving applicable knowledge from the findings of pure linguistics and testing its applicability (F. Grucza 2010: 36). Inherent in this definition are three historically established notions of AL. First of all, AL can be seen as focused on using the findings of linguistic studies. Secondly, AL can be understood as oriented towards solving practical problems (e.g. American linguists working for the American army during WW2 on effective foreign language teaching methods). Thirdly, AL can be perceived as a collection of disciplines such as foreign language teaching methodology, translation studies, language impairment, speech therapy, contrastive studies, terminology, and glottodidactics (this understanding of AL is proposed by the International Association of Applied Linguistics). W. Wilczyńska and A. Michońska-Stadnik (2010: 43) accentuate the problem of too much generality inherent in the concept, which makes it difficult to determine its concrete subject matter. Furthermore, the name itself suggests that AL deals with practical implementation of linguistic findings, which is a widespread misunderstanding.

As argued above, there are subtle differences in the understanding of the term in different research traditions. In the English-speaking countries, the heterogeneous nature of AL hinders the conceptualisation of its research area. AL serves as an umbrella term for translation studies, lexicography, rhetoric, stylistic, language acquisition, and language teaching. The area of research known as second language acquisition (SLA) isolated itself from AL in the 1960s, and deals with processes and conditions of acquiring a second language. The issues concerning the teaching of foreign languages as well as educating foreign language teachers are tackled by yet another discipline, known in the Anglophone

world as foreign language teaching methodology. This research area is traditionally concerned with approaches, methods, and techniques serving foreign language education (for discussion see W. Wilczyńska and A. Michońska-Stadnik 2010: 42–46). In the Polish context, a discipline which can be identified with foreign language teaching methodology is glottodidactics, which is described in the section below.

2. Glottodidactics

Despite the fact that teaching foreign languages has a reported history of 2500 years, a scientific discipline serving a deeper consideration of the subject is still at a nascent stage. The term 'glottodidactics' was introduced in the works of Polish professor Ludwik Zabrocki in the 1960s and denoted, at its initial stage, the creation and evaluation of texts used for teaching foreign languages, and later on, the investigation of the properties of learners as well as teachers (for a further discussion see E. Wąsik and Z. Wąsik 2008). The term is used mainly in Polish and Greek educational contexts, whereas the English speaking countries refer to foreign language (FL) teaching methodology. Following T. Siek-Piskozub (2007), in the Western countries foreign language didactics is regarded a domain of AL, whereas the dominating paradigm in Poland is seeing it as a separate discipline (although glottodidacticians are formally perceived as linguists).

With no pretence of offering an exhaustive account of how languages are learned, many Polish researchers voice the need for establishing glottodidactics as a scientific discipline in its own right, since applied linguistics did not fulfil its role of accounting for the various difficulties marking the processes of language learning. Yet, as M. Dakowska (2010a: 148), for example, observes that glottodidactics is notoriously limited to its practical dimension and is being refused its cognitive value. W. Wilczyńska (2010: 22) calls for distinguishing glottodidactics from pedagogy and linguistics with which it was wrongly considered equivalent. Both authors argue that glottodidactics is an empirical discipline which needs to clearly define its research field, research objectives, methodology, and terminology.

2.1. A short history of the field

A growing interest in foreign language teaching methodology in Poland can be observed beginning with the 1970s. Before this period, the status of foreign language (FL) methodology both in Poland and around the world had not been debated for the simple reason that methodology had not existed as a scientific discipline. Things began to change first in the Anglophone world with the advent of the audio-lingual era based on linguistic structuralism and behavioural pedagogy. Although initially proposed as a method of teaching foreign languages, the audio-lingual method quickly influenced the teaching of other subjects. Of

note, linguistics had been until then regarded as a parent discipline for foreign language teaching. Structural linguistics was notably an approach noted for the audio-lingual method as well as for its assumptions about Language Acquisition Device. In the United States, however, the real interest in FL education had political rather than scientific beginnings. The danger of nuclear war with the Soviet Union led many Americans to take up learning Russian. Knowing the language of the enemy increased the US chances of not falling behind in the arms race. Schools, universities, and private courses laid emphasis on Russian lessons which resulted in an increased interest in FL methodology. N. Chomsky's critique of B. Skinner's behaviourism only flared up the debate over effective teaching methods.

Before the 1970s, the unfortunate paucity of scientific consideration regarding foreign language teaching in Poland left many teachers responsible for the organisational issues concerning their work. As H. Komorowska (2007: 78) notes, pursuing an academic career meant choosing between linguistics and literature. In effect, this led many teachers oriented towards FL methodology to abandon their initial research interests once they entered academic institutions. Doctoral and postdoctoral theses on FL methodology of the time were non-existent. In the 1970s, however, the need for a disciplined reflection on FL methodology began to be increasingly recognised. The credit for acknowledging FL methodology as a scientific discipline in its own right should be given to Prof. Ludwik Zabrocki (1907–1977) of Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, who created the foundations of glottodidactics (L. Zabrocki did not use the term 'glottodidactics', though), and to Prof. Jacek Fisiak of the same University, who was the first to award academic degrees in the field.

The beginnings of glottodidactics in Poland can be therefore associated with Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań. The name of the discipline was coined by Prof. Jan Wikarjak for the purposes of a scientific journal "Glottodidactica. A journal of applied linguistics"[2] founded in 1966 by L. Zabrocki. The term comes from Greek in which *glotta* denotes 'language' and *didascein* translates as 'to teach'. Strangely enough, L. Zabrocki never referred to the field as glottodidactics and preferred to use the terms 'methodology' or 'foreign language teaching'. Nonetheless, he associated the discipline as related mainly to (but not identical with) linguistics rather than teaching. In 1964, L. Zabrocki established the first Polish Department of Applied Linguistics in which the first glottodidactic research was carried out. L. Zabrocki's track record in the field was summed up in his book "Językoznawcze podstawy metodyki nauczania języków obcych" ("Linguistic foundations of foregin language teaching methodology") of 1966.

---

[2] The name of the journal can be misleading. Glottodidactics was not associated by Zabrocki with applied linguistics, the title was given for the reason that the journal was issued by the Department of Applied Linguistics. Unfortunately, it still adds to the misconception that glottodidactics is a part of applied linguistics.

Following L. Zabrocki's proposal, Polska Akademia Nauk (Polish Academy of Sciences) set up the Applied Linguistics Section in 1973. Its first chair was Zabrocki's disciple, F. Grucza, who also continued L. Zabrocki's work in the Institute of Applied Linguistics at Warsaw University. In Poznań, L. Zabrocki's thought is being developed, *inter alia* by Prof. Pfeiffer.

2.2. Models of glottodidactics

Ever since a debate on the status of glottodidactics evoked, Polish researchers worked intensively on establishing its autonomy. T. Siek-Piskozub (2007) observes that glottodidactics, as a discipline based on linguistics, became one of the pillars of educating philologists in Poland. The sheer fact that glottodidactics is characterised by two plains: pure and applied, speaks in favour of its scientific independence. In the past thirty years, three models of the science were proposed by Polish researchers. The first model, put forward by F. Grucza in 1978 and dubbed 'układ glottodydaktyczny' ('glottodidactic system'), presents a very simple layout comprising of a teacher, a student and a channel of communication between them. The model was intended to demonstrate how different fields of science (pedagogy, psychology, and communication studies) are integrated in the subject matter of glottodidactics. It is instructive to look at the model as a whole despite its tripartite structure. In other words, all three elements constituting it are equally important, none being superior to others, and all three should be considered concomitantly by glottodidactics.

The second model, offered by W. Woźniewicz (1987), distinguishes between pure, applied, and practical glottodidactics. Pure glottodidactics is placed at the highest level of his model. It derives its theories from empirical reality and influences the other two types of glottodidactics by pointing to new avenues of their inquiry, directions for future development, and defining their aims. Pure glottodidactics, out of necessity, makes use of related scientific disciplines. Applied glottodidactics draws from pure glottodidactics in that it uses its findings to offer applicable conclusions (if A then B). Finally, practical glottodidactics, also known as the methodology of foreign language teaching is concerned with the practical implementation of these findings.

The third, and the most elaborate model of glottodidactics, presented by W. Pfeiffer (2001: 21), places at its heart language which acts as a mediator between a teacher and a student. The remaining elements are teaching materials, teaching methods, teaching conditions, and objective reality (i.e. social and school milieu, as well as state educational policy). All the elements remain in specific relations to one another. This model is open and dynamic in that it takes into account the changing reality of foreign language teaching.

2.3. Glottodidactic research areas

It is generally assumed that a scientific discipline is organised around one specific research problem. With reference to glottodidactics, however, the articulation of such a problem seems unattainable in the near future. Although it is generally agreed that glottodidactics is concerned with teaching and learning foreign languages, a whole host of important questions concerning its research area remains. With respect to this, W. Wilczyńska (2010: 22) contends that any humanistic science, due to its nature, should be perceived as an open space and attaches immense weight to the fact that much of what constitutes the interest of glottodidactics is simply unobservable. Germane to this discussion are brain-based processes.

It might seem that at the core of glottodidactics lies the task of verifying and investigating methods of teaching foreign languages. After all, the science is predominated by questions pertaining to language acquisition and the transfer of languages between people. Following the printsteps of L. Zabrocki, glottodidactics is seen as separate from general didactics and AL. Some linguists go even so far as to claim that teaching methods constitute a marginal area of glottodidactic research (e.g. F. Grucza 2007: 313). As remarked earlier in the article, the anthropocentric view of language departed from the dominating structuralist perceptions which regarded it as a tangible object open for scientific scrutiny. Since language was no longer seen as an analysable system but an integral part of human mind, subject to dynamic changes in various social interactions, the task of examining language learning processes became even more complicated. Foreign language teaching of the 1950s, which focused to a large extent on language analysis, had to take into account developing language skills which are fundamental to performing diverse speech acts. The relationship between human and his language is manifested in the three models presented in the previous section but neither of them points to a concrete research area of glottodidactics. As the following discussion will show, glottodidactics must of necessity focus on a number of elements at the same time.

Pursuing F. Grucza's (2007: 312) line of investigation, one has to adopt a wider understanding of the research areas of glottodidactics. As a point of departure serves the assumption that glottodidactics goes beyond mere studying and compiling methods of teaching foreign languages. In fact, it does not put these processes in the centre of its attention. According to the author, glottodidactics is a field concentrating its research interests on the functioning of the three elements of the glottodidactic system. These elements constituting it are learners, teachers (also first-language teachers), and language. The primary task of glottodidactics is to reconstruct their specific properties (skills/abilities). In more detail, this conceptualisation poses questions regarding language acquisition and ventures into discovering how the processes of language transfer between people occur. An underlying assumption here is that research should first of all

concentrate on a learner and their abilities. If one does not establish and explain the primary functions of language learners, one is unable to account for the primary functions of their teachers. For this reason, F. Grucza (2007: 313) argues, there is a need to combine foreign with mother language glottodidactics. Professing these two lines of investigation separately is, according to the author, a common fallacy lacking scientific entrenchment. The fact that central acquisition processes are analogous in the first and next languages is conclusive.

A different optics is taken by W. Pfeiffer (2001: 14) who stresses that glottodidactics concerns foreign language learning only and is distinctly different from first language acquisition. The author indicates that the aim of mother tongue learning is broadening the knowledge of vernacular literature and language structure. What follows is that the overall aims, methods and learning conditions are different for the two disciplines. W. Pfeiffer concedes (2001: 17) that the subject matter of glottodidactics embraces the processes of foreign language learning and teaching and the aim of glottodidactic research lies in understanding these processes in order to develop optimal learning and teaching systems.

J. Zając asserts (2010: 43) that the research area of glottodidactics is composed of three elements: a language, a learner, and a teacher. The three should always be perceived as a whole. Even though each of the elements could be investigated separately, a broad view of glottodidactics is only achieved when the three constituents are perceived in unity. This holistically oriented approach to the subject matter of glottodidactics is what differentiates it from other related sciences such as psychology or linguistics. Loosing this fact of sight may result in research falling either into the scope of psychology (focusing too much on a learner), pedeutology (focusing too much on a teacher), or linguistics (concentration on language).

A yet different slant is taken by W. Wilczyńska who recognizes the formidable challenge of pointing to one specific research area of glottodidactics. Particular empirical studies, which define themselves as glottodidactic, oscillate around problems closest to researchers' interests and, in the author's view (2010: 25), only tenuously touch upon the subject matter of glottodidactics. Nonetheless, certain research areas slowly begin to emerge, although one cannot say with certainty that they cover all the lines of glottodidactic interest. On the face of it, their common axis is gaining communicative competence in a foreign language. Among these discernible topics are content-and-language-integrated learning (CLIL), new technologies, evaluation, school interaction, and learning strategies. Still, this enumeration is not sufficient to account for the subject matter of the field. In other words, one cannot say that the discipline is a sum of these research areas. On the other hand, making generalisation of the type "glottodidactics concerns teaching and learning foreign languages" would be an over-simplification. W. Wilczyńska (2010: 30) emphasises that as long as the frames of glottodidactic interest are not established, scientists will choose to restrict their consideration to individually chosen and unrelated subfields.

2.4. Some notable achievements of glottodidactics in Poland

Forty years since glottodidactics has been established, Polish theoreticians and practitioners gathered some achievements to their credit. The following section contains an outline of theoretical positions and empirical investigations that have been influential in the field. The overview is of necessity very selective with the intention of providing the reader with a general idea of Polish advances in the field, that is to say, due to space constraints credit has been given only to a handful of scholars.

Polish glottodidactics owes a great deal to F. Grucza (1978b), who among other things investigated how errors are inextricably connected to language learning, the sources of these errors as well as possibilities of anticipating their occurrence. Language learning strategies have particularly been the focus of a study by K. Droździał-Szelest (1997). Her monograph on the topic covers the theoretical issues behind the choice of learning strategies and reports on the author's findings that two-thirds of students employ cognitive strategies, with metacognitive and socio-affective accounting for roughly 17% each. It has also been noted that their teachers enumerated the cognitive strategies as most frequently used by their students.

The methods of teaching foreign languages have also been the focus of scientists' attention. In particular, they are a pervading theme of H. Komorowska's works, particularly her monograph "Metodyka nauczania języków obcych" of 1999 (2005). It is meant as on overview of key issues such as lesson planning, choosing teaching methods and techniques, developing language skills, and evaluating students. H. Komorowska's notable output is also a concise book on constructing FL teaching curricula (H. Komorowska 2005). The communicative approach in glottodidactics resulted, *inter alia*, in an increased interest in ludic techniques (ludic = relating to play). Seeking to explain the usefulness of ludic techniques in foreign language teaching, T. Siek-Piskozub (2001) discussed theoretical, educational and practical considerations of using language games. The author pointed to their many values beginning with motivation through engagement and cognitive values to therapeutic ones. She also drew attention to the negative phenomena which may appear in the course of implementing ludic techniques.

E. Zawadzka (2004), who investigated the roles of FL teachers, called for a new paradigm of teacher education. She believes that education has a certain mission to fulfil, a mission of intellectual, emotional, and cultural rebirth of learners, and of shaping an individual's personality in the process of life-long learning. Her monograph devoted to the socio-political changes influencing language teachers shed light on the necessity of reconceptualising teachers' roles taking into account the need for training them into becoming intercultural mediators, material writers, innovators, experts, advisors, investigators, and reflective practitioners. In a similar vein, A. Michońska-Stadnik (2013)

investigated the subjective theories of future foreign language teachers regarding the learning and teaching foreign languages. This was done in order to gain a better understanding of the determinants of failure and success in language attainment.

Facilitative aspects of the form-focused instruction on foreign language were the subject of M. Pawlak's (2006) pioneering monograph, in which the author contributed to the debate on the place of grammar teaching in a language classroom. Although M. Pawlak does not use the term glottodidactics (preferring to use the term SLA (second language acquisition) instead), his monograph complies neatly with the field's research areas. The author resolves crucial terminological issues and outlines the scope of research into form-focused instruction. In addition, he provides the reader with a range of important pedagogical implications which inform the provision of form-focused instruction in Polish educational context.

A first complete introduction to the methodology of research in glottodidactics was provided by W. Wilczyńska and A. Michońska-Stadnik (2010). In their work, the authors present main types of research and the rules for writing scientific papers. In their understanding, glottodidactics refers to the processes of foreign language learning and teaching, thus its subject matter focuses both on a learner and on a teacher. At the same time the authors appreciate the manifold planes on which this subject matter can be considered. Therefore, their book is a concise guide to conducting research in this multifaceted discipline.

As an independent field, glottodidactics slowly begins to isolate its subfields. Some researchers notice the need for establishing comparative glottodidactics ('glottodydaktyka porównawcza') in order to compare glottodidactics research across countries and institutions (P. Gębal 2009, 2013). S. Grucza (2010) discusses the theoretical and practical issues behind glottodidactics of specialist languages ('glottodydaktyka specjalistyczna'). The social and cultural changes influencing education and the life of seniors have been recognised by A. Jaroszewska (2011) who puts forward a proposal of cooperation between language education and geragogics under the name of senior foreign language education ('glottogeragogika'). In a different enquiry, K. Karpińska-Szaj (2013) focuses on teaching foreign languages to students with disabilities, which may bring therapeutic benefits ('surdoglottodydaktyka', 'tyfloglottodydaktyka').

3. Final remarks

The above-elaborated considerations lead the author to the formulation of a number of points in conclusion of the discussion on the shaping of applied linguistics, the emergence and evolution of glottodidactics and its drive towards marking its own territory among other sciences.

First of all, in the quest for its autonomy, glottodidactics cannot break up with

its linguistic nor didactic traditions. Applied linguistics in particular, is a source of information about language and its functioning as well as linguistic texts and their communicational functions. Further, it needs to integrate other sciences such as sociology, psychology, neurology, cybernetics, etc. As both human and the linguistic processes in their brains are at the centre of glottodidactic attention, the areas engaged in human behaviour may inform the discipline.

Secondly, despite its interdisciplinary nature, glottodidactics should endeavour to establish its own terminological apparatus. Too often the borrowing of scientific terms from other disciplines has been a negative practice resulting in terminological discord. Not only the adoption of strictly linguistics and pedagogic concepts results in lack of clarity, but also borrowings by experts in different languages add to the ambiguities.

Thirdly, glottodidactics suffers from the lack of precise definition. Some Polish linguists (e.g. K. Polański 1993: 251–252, J. Kida 1999) regard glottodidactics as a constituent of AL, while others (e.g. A. Szulc 1997: 75) consider it equal with foreign language teaching methodology. Such discord must be seen as detrimental to its emancipation from other branches of science. Finally, glottodidactics as a science should strive to be regarded as more complex than simply foreign language teaching methodology. In fact, the methodology of teaching foreign languages constitutes only a part of glottodidactic enquiry, which has been evidenced in the above considerations.

Bibliography

Dakowska, M. (2010), *Dydaktyka języków obcych we współczesności*. In: J. Fisiak, (ed.), Język a komunikacja 29. Studia językoznawcze: od języko-znawstwa teoretycznego do stosowanego. Kraków. 147–178.

Droździał-Szelest, K. (1997), *Language learning strategies in the process of acquiring a foreign language*. Poznań.

Duszak, A. (1998), *Tekst, dyskurs i komunikacja interkulturowa*. Warszawa.

Gębal, P. (2009), *Od glottodydaktyki ogólnej do glottodydaktyki porównawczej. Krótka refleksja nad sensem powstania nowej subdyscypliny glottodydaktyki*. In: J. Mąkoszy-Bogdan/ W. Pytla (eds.), Specifity of Teaching English. Schools Language Courses – Tertiary Education. Warszawa. 77–88.

Gębal, P. (2013), *Modele kształcenia nauczycieli języków obcych w Polsce i w Niemczech*. Kraków.

Grucza, F. (1978a), *Glottodydaktyka, jej zakres i problemy*. In: Przegląd Glotto-dydaktyczny 1. 29–44.

Grucza, F. (1978b), *Ogólne zagadnienia lapsologii*. In: F. Grucza (ed.), Z pro-blematyki błędów obcojęzycznych. Warszawa.

Grucza, F. (1993), *Zagadnienia ontologii lingwistycznej: O językach ludzkich i ich (rzeczywistym) istnieniu*. In: B. Kaczmarek (ed.), Opuscula Logopaedica in honorem Leonis Kaczmarek. Lublin. 25–47.

Grucza, F. (2007), *Lingwistyka stosowana: Historia – zadania – osiągnięcia*. Warszawa.

Grucza, F. (2009), *Metanaukowa i metalingwistyczna wizja lingwistyki (stosowanej)*. In: Lingwistyka Stosowana/ Applied Linguistics/ Angewnadte Linguistik 1. 19–39.

Grucza, F. (2010), *O statusie, pozycji i zadaniach lingwistyki stosowanej*. In: J. Fisiak (ed.), Język a komunikacja 29. Studia językoznawcze: od językoznawstwa teoretycznego do stosowanego. Kraków. 121–146.

Grucza S. (2010), *Glottodydaktyka specjalistyczna – jej przedmiot i cele poznawcze*. In: J. Knieja/ T. Zygmunt/ Ł. Brzana (eds), Literaturoznawstwo, językoznawstwo i kulturoznawstwo jako płaszczyzny przekazu we współczesnej glottodydaktyce. Lublin. 35–48.

Grucza, S. (2011), *Lingwistyka antropocentryczna a badania okulograficzne*. In: Lingwistyka Stosowana/ Applied Linguistics/ Angewnadte Linguistik 4. 149–162.

Jaroszewska, A. (2011), *Współczesne determinanty badań glottodydaktycznych. O perspektywach rozwoju "glottogeragogiki"*. In: Neofilolog 37. 87–100.

Karpińska-Szaj, K. (2013), *Nauczanie języków obcych uczniów z niepełnosprawnością w szkołach ogólnodostępnych*. Poznań.

Kida, J. (1999), *Lingwistyka stosowana i jej wpływ na modernizację dydaktyki języków*. In: Bulletin de la société polonaise de linguistique LV. 93–105.

Komorowska, H. (1999), *Metodyka nauczania języków obcych*. Warszawa.

Komorowska, H. (2005), *Programy nauczania w kształceniu ogólnym i w kształceniu językowym*. Warszawa.

Komorowska, H. (2007), *Metodyka nauczania w Polsce 1957-2007*. Warszawa.

Michońska-Stadnik, A. (2013), *Teoretyczne i praktyczne podstawy weryfikacji wybranych teorii subiektywnych w kształceniu nauczycieli języków obcych*. Wrocław.

Pawlak, M. (2006), *The Place of Form-Focused Instruction in the Foreign Language Classroom*. Kalisz/Poznań.

Pfeiffer, W. (2001), *Nauka języków obcych. Od praktyki do praktyki*. Poznań.

Polański, K. (ed.) (1993), *Encyklopedia językoznawstwa ogólnego*. Wrocław.

Sadownik, B. (2012), *Język w strukturze modularnej umysłu*. In: Lingwistyka Stosowana/ Applied Linguistics/ Angewnadte Linguistik 5. 75–94.

Siek-Piskozub, T. (2001), *Uczyć się bawiąc. Strategia ludyczna na lekcji języka obcego*. Warszawa.

Siek-Piskozub, T. (2007), *Narodziny i rozwój językoznawstwa stosowanego jako dyscypliny naukowej*. [Paper presented in Wyższa Szkoła Filologiczna in Wrocław].

Stelmaszczyk, P. (2011), *Historyczne i metodologiczne uwarunkowania współczesnego generatywizmu*. In: Linguistica Copernica 1(5). 15–32.

Szulc, A. (1997), *Słownik dydaktyki języków obcych*. Warszawa.

Wąsik, E. (2007), *Język – narzędzie czy właściwość człowieka*. Poznań.

Wąsik, E./ Z. Wąsik (2008), *Zagadnienie właściwości lingwistycznych człowieka wobec definicji przedmiotu językoznawstwa na potrzeby glottodydaktyki*. In: Perspektywy glottodydaktyki i językoznawstwa. Tom jubileuszowy z okazji 70. urodzin Profesora Waldemara Pfeiffera. Poznań. 129–43.

Wąsik, Z. (1986), *W sprawie koncepcji antropocentrycznej języka na potrzeby lingwistyki stosowanej. Na marginesie książki Franciszka Gruczy „Zagadnienia metalingwistyki"*. In: Studia Linguistica X. 91–102.

Wilczyńska, W. (2010), *Obszary badawcze glottodydaktyki*. In: Neofilolog. 34. 21–35.

Wilczyńska, W./ A. Michońska-Stadnik (2010), *Metodologia badań w glottodydaktyce*. Kraków.

Woźniakowski, W. (1994), *Lingwistyczy status tzw. subjęzyków specjalistycznych*. In: F. Grucza /Z. Kozłowska (eds), Języki Specjalistyczne. Warszawa. 45–60.

Woźniewicz, W. (1987), *Kierowanie procesem glottodydaktycznym*. Warszawa.

Zając, J. (2010), *Glottodydaktyka w ujęciu epistemologicznym*. In: Neofilolog 34. 37–49.

Zawadzka, E. (2004), *Nauczyciele języków obcych w dobie przemian*. Kraków.