

WŁADYSŁAW T. MIODUNKA

*Uniwersytet Jagielloński*  
w.miodunka@uj.edu.pl

PRZEMYSŁAW E. GĘBAL

*Uniwersytet Jagielloński/Uniwersytet Warszawski*  
p.gebal@uw.edu.pl

# **From the Poznan School of Applied Linguistics to the Cracow School of Comparative Glottodidactics. The past, the present and the future of Polish Glottodidactics**

**ABSTRACT.** To present the emergence and transformation of Polish glottodidactics, the authors refer to the earlier works of Miodunka and Gębal. The former divides the post-war history of teaching PAFL into three periods: 1) the period of applying linguistics to teaching PAFL (1950–1992), 2) the period of the development of Polish glottodidactics (1993–2003), and 3) the period of Polish glottodidactics based on European standards (2004– ). The paper ends with reflections on the emergence and evolution of comparative glottodidactics.

**KEYWORDS:** Polish glottodidactics; comparative glottodidactics; methodology of teaching Polish as a foreign language; teaching Polish to foreigners.

## **1. PIONEERING PERIOD OF TEACHING POLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE**

The 1950s brought a new challenge to academics working in the field of Polish Studies. The challenge was to teach Polish to foreigners who came to Poland to pursue vocational training or higher education. This task could be approached on several levels. However, the most important challenge at that

time was very practical classroom teaching. The aim was to effectively teach Polish to foreigners so that they were able to undertake M.A. studies or pursue any other education in Poland after completing a one-year course. This pioneering period of teaching Polish as a foreign language deserves special recognition as those teaching Polish to foreigners at that time did not have the appropriate methodological preparation or theoretical background. A scientific reflection on the approach to be taken in teaching Polish was initiated a little later by a group of scholars from the University of Warsaw. What is noteworthy is that their reflection focused on Polish linguistics and how it could be applied to teaching Polish as a foreign language. The scholars involved in this pioneering work used their knowledge on the functioning of the contemporary Polish language system in an attempt to adapt it to teaching Polish as a foreign language. This is clearly reflected by the book entitled *Metodyka nauczania języka polskiego jako obcego* (Methodology of Teaching Polish as a Foreign Language) by Lewandowski, et al. (1980), which contains a selection of articles written between 1965 and 1977. The book included publications of the renowned lexicologist Buttlerowa who discussed methods of teaching Polish vocabulary (1980: 129–153) and selecting words to be included in the future Polish “survival dictionary” (1980: 154–165). Wojtowicz highlighted key problems relating to teaching Polish grammar (1980: 166–188), with a focus on teaching grammatical cases which are a central part of the Polish grammar system. When analyzing Polish textbooks for beginners used at that time, Wojtowicz presented the order of teaching cases, looking into the *locative singular* in more detail. A similar approach was also used by Buttlerowa who attempted to develop an extensive curriculum for teaching Polish grammar to beginners by conducting an in-depth analysis of the contemporary textbook practice (1980: 189–216). It should be noted that back in 1974, Buttlerowa considered that scientific data should be taken into account when developing teaching curricula, e.g. the data on the frequency of use of the Polish grammatical cases based on *Słownictwo współczesnej publicystyki polskiej. Listy frekwencyjne* (Vocabulary in the Contemporary Polish Journalistic Writings. Frequency Lists) by Lewicki, Masłowski, Sambor and Woronczak (1972). Wojtowicz and Lewandowski elaborated on teaching pronunciation to foreigners; Smoczyński focused on the difficulties of Polish pronunciation for German speakers, while Frankiewicz discussed the common problems faced by Vietnamese speakers. Overall, the compilation is divided into three parts dedicated to teaching pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar, respectively. This division clearly corresponds to the core segments of Polish descriptive grammar, traditionally consisting of phonetics, inflection (as an important part of morphology), and lexicology and lexicography which describe the vocabulary and the lexicon of a language.

## 1.1. Polish linguistics and teaching Polish as a foreign language (PAFL)

Part one of the Lewandowski's monograph serves as an introduction to the compilation, and provides a general perspective. The first in the book is an article written by Wiczorkiewicz in 1966 on teaching Polish as a foreign language. The author starts the discussion with three questions which are fundamental to teaching Polish to speakers of other languages: *Who to teach?* *What to teach?* and *How to teach?* (Wiczorkiewicz 1980: 9), to which he provides a firm answer: *Definitely not the same way we teach the mother tongue; instead, we should do it the same way and using the same principles which are now the basis for teaching any living foreign language* (Wiczorkiewicz 1980: 10). The author is very critical of the methods used at that time to teach Polish as a foreign language (hereinafter PAFL), stating that:

We do not have any ready-made curriculum, or modern textbooks, or a variety spectrum of other essential teaching aids, such as properly adapted texts, disc and tape recordings, tables, graphs, 'survival dictionaries', etc. **Also, there is no exchange of experiences** which are surely noteworthy; **no one has ever been interested in these matters** (Wiczorkiewicz 1980: 10; highlights by WM, PG).

The lack of experience sharing is highlighted in the citation as it corresponds to Lewandowski's remark on teaching PAFL in 1948–1962, which he calls intuitive teaching, lacking reflection on the methods used and not supported by any theory.

Wiczorkiewicz's firm opinion on the methods of teaching Polish as a foreign language was a very modern one. Today, nearly 50 years later, this can be said without hesitation, as we know the actual course of development of the Polish language teaching methods and the implementation of the European standards to teaching and testing non-native speakers' command of the Polish language. However, looking at other papers published in the book, one will see that only a few authors explicitly referred to the methods of teaching foreign languages used at that time, namely Wiczorkiewicz, Buttlerowa, Wójtowicz, and Miodunka who dedicated an entire article to the Polish language and the contemporary methods of teaching foreign languages (Miodunka 1980: 46–67). The authors listed above referred to publications by American, Russian, German, British and French scholars, i.e. the methodologies of teaching world languages. It is important to underline that these authors *refer* to the methodology as a guideline to be applied to the teaching of Polish as a foreign language, and show how this should be done. Influenced by the French, British and American approaches of the time, Miodunka expressly states that scholars should draw on the achievements of applied linguistics, as reflected by the following statement:

The fact is that when searching for good or improved solutions, applied linguistics discovered many new aspects of the teaching process; these aspects provide original insights on its mechanisms [...]. Referring to the latest methods of foreign language teaching will help us answer the question of HOW to teach. It must be clearly said, though, that if we want to get our language outside our own backyard, we need to teach it the same way other foreign languages are taught in the countries we want to reach. Otherwise, not only will we fail to achieve anything but we will also reinforce the opinion that we are behind (Miodunka 1980: 66).

In the opening of his article, Wieczorkiewicz asked questions about who to teach, what to teach and how to teach. Other authors also ponder these questions but they do not treat them as equally important. As they attempt to respond to the question of who to teach, the authors differentiate between “real” foreigners and foreigners of Polish origin who used to be referred to as students from the Polish communities outside Poland. To answer the question of how to teach, they refer to the direct method, the audio-lingual method, the French audio-visual method, the structural global method and programmed learning. All authors whose articles are included in the compilation consider that the crucial question is that of what should be taught, to what extent and in what order. This question gives the authors the opportunity to fully use their knowledge of Polish phonetics, inflection, syntax, lexicology and lexicography. The discussion here is more elaborate, and some of the authors put forward some original and personal suggestions. We believe that this is typical to the stage of reflection on teaching Polish to non-native speakers, or **the stage when Polish linguistics was applied to teaching Polish as a foreign language.**

## 1.2. Methodology of teaching Polish as a native language and PAFL

Contrary to what could be assumed based on Lewandowski’s monograph, the first stage did not end in 1980 or in the 1980s. A summary of this stage can be found in the collective work entitled *Vademecum lektora języka polskiego* (A Manual for Polish Language Teachers) by Bartnicka, Kacprzak and Rohozińska, et al. (1992), which was developed by scholars from the University of Warsaw with many years of experience in teaching the future teachers of PAFL at universities outside Poland. In the introduction to the publication, the editors note that those teaching Polish as a foreign language lack proper preparation:

The expertise in Polish studies gained and unilaterally developed by taking classes at a university in Poland often proves to be insufficient in the new circumstances (when working at a university abroad – WM). **Linguists in Poland are usually familiar with the methodology of teaching Polish as the native language but they rarely have the opportunity to get to know the methods of teaching Polish as a foreign language which are fundamentally different.** Literary scholars, on the other hand, not only need to become familiar with problems that were completely unknown to them but they should also refresh their knowledge of the grammar (Bartnicka, Kacprzak, Rohozińska et al. 1992: 5; highlights by WM, PG).

The editors' input was valuable as they highlighted the fact that Polish teachers needed to be prepared for teaching foreigners, and identified the main gaps in their education which had to be eliminated, considering that the only methodology of teaching the Polish language known to specialists in Polish studies was the one of teaching Polish as the native language. For that reason, the editors provided information on teaching Polish pronunciation, nominal and verbal inflection (including aspects), syntax and vocabulary, i.e. the system of the contemporary Polish language, which accounted for more than 60% of the overall content. Also, the authors tackled the psychological aspects of teaching beginners and intermediate learners, and discussed elements of Polish culture which should be taken into account when teaching Polish as a foreign language.

The book entitled *Język polski jako obcy. Programy nauczania na tle badań współczesnej polszczyzny* (Polish as a Foreign Language. Teaching Curricula within the Context of Studies on the Contemporary Polish Language) by Miodunka, et al. (1992) was published by Jagiellonian University the same year. It provides the results of the analyses of the frequency of the use of parts of speech based on the spoken language used on Polish television (Miodunka, et al. 1992: 177–306), as well as the curricula for teaching Polish to beginners, intermediate and advanced learners which answer the question of what to teach in terms of vocabulary, grammar (inflection), and syntax. The book does not provide any specific answer to the question of how to teach (what methods to use), although it does suggest two inventories used as the basis of the communicative approach which was introduced to the teaching of world languages in the 1980s: the intentional terminology inventory and the thematic inventory (Martyniuk 1992a: 119–156). For the first time in Poland, it was suggested that a certification system should be introduced for Polish as a foreign language, which was to be given a legal framework in 2003, and implemented in 2004 in the form of certification exams. (Martyniuk 1992b: 157–174). The title of the editor's introduction to

the compilation indicates that he still writes from the perspective of applied linguistics. *Programy nauczania polszczyzny. Próba syntezy badań z zakresu językoznawstwa stosowanego do nauczania języka polskiego jako obcego* (Polish Language Teaching Curricula. An Attempt to Synthesize Studies on Linguistics Applied to Teaching Polish as a Foreign Language) (Miodunka 1992: 13–34). Despite the fact that the publication entitled *Język polski jako obcy. Programy nauczania...* (*Polish as a Foreign Language. Teaching Curricula...*) was developed and published by Jagiellonian University, the curricula included in the book were a result of the collective efforts of experts appointed by the Polish Ministry of Education (MEN) representing Poland's major academic centers specializing in teaching foreigners, including University of Warsaw, University of Łódź, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Marie Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin, Jagiellonian University, and the Pedagogical University of Opole (WSP). Consequently, it may be assumed that the book reflected the state of knowledge of the country's specialists in teaching Polish as a foreign language at the time.

As one can see, both of the collective publications discussed here mainly present the knowledge of the contemporary Polish language system applied to teaching Polish as a foreign language. Additionally, the work published in Cracow includes some aspects of the communicative approach, while the Warsaw publication tackles some of the problems of educating teachers of Polish as a foreign language and teaching Polish culture to foreigners. Hence, it may be stated without exaggeration that the main focus of the methodology used at that time was the knowledge of the contemporary Polish language applied to teaching Polish to non-native speakers. The awareness of the methods used to teach other foreign languages, which slowly started to be introduced to teaching PAFL, was at the periphery of the methodology. What was truly novel was the communicative approach and the two inventories on which this approach was based: the intentional-notional and the thematic inventories.

This period is also characterized by another phenomenon: the separation of the theoretical reflection from the practical teaching of PAFL. Polish language teachers were generally not interested in the theory of teaching PAFL, or the scholars' debates and their outcomes. Teachers were most interested in developing new teaching aids for PAFL, which were still lacking and were poorly distributed, as manuals were published by universities to meet the needs of their students only, without trying to meet country-level demand. Therefore, when Buttlerowa published new textbooks at the University of Warsaw, they were known to and used by teachers, whereas her interesting articles on the methods of teaching PAFL were of interest only to a very small group of specialists who strived to combine theory and practice.

## 2. METHODOLOGY OF PAFL AND GLOTTODIDACTICS

One may wonder if the country's specialists at that time used the term *glottodidactics* to refer to teaching Polish as a foreign language. Clearly, it played a secondary role. This is confirmed by the work by Lewandowski entitled *Kierunki rozwoju metodyki nauczania polszczyzny jako języka obcego po roku 1970* (Directions in the Development of Methods of Teaching Polish as a Foreign Language after 1970), published in "Poradnik Językowy" in 1979, and reprinted later in the book *Metodyka nauczania języka polskiego jako obcego* (Methods of Teaching Polish as a Foreign Language) (Lewandowski 1980: 68-82). In his work, Lewandowski reflects on the relationship between the methodology of teaching Polish as a foreign language and glottodidactics. He refers to the work by F. Grucza, and the initial glottodidactic system he created, composed of the teacher, the communication system and the learner(s).

If we look at the relationship between the methodology and glottodidactics in Lewandowski's monograph from 1985 entitled *Nauczanie języka polskiego cudzoziemców w Polsce. Monografia glottodydaktyczna* (Teaching Polish to Foreigners in Poland. A Glottodidactic Monograph), we will see that the author uses both terms but for different purposes. A crucial part of his book (and the largest in terms of volume) is chapter 4 entitled *Kształtowanie się metodyki nauczania języka polskiego jako obcego* (Formation of the Methodology of Teaching Polish as a Foreign Language) (Lewandowski 1985: 73-225). In more than 70 pages, the author presents and discusses the scientific achievements in teaching PAFL, and the theoretical and methodological bases of this approach which he dissociates from the scientific ones and the Polish studies and linguistics. It is only at the end of the chapter that the author moves to the part entitled *Nauczanie języka polskiego cudzoziemców jako układ glottodydaktyczny* (Teaching Polish to Foreigners as a Glottodidactic System) where he presents F. Grucza's glottodidactic system and glottodidactics itself, and transfers the system's components to the teaching of PAFL, reflecting on the *readiness of the components of the potential system for teaching PAFL to organize the current teaching processes* (Lewandowski 1985: 196). The author's final conclusions on the reality of teaching PAFL at that time were very interesting:

It may be ascertained that in terms of their internal glottodidactic coherence, all of the organized processes of teaching PAFL in Poland between 1948 and 1982 were "open" systems - "wide open", to be precise. Obviously, this did not contribute to making teaching PAFL more effective. Therefore, the use of the modeling method has allowed us to identify dysfunctionality of each of the organizational forms of such teaching (Lewandowski 1985: 196).

By mentioning *wide-open systems*, the author refers to L. Zabrocki's work arguing that the communication system is composed of three circles: the information circle, the control circle, and the steering circle, and underlined that optimally, the glottodidactic system should be a closed one, i.e. everything in it should be planned and controlled (Lewandowski 1985: 167).

Coming back to our discussion, we wish to underline that, according to Lewandowski, the methodology of teaching PAFL played a primary role and, unlike glottodidactics, it was believed to be the *new research area*. This is perfectly understandable as Polish scholars specializing in the contemporary Polish language were the initiators of this methodology remaining in the forefront of the academic discussion, and the authors of major works dedicated to the methodology of teaching PAFL. They did not use the term *glottodidactics* as they were likely to be unfamiliar with it. Lewandowski was a specialist in Polish studies but he did not pursue his career at "Polonicum", a centre at the University of Warsaw specialized in teaching Polish to foreigners, but at the Institute of Applied Linguistics, University of Warsaw, where the majority of academics specialized in modern language studies. Considering the then-existing structure of scientific specialties, which is still present today, it appears that promoting concepts developed by specialists in German studies among scholars specializing in Polish studies was a challenging task, and may have even seemed impossible.

## 2.1. From applied linguistics to glottodidactics

The term *glottodidactics* first appear in 1966. Its creator was prof. Jan Wikarjak from Classical Philology Department, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznan. Its first popularizers were specialists from Poznan gathered around prof. Louis Zabrocki, the creator of Polish applied linguistics. The same year in Poznan was published the first issue of *Glottodidactica. An International Journal of Applied Linguistics*.

In 1977 *glottodidactics* emerged as the name of the Department of Glottodidactics which was established in 1972 as part of the Institute of Applied Linguistics, University of Warsaw. In 1972–1977, the department was known as the Department of General Foreign Language Teaching Methodology.

Similarly to other universities attended by foreigners, Jagiellonian University established the School of Polish for Foreign Students in 1965 (Spyt 1999: 26–33). In 1978, the School, which previously existed as part of the Jagiellonian University Institute of Polish Philology, was transferred to the Jagiellonian University Institute of Polonia Studies, where since 1971 Polish was taught to students of Polish origin, mainly from the US and Canada. In

1980, the Institute of Polonia Studies established the Department of Linguistics Applied to Teaching Polish as a Foreign Language.

The proposal to convert the School of Polish for Foreign Students into the Department of Applied Linguistics shows that the originator sought to underline the scientific bases of teaching Polish as a foreign language. This was a clear reference to the French applied linguistics [...], as well as the Poznań School of Applied Linguistics [...], and the rapidly growing Warsaw School of Applied Linguistics. **The creation of a new quality represented by the Department of Applied Linguistics was also connected with the desire to discontinue the School of Polish for Foreign Students, even at a symbolic level, as the educational activities conducted there were considered to have no scientific grounds** (Miodunka 2009: 63).

Therefore, the overview of the 20 years of the Department of Applied Linguistics was entitled *Od Studium Języka Polskiego do Zakładu Językoznawstwa Stosowanego. 20 lat kształcenia cudzoziemców w Instytucie Polonijnym UJ* (From the School of Polish for Foreign Students to the Department of Applied Linguistics. 20 Years of Educating Foreign Students at the Jagiellonian University Institute of Polonia Studies) (Miodunka 1999: 34–48). The title clearly indicates that the author was proud of the changes made, which included modernisation of the process of teaching PAFL by incorporating the scientific achievements of the European applied linguistics, as well as those in the field of sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, foreign language teaching and Polish glottodidactics.

## 2.2. Polish glottodidactics

When referring to *glottodidactics* as a term competing with *methodology of teaching PAFL*, we should first shortly elaborate on the origins of this term. The term was adopted in Poland to refer to foreign language teaching. The pioneering efforts to create and promote the term were made by instructors of world languages who realized, at a relatively early stage, that foreign language teaching must be continuously modernised to keep up with the development of linguistics studies, including in particular language acquisition, and psycho- and sociolinguistic research, as well as the development of teaching concepts and communication sciences. Although a detailed elaboration on the development of glottodidactics in Poland is not the focus of this article, we should mention L. Zabrocki, Professor of German Studies at the Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, and the creator of applied linguistics from which glottodidactics was derived. In 1965, Zabrocki established

Poland's first Department of Applied Linguistics, and many of his students later contributed to the development of both applied linguistics and glottodidactics at different academic centers across Poland (on Zabrocki's contribution to applied linguistics, see F. Grucza 2007: 279–285; cf. Pfeiffer 2010: 13–16). At Adam Mickiewicz University wide activity in the field of *glottodidactics* was continued by Pfeiffer, Skowronek, Prokop, Sopata, Krysztowicz-Adamczak, Wiśniewska and Badstübner-Kizik.

A contributor deserving special recognition is also F. Grucza, Professor of the University of Warsaw, and the creator of the renowned Institute of Applied Linguistics. What is particularly noteworthy is the fact that F. Grucza used his influential position within the applied linguistics community to promote solutions in the field of Polish language teaching (see F. Grucza 2007: 290–348). Since the early 1970s, F. Grucza presented his concept of glottodidactics many times. The following citation shows how he perceived the difference between glottodidactics and methodology:

Glottodidactics has broadened the focus of interest to include the entire glottodidactic system, together with the processes taking place in the system. The primary task of glottodidactics (...) is not to develop practical foreign language teaching methods, etc., but to describe and explain the structure of the glottodidactic system, including the processes taking place in the system, and its functioning (Grucza 1976: 15).

As the above-cited quote suggests, from the very beginning, glottodidactics was considered by its creator as a much broader concept than methodology. The purpose of glottodidactics was to explore the communication between foreign language learners and the teacher to help learners acquire a foreign language. Learners were the more significant component of the system as the language acquisition process took place in their minds. Teachers were considered an essential component of the system, but their role was to help learners acquire a foreign language. The foreign language being learned by the students and taught by the teachers was only the object of communication and teaching. In that case, the development of methods for teaching foreign languages could not be the primary task of glottodidactics; instead, it was considered to be an additional task, or a task of secondary importance. This explains the initial caution or even reluctance of foreign language teaching practitioners and teachers towards glottodidactics: what mattered for teachers were the foreign language teaching methods and teaching aids to use in the classroom, of which there was a constant shortage in the 1970s and 1980s in Poland. Also, those of the teachers who considered themselves to be in the centre of the teaching process did not realise for

a long time the emergence of a new approach to the glottodidactic process which focused on the learners, and not the teacher.

The history of the introduction of the term *glottodidactics* to the applied linguistics terminology was vividly described by F. Grucza (2007: 314–321) who noted that the use of specific terms by scholars is often a matter of personal inclination which should be remembered as it explains many things.

### 3. COMPARATIVE GLOTTODIDACTICS

Although the term *comparative glottodidactics* emerged relatively recently, in 2010, the use of the comparative method in Polish glottodidactics has a much longer tradition dating back to the 1980s. For Gębal, the promoter of this term, it was a gradual process: first of all, it should be noted that the subheading of the title of his textbook *Dydaktyka kultury polskiej w kształceniu językowym cudzoziemców* (*Teaching Polish Culture in the Language Education of Foreigners*) is *Podejście porównawcze* (*A Comparative Approach*) (2010a). The comparative approach consisted in the transfer of elements of the German *Landeskunde* to teaching aspects of the daily life in Poland and the Polish culture (Gębal 2010a) 26–38; 42–63), as well as references to the achievements of the French lexiculture (Gębal 2010a: 38–42), and the use of the European standards based on CEFR at all levels of proficiency (Gębal 2010a: 178–199). Gębal's article entitled *Poza granicami tradycyjnej glottodydaktyki: w stronę glottodydaktyki porównawczej* (2010b) (*Beyond Traditional Glottodidactics: A Shift Towards Comparative Glottodidactics*) was published the same year in the book *Polonistyka bez granic* (*Polish Studies Without Borders*), where he referred to comparative glottodidactics as a *sub-discipline of glottodidactics*, aimed at supporting multilingualism and multiculturalism, as well as the teaching of *rare languages* and the languages of the neighbouring countries in border regions, advocating the use of comparative glottodidactics in *third language teaching*, as well as in the foreign language teaching practice (Gębal 2010a: 76–79). However, Gębal provided the most comprehensive description of comparative glottodidactics in the monograph entitled *Modele kształcenia nauczycieli języków obcych w Polsce i w Niemczech* (*Models of Educating Foreign Language Teachers in Poland and in Germany*) which was published three years later, and included a chapter entitled *Zarys koncepcji glottodydaktyki porównawczej* (2013: 91–108) (*Outline of the Comparative Glottodidactics Concept*), preceded by the chapter entitled *Badania porównawcze w glottodydaktyce europejskiej na przykładzie glottodydaktyki francuskiej, niemieckiej i polskiej* (2013: 61–90) (*Comparative Studies in European Glottodidactics as Exemplified by the French, German and Polish Glottodidactics*). Follow-

ing his elaboration on comparativism in foreign language teaching in Europe, particularly in the works of the French, German and Polish glottodidactics, Gębal suggested the following definition of comparative glottodidactics:

Comparative glottodidactics is a sub-discipline of glottodidactics dedicated to the theoretical and empirical comparative analysis of the methods of organisation and implementation of elements of language education within the framework of various education systems in their historical, socio-economic, political and cultural contexts. By its very nature, it is linked to the assumptions and achievements of general glottodidactics and detailed glottodidactics open to multilingualism. In terms of methodology, comparative glottodidactics is an interdisciplinary field of study drawing from pure and applied glottodidactics and the neighbouring fields, including in particular applied linguistics and pedagogy (Gębal 2010a: 95).

In his further analysis of comparative glottodidactics, the author focuses on **glottodidactic comparativism** which he defines as *conducting comparative analyses for research and didactic purposes* (Gębal 2010a: 95). In his further deliberations, the author differentiates between **internal comparativism** and **external comparativism**. The first one is

a comparative activity as part of the teaching of a single foreign language (e.g. Polish as a foreign language), both on a national level (within the framework of one education system) and an international level (intersystemic). External comparativism involves comparative studies at the crossroads of didactics of two or more languages (both on a national and international level). External comparativism also applies to situations where transnational language education standards serve as a point of reference for the comparisons made (Gębal 2010a: 95–96).

Gębal's works discussed so far suggest that before deciding to promote the comparative approach to Polish glottodidactics, he had used this approach in practice, both in research and the didactics of PAFL. The author also underlines that the *international flow of ideas on glottodidactics is the sine qua non for professional comparative studies*, and notes that his interest in comparative glottodidactics has synergy with the works by some foreign authors (including Puren, Porcher, and Abendroth-Timmer) who discussed comparative studies in the teaching of French and German. Influenced by their writings, Gębal decided to implement this idea at home, and suggested the creation of comparative glottodidactics as a new sub-discipline of general glottodidactics in Poland (Gębal 2013: 69).

Similarly to other European countries, the comparative approach was occasionally used in Polish glottodidactics, but it was not treated as a sepa-

rate type of glottodidactic studies. Poland's accession to the European Union in 2004 led to the publication of a comparative work entitled *Nauczanie języków obcych. Polska a Europa* (Foreign Language Teaching. Poland vs. Europe) by Komorowska, et al. (2007) where the comparative approach is reflected by the subheading *Poland vs. Europe*. Gębal proved that the authors whose works are collected in his monograph represent a comparative approach as they refer to the recommendations of the European Council and the EU, use the empirical studies conducted there, carry out specific cross-system comparative analyses, and suggest specific solutions for the Polish education system developed based on the solutions implemented in other EU countries (Gębal 2010a: 77–84, particularly 80).

### 3.1. Comparative glottodidactics and teaching PAFL

In Polish glottodidactics, the situation was similar, except for the fact the comparative approach started to be consciously used 30 years earlier, in 1977, when Miodunka, who took charge of teaching Polish to foreigners at the Institute of Polonia Studies, Jagiellonian University, developed an action plan in which he expressly stated that:

**This plan is an attempt to transfer the practical experience and the theoretical arrangements developed by foreign centers (of applied linguistics), which takes into consideration our organizational capabilities and the status of teaching Polish as a foreign language.** Nevertheless, this plan is unrealistic in a way that it involves the required team which will implement it, and not the specific team. The creation of this team is a pre-requisite for the plan's overall success (Gębal 2010a: 85; see also Miodunka 1999: 34; highlights by WM, PG).

From the very beginning, the author supported:

the creation of a new team of employees who were not only supposed to start teaching foreigners differently, but also to develop teaching aids (of which there was a shortage) and to scientifically study the process of teaching Polish as a foreign language. Consequently, teaching the Polish language to foreigners was meant to **change from a practical service into academic instruction**: those teaching Polish as a foreign language were supposed to study and explore the peculiarities of the Polish language, and develop new teaching aids using the knowledge gained in the process, as well as to analyse the teaching process to see how the methods of teaching foreign languages used in the teaching of world languages work in the Polish language environment, and to assess the usefulness of the methods and aids developed to teach Polish as a foreign language in practice (Miodunka 1999: 35; highlights by WM, PG).

After 20 years following the implementation of the 1977 plan, Miodunka assessed the process in the book entitled *Oswajanie chrząszcza w trzcinnie, czyli o kształceniu cudzoziemców w Instytucie Polonijnym Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego* (Coming to Terms with the Intricacies of the Polish Language: the Experience of Teaching Foreigners at the Jagiellonian University Institute of Polonia Studies) edited by Miodunka and Rokicki (1999). In the article entitled *Od Studium Języka Polskiego do Zakładu Językoznawstwa Stosowanego. 20 lat kształcenia cudzoziemców w Instytucie Polonijnym UJ* (From the School of Polish for Foreign Students to the Department of Applied Linguistics: 20 Years of Teaching Foreigners at the Jagiellonian University Institute of Polish Studies) published in the collection, he began by describing the process of building and educating the team, then moved on to the teaching aids developed by the team to be used in teaching PAFL, the research studies conducted by the team which were published individually or collectively, and finally elaborated on the changes made in the organisation of the process of teaching PAFL (1999: 34–48). It should be noted that, in his opinion, the change made over the 20-year period consisted in the conversion of the School of Polish for Foreign Students into the Department of Applied Linguistics. The names of the research and teaching units directed by Miodunka reflected the shift from *practical services to academic instruction*, enriched by individual and collective research studies.

### 3.2. The comparative approach at Jagiellonian University

The comparative approach was often used at the Jagiellonian University Department of Linguistics Applied to Teaching Polish as a Foreign Language in didactics and teaching by referring to research studies and didactic solutions (including methods and approaches) used in the teaching of world languages. However, expressions such as *comparative approach*, *(glotto)didactic comparativism* or *comparative glottodidactics* were not used. These expressions, which later became terms, only emerged in Gębał's works discussed here. In chapter two of his monograph entitled *Modele kształcenia nauczycieli języków obcych* (Models of Educating Foreign Language Teachers), a sub-chapter entitled *Krakowska szkoła glottodydaktyki porównawczej* (The Cracow School of Comparative Glottodidactics) was included for the first time (2013: 84–90), and provided a very general overview of the scientific achievements of the Jagiellonian University's scholars specializing in teaching PAFL. The sub-chapter was later expanded to include detailed analyses of the works published in the book entitled *Krakowska szkoła glottodydaktyki porównawczej na tle rozwoju glottodydaktyki ogólnej i polonistycznej* (The Cracow School of Com-

parative Glottodidactics within the Context of the Development of General and Polish Glottodidactics) (2014). The first chapter of this publication describes the development of the glottodidactic concept with regard to the Polish language, or the shift from general glottodidactics to Polish glottodidactics (see 1.1.). The second chapter is dedicated to the Cracow School of Comparative Glottodidactics. The author divided the period of the existence of the Cracow centre of Polish glottodidactics into three stages. In his opinion, the first stage was the *introduction of the foreign concept into teaching PAFL*, which occurred in the course of a study on the Polish thematic dictionary and the development of the bases for the communicative approach to teaching PAFL. The following works were included in this stage and carefully analysed by Gębał: *Teoria pól językowych. Społeczne i indywidualne ich uwarunkowania* (The Language Fields Theory: Social and Individual Determinants) by Miodunka (1980), *Słownictwo tematyczne języka polskiego. Zbiór wyrazów w układzie rangowym, alfabetycznym i tematycznym* (Thematic Vocabulary of the Polish Language. A Collection of Words by Rank Order, Alphabetical Order and Theme) by Cygal-Krupa (1986), *Prononciation polonaise pour les francophones* (Polish Pronunciation for French Speakers) by Miodunka (1987), *Nauczanie mówienia w języku polskim jako rozwijanie kompetencji komunikacyjnej* (Learning to Speak Polish as a Development of Communicative Competence) (teaching curriculum) by Czarnecka (1990), *Grundbaustein Polnisch. Propozycja programu nauczania języka polskiego jako obcego* (Grundbaustein Polnisch. A Suggested Curriculum for Teaching Polish as a Foreign Language) by Martyniuk (1991), *Język polski jako obcy. Programy nauczania na tle badań współczesnej polszczyzny* (Polish as a Foreign Language. Teaching Curricula Within the Context of Contemporary Polish Studies) by Miodunka, et al. (1992), and *Komputer w nauczaniu języka polskiego jako obcego* (Computers in Teaching Polish as a Foreign Language) by Dębski (1996; cf. Gębał 2014: 62–81).

The author discussed the achievements of the second stage in the development of the Cracow school of comparative glottodidactics in the sub-chapter entitled *Komparatywizm glottodydaktyczny w monografiach i opracowaniach glottodydaktycznych z zakresu semantyki i leksykografii porównawczej, dydaktyki kultury oraz metodyki nauczania sprawności językowych i części systemu językowego* (Glottodidactic Comparativism in Glottodidactic Monographs and Compilations on Comparative Semantics and Lexicography, Culture Teaching and Methodology of Competency-Based Language Teaching and Teaching Elements of the Language System) (Gębał 2014: 61–114). During that period, the following works were written and/or published at Jagiellonian University: *Definicje i definiowanie* (Definitions and Defining) by Seretny (1998), *Kultura w nauczaniu języka polskiego jako obcego*.

*Stan obecny – programy nauczania – pomoce dydaktyczne* (Culture in Teaching Polish as a Foreign Language. The Current Status, Curricula and Teaching Aids) by Miodunka, et al. (2004), *Nowa generacja w glottodydaktyce polonistycznej* (The New Generation in Polish Glottodidactics) by Miodunka, et al. (2009), *Dydaktyka kultury polskiej w kształceniu językowym cudzoziemców. Podejście porównawcze* (Polish Culture Teaching in the Language Education of Foreigners. A Comparative Approach) by Gębal (2010), *ABC metodyki nauczania języka polskiego jako obcego* (The ABCs of the Methodology of Teaching Polish as a Foreign Language) by Seretny and Lipińska (2005), *Z zagadnień dydaktyki języka polskiego jako obcego* (Aspects of Teaching Polish as a Foreign Language) by Lipińska and Seretny, et al. (2006), *Specyfika nauczania języków obcych dzieci na przykładzie języka polskiego jako obcego* (Teaching Foreign Languages to Children as Exemplified by Polish as a Foreign Language) by Rabiej (2007), *W poszukiwaniu nowych rozwiązań. Dydaktyka języka polskiego jako obcego u progu XXI wieku* (In Search for New Solutions. Teaching Polish as a Foreign Language in the Early 21st Century) by Miodunka and Seretny, et al. (2008), *Planowanie lekcji języka obcego. Podręcznik i poradnik dla nauczycieli języków obcych* (Planning Foreign Language Lessons. A Textbook and Guide for Foreign Language Teachers) by Janowska (2010), and *Kompetencja leksykalna uczących się języka polskiego jako obcego w świetle badań ilościowych* (Lexical Competence of Students Learning Polish as a Foreign Language Within the Context of Quantitative Studies) by Seretny (2011).

The third stage in the development of the Cracow school was analysed and discussed by Gębal in the sub-chapter entitled *Podejście porównawcze odwołujące się do europejskich standardów kształcenia językowego* (A Comparative Approach Referring to the European Standards in Language Education) (Gębal 2014: 114–122), and includes the following publications: *Podejście zadaniowe do nauczania i uczenia się języków obcych. Na przykładzie języka polskiego jako obcego* (A Task-Based Approach to Foreign Language Teaching and Learning as Exemplified by Polish as a Foreign Language) by Janowska (2011), *Programy nauczania języka polskiego jako obcego. Poziomy A1 – C2* (Curricula for Teaching Polish as Foreign Language. Levels A1 – C2) by Janowska, Lipińska, Rabiej, Seretny, Turek, et al. (2011), *Tekst literacki w nauczaniu języka polskiego jako obcego (z elementami pedagogiki dyskursywnej)* (Literary Texts in Teaching Polish as a Foreign Language (including elements of discursive pedagogy) by Czerkies (2012), *Rozwijanie sprawności rozumienia ze słuchu w języku polskim jako obcym* (Development of Listening Comprehension Skills in Polish as a Foreign Language) by Prizel-Kania (2013). The following two monographs also represent this stage: *Lingwistyka i glottodydaktyka języków specjalistycznych na przykładzie języka biznesu* (Linguistics and Glottodidactics of Languages for Specific Purposes as Exemplified by Busi-

ness Language) by Ligara and Szupelak (2012; Gębal 2014: 127–128), and *Modele kształcenia nauczycieli języków obcych Polsce i w Niemczech. W stronę glottodydaktyki porównawczej* (Models of Educating Foreign Language Teachers in Poland and in Germany. A Shift Towards Comparative Glottodidactics) by Gębal (2013), which was still unpublished at the time when *Krakowska szkoła glottodydaktyki porównawczej* (The Cracow School of Comparative Glottodidactics) went to press, and therefore it was not discussed by the author, except for a short mention of it on page 127.

### 3.3. Summary of the Cracow comparativism

In his summary of the Cracow comparativism in the field of Polish glottodidactics, P. Gębal argues that the use of the comparative approach *has enabled Polish glottodidactics to rapidly catch up with the didactics of other languages*, including world languages, as shown by the position of the specialists in Polish glottodidactics in ALTE's work. The author also underlines that the consistent implementation of the European standards into teaching PAFL

has not only stimulated the establishment of new centers, but, to a large extent, it contributed to the development of Polish glottodidactics as a whole, and resulted in the emergence of three important contemporary trends: the task-based approach, the intercultural approach and multilingual didactics (Gębal 2010a 2014: 122–124).

The Cracow centre is obviously not the only one applying the comparative approach, as noted by Gębal when discussing various important publications, including *Polityka językowa i certyfikacja* (Language Policy and Certification) by Tambor and Rytel-Kuc, et al. (2006) and *Europäische Sprachpolitik und Zertifizierung des Polnischen und Tschechischen* (*The Language Policy in Europe and the Certification of the Polish and Czech Languages/ Jazyková politika v Evropě a certifikace polštiny a češtiny*) by Rytel-Kuc and Tambor, et al. (2008), written as a result of collaboration between the School of Polish Language and Culture, University of Silesia, and the Faculty of West Slavic Studies, University of Leipzig. It should be mentioned that these publications included works by representatives of several Polish glottodidactic centers (Gębal 2014: 133–137).

In his monograph, Gębal also noted that the comparative approach was transferred from Polish glottodidactics to the teaching of Asian languages in Poland, as shown by the monograph entitled *Glottodydaktyka sinologiczna* (Sinological Glottodidactics) by Zajdler (2010), and Lewicka's article entitled

*Kompetencja kulturowa i komunikacja interkulturowa w dydaktyce języka arabskiego* (Cultural Competence and Intercultural Communication in Arab Language Teaching) (2013; Gębał 2014: 129–133).

When discussing the directions of research undertaken at the School of Polish Language and Culture for Foreigners, University of Wrocław, Dąbrowska mentions comparative glottodidactics, as exemplified by the work entitled *Ukryty program nauczania polskiego i niemieckiego jako języków obcych. Konteksty kulturowe* (The Hidden Curriculum for Teaching Polish and German as a Foreign Language. Cultural Contexts) by Żurek and Stankiewicz (2014; Dąbrowska 2014: 255–276).

#### **4. THE DEVELOPMENT OF POLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING METHODOLOGY (GLOTTODIDACTICS) IN OTHER RESEARCH CENTRES**

Apart from the Kraków school of Polish language teaching methodology, the scientific development of teaching Polish as a foreign language took place also in other academic centres. Monographs and scientific papers from authors related to individual institutions and the subject of conferences organized by such institutions allow us to distinguish five trends in the methodology of Polish language teaching. These include:

- the cultural approach, developed in the Warsaw “Polonicum”, mainly through the work of Garncarek and Kajak;
- the intercultural approach, practiced at the University of Lodz (UŁ), present mainly in the works of Zarzycka;
- the philological approach, developed at the University of Silesia (UŚ);
- focus on teaching Polish students from the East in the works created at UMCS;
- focus on the study of errors made by foreigners learning Polish in the studies prepared at the University of Wrocław.

The cultural studies approach practiced at UW (Warsaw University) is present mainly in the theoretical studies of Garncarek (elements of national culture), Kajak (popular culture), Jelonkiewicz (knowledge about Poland and Polish films) and the series *Biblioteka Polonicum*, which published four volumes, largely or entirely devoted to the so-called Polish language and culture education<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> These include: *Nauczanie języka polskiego jako obcego i polskiej kultury w nowej rzeczywistości europejskiej*, ed. P. Garncarek (2005), *Na chwilę i pożytek nasz wzajemny. Złoty jubileusz Polonicum*, ed. E. Rohozińska, M. Skura and A. Piasecka (2006), *Kanon kultury w nauczaniu języka polskiego*

The cultural orientation of the development of Polish language teaching methodology, which has taken on a clearly intercultural dimension, is an important element characterizing the studies made in Łódź, in particular the works of Zarzycka related to the local Department of Applied and Cultural Linguistics<sup>2</sup>. Research and analysis, as well as specific programme proposals, which have accompanied her theoretical studies, have largely contributed to the orientation of the process of teaching Polish to a didactic intercultural openness. The centre in Łódź has also contributed to the development of Polish language teaching methodology by providing research and studies focusing on the subject of content and language learning, which constitutes the beginning of the concept of CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) in the area of teaching Polish to foreigners. Among theoretical works devoted to specialized language teaching, the following monographs should be mentioned, by such authors as: Rubaj, Michowicz and Rudziński.

The philological approach, present in the activities of the School of Polish Language and Culture of the University of Silesia, can be interpreted as a more traditional model of practicing foreign language teaching, reminiscent of the period of the development of the domain in terms of methodology. Usually, the centre's wide-spread teaching and publishing activities are not accompanied by the process of empirical research. A significant part of the papers and textbooks is characterized by rational empiricism based on the great sensitivity and experience of teachers, but is not a result of earlier research. An important element of the Silesia Centre includes publishing works concerning the issues of language policy and the place of the Polish language in the world.

The focus on teaching Polish students from the East is a constitutive element of the development of the UMCS Polish Language and Culture Centre for the Polish community living abroad and Foreigners. The Lublin specialization was the result of political changes that occurred at the beginning of the 1990s. The initiative to provide considerable educational help for Poles in the East was reflected in the teaching and research activities of the UMCS centre. Regular conferences, organized in the early years, devoted to the problems of educating Poles from the East and the teaching methodology, resulted in a series of post-conference works edited by Mazur<sup>3</sup> Furthermore,

---

*jako obcego*, ed. P. Garncarek, P. Kajak and A. Zieniewicz (2010) and *Edukacja międzykulturowa. Forum glottodydaktyczne*, ed. A. Rabczuk (2013).

<sup>2</sup> These include: *Dialog międzykulturowy. Teoria oraz opis komunikowania się cudzoziemców przyswajających język polski* (2000) and *Opis pedagogiki zorientowanej na rozwój kompetencji i wrażliwości interkulturowej* (2008).

<sup>3</sup> The most important works include: *Problemy kształcenia Polaków ze Wschodu* (Mazur 1992a), *Metodyka kształcenia językowego Polaków ze Wschodu* (Mazur 1993a), *Merytoryczne kształ-*

the centre in Lublin also prepared a number of programmes and textbooks for readers from the East (see: Miodunka 2013).

The focus on studying errors made by foreigners learning Polish became an important element of research activities of the Wrocław School of Polish Language and Culture for Foreigners. The body of errors made by foreigners learning Polish, created by specialists from the Wrocław centre, under the direction of Dąbrowska, is the largest of its kind used for the needs of Polish language teaching methodology (see: Dąbrowska 2004). It has allowed to catch up with the teaching and methodology of Polish as a foreign language in the field of research on the border of comparative linguistics, which have been carried out for years in the context of didactics of world languages.

There are two academic centres in Poland, which have been teaching Polish to foreigners since the 1970s, whose research and teaching profile is not clearly defined. These centres include KUL in Lublin and UAM in Poznań. Both centres lacked leaders who would have a decisive influence on the development of staff and conducted educational programmes, both still lack independent researchers (doctors with habilitation), specializing in the methodology of Polish language teaching. The staff of the Faculty of Polish Studies at UAM includes Zgólkowa, who took an active part in the development of early learning programs PAFL, preparing lexical programs for them (Miodunka ed. 1992: 37–104), then with Kurzowa she published *Słownik minimum języka polskiego* (1992), and individually *Słownik podstawowy języka polskiego z zarysem gramatyki polskiej* (2008). The above works were related to her individual lexicographical interests, however they did not have a major impact on didactic work associated with PAFL teaching conducted at UAM.

When the “Bristol” Association of Polish and Foreign Teachers of Polish Culture and Polish as a Foreign Language was registered, individual centres of Polish language teaching methodology organized scientific conferences which were regularly held (1995 UW; 1996 Jagiellonian University, 1997 University of Lodz, 1999 UMCS, 2000 University of Silesia; 2002 University of Wrocław; 2004 UW; 2007 Jagiellonian University, 2008 University of Lodz, 2011 UMCS, 2012 UAM and 2014 KUL). As you can see, the centres in question joined the international cooperation in the field of Polish language teaching methodology relatively late, several years after it was launched. In the case of UAM there is no clear influence of applied linguistics at the faculty of modern languages, which is very strong at this university, on the teaching of Polish as a foreign language.

In recent years, an increasing number of Polish institutions of higher education (not only universities) have decided to run specialized units dealing with teaching Polish as a foreign language. These include units that, apart from typical didactic activities, also take up various scientific initiatives. For example, UMK in Toruń which in 2016 will host the next international conference of the "Bristol" association.

The development paths of Polish language teaching methodology described in this paper, reflecting the scientific activities of other Polish research centres, differ methodologically from the comparative-oriented approach practiced at UJ, but provide a lot of interesting topics and valuable details.

## **5. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE KRAKÓW SCHOOL OF POLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING METHODOLOGY AND THE POZNAŃ SCHOOL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS**

The idea of raising the teaching of foreign languages to the status of an independent scientific discipline, derived from UAM in Poznań, has become a major reference point for the creation of the foundations of the scientific methodology of Polish language teaching. The activity of prof. Ludwik Zabrocki and his students, also associated with other research centres, has triggered the first discussions on the scientific theoretical basis of teaching Polish as a foreign language. The first specialists who used the previously developed methodological solutions of the Poznań glottodidactics were prof. Jan Lewandowski from UW and prof. Władysław T. Miodunka from the Jagiellonian University. In their studies they referred directly to the deliberations of Polish specialists in the field of Modern Languages and their research (see: Miodunka 1997 and 1980, Lewandowski 1969 and 1980). Also other concepts and research developed at a later stage in the environment of researchers associated with the Poznań school of applied linguistics were reflected in the activities of the Kraków school of Polish language teaching methodology. These include, inter alia, deliberations on foreign language teaching as a science made by Pfeiffer and continued by Miodunka and Gębal and the popularization of the term intercultural glottopedagogics created at UAM, and used at UJ as the name of the course on modern aspects of intercultural education in the process of language learning.

In the development of applied linguistics in Poznań, issues related to Polish language teaching methodology were also raised. These include mainly the works of Kowalonek-Janczarek, preceded by empirical research,

describing certain aspects of learning and teaching of the Polish language in the German reality in the context of achieving the objectives of the European policy of plurilingualism (Kowalonek-Janczarek 2009, 2010a, 2010b and 2012).

## REFERENCES

- Bartnicka, B., Kacprzak, L., Rohozińska, E. (red.) 1992. *Vademecum lektora języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Uniwersytet Warszawski.
- Buttler, D. 1980. Z zagadnień metodycznych początkowego kursu polszczyzny jako języka obcego. W: Lewandowski, J. (red.). *Metodyka nauczania języka polskiego jako obcego*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Cygal-Krupa, Z. 1986. *Słownictwo tematyczne języka polskiego. Zbiór wyrazów w układzie rangowym, alfabetycznym i tematycznym*. Kraków: UJ.
- Czarnecka, U. 1990. *Nauczanie mówienia w języku polskim jako rozwijanie kompetencji komunikacyjnej*. Kraków: UJ.
- Czerkies, T. 2012. *Tekst literacki w nauczaniu języka polskiego jako obcego (z elementami pedagogiki dyskursywnej)*. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.
- Dąbrowska, A. 2004. Najczęstsze błędy popełniane przez cudzoziemców uczących się języka polskiego jako obcego. W: Seretny, A., Martyniuk, W., Lipińska E. (red.). *Opisywanie, rozwijanie i testowanie znajomości języka polskiego jako obcego*. Kraków: Universitas, 105–136.
- Dąbrowska, A., Dobesz, U. (red.) 2014. *40 lat wrocławskiej glottodydaktyki polonistycznej. Teoria i praktyka*. Wrocław: Oficyna wydawnicza ATUT.
- Dębski, R. 1996. *Komputer w nauczaniu języka polskiego*. Kraków: UJ.
- Dębski, R. 2009. *Dwujęzyczność angielsko-polska w Australii. Języki mniejszościowe w dobie globalizacji i informatyzacji*. Kraków: UJ.
- Gębal, P.E. 2010a. *Dydaktyka kultury polskiej w kształceniu językowym cudzoziemców. Podejście porównawcze*. Kraków: Towarzystwo Autorów i Wydawców Prac Naukowych Universitas.
- Gębal, P.E. 2010b. Poza granicami tradycyjnej glottodydaktyki: w stronę glottodydaktyki porównawczej. W: Kunz, T., Miodunka, W.T., Nycz, R. (red.). *Polonistyka bez granic. Tom 2: Glottodydaktyka polonistyczna – współczesny język polski – językowy obraz świata*. Kraków: Towarzystwo Autorów i Wydawców Prac Naukowych Universitas, 67–79.
- Gębal, P.E. 2013. *Modele kształcenia nauczycieli języków obcych w Polsce i w Niemczech. W stronę glottodydaktyki porównawczej*. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.
- Gębal, P.E. 2014. *Krakowska szkoła glottodydaktyki porównawczej na tle rozwoju glottodydaktyki ogólnej i polonistycznej*. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.
- Grucza, F. 1976. *Lingwistyczne uwarunkowania glottodydaktyki*. W: Grucza, F. (red.). *Glottodydaktyka a lingwistyka*. Warszawa: Uniwersytet Warszawski, 7–25.
- Grucza, F. 2007. *Lingwistyka stosowana. Historia – zadania – osiągnięcia*. Warszawa: Euroedukacja.
- Janowska, I. 2010. *Planowanie lekcji języka obcego. Podręcznik i poradnik dla nauczycieli języków obcych*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Janowska, I. 2011. *Podejście zadaniowe do nauczania i uczenia się języków obcych. Na przykładzie języka polskiego jako obcego*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Kowalonek-Janczarek, M. 2009. Die Nachbarsprache Polnisch aus einer sprachpolitischen und soziolinguistischen Perspektive im Kontext der Mehrsprachigkeit in Europa. W: *Glottodactica* XXXV. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 139–150.

- Kowalonek-Janczarek, M. 2010a. PaF-Unterricht in der Grenzregion Deutschland-Polen als Gegenstand glottodidaktischer Reflexion. W: Myczko, K. (red.). *Reflexion als Schlüsselphänomen der gegenwärtigen Fremdsprachendidaktik*. Frankfurt am Main w.a.: Peter Lang Verlag, 271-278.
- Kowalonek-Janczarek, M. 2010b. Sprechen Sie Polnisch? Kilka uwag o sprawności mówienia Niemców uczących się języka polskiego jako języka sąsiada. W: Pawlak, M., Waniek-Klimczak, E. (red.). *Mówienie w języku obcym – sukcesy i porażki uczenia się i nauczania*. Poznań-Kalisz-Konin: Wydawnictwo Państwowej Wyższej Szkoły Zawodowej w Koninie, 131-138.
- Kowalonek-Janczarek, M., Grzywina, K. 2012. Współczesny Europejczyk joggt und biket has fun and feeling, czyli anglicyzmy jako bariera i/lub wyzwanie w nauczaniu języków sąsiada. W: Filipowicz-Tokarska, K., Chojnowski P. (red.). *Barriere i/jako wyzwania w nauczaniu języka polskiego jako obcego*. Słubice: Collegium Polonicum. 71-80.
- Kurzowa Z., Zgólkowa H., 1992. *Słownik minimum języka polskiego*. Poznań: SAWW.
- Lewandowski, J. 1969. O potrzebie badań nad nauczaniem języka polskiego cudzoziemców. W: *Życie Szkoły Wyższej*, nr 2. Warszawa: UW, 76-80.
- Lewandowski, J. 1979. Kierunki rozwoju metodyki nauczania polszczyzny jako języka obcego po roku 1970. W: *Przegląd Glottodydaktyczny*, nr 3.
- Lewandowski, J. (red.) 1980. *Metodyka nauczania języka polskiego jako obcego*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Lewandowski, J. 1985. *Nauczanie języka polskiego cudzoziemców w Polsce. Monografia glottodydaktyczna*. Warszawa: Uniwersytet Warszawski.
- Lewicka, M. 2013. Kompetencja kulturowa i komunikacja interkulturowa w dydaktyce języka arabskiego. W: Michalak-Pikulska, B., Lewicka, M. (red.). *Dydaktyka języka arabskiego. Teoria – praktyka – perspektywy*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UMK.
- Ligara, B., Szupelak, W. 2012. *Lingwistyka i glottodydaktyka języków specjalistycznych na przykładzie języka biznesu. Podejście porównawcze*. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.
- Lipińska, E., Seretny, A. (red.) 2006. *Z zagadnień dydaktyki języka polskiego jako obcego*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Martyniuk, W. 1991. *Grundbaustein Polnisch. Propozycja programu nauczania języka polskiego jako obcego*. Kraków: UJ.
- Martyniuk, W. 1992a. Inwentarz intencjonalno-pojęciowy i tematyczny do nauczania języka polskiego jako obcego. W: *Język polski jako obcy. Programy nauczania na tle badań współczesnej polszczyzny. Zbiór materiałów opracowanych przez Komisję Ekspertów Ministerstwa Edukacji Narodowej*. Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński, 119-156.
- Martyniuk, W. 1992b. Nauczanie języka polskiego jako obcego/ drugiego. Propozycja systemu certyfikatowego. W: *Język polski jako obcy. Programy nauczania na tle badań współczesnej polszczyzny. Zbiór materiałów opracowanych przez Komisję Ekspertów Ministerstwa Edukacji Narodowej*. Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński, 157-174.
- Miodunka W.T. 1977. Język polski a współczesne metody nauczania języków obcych. W: *Przegląd Polonijny*, nr 1. Warszawa: UW, 131-141.
- Miodunka, W.T. 1980. Język polski a współczesne metody nauczania języków obcych. W: Lewandowski, J. (red.). *Metodyka nauczania języka polskiego jako obcego*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 46-67.
- Miodunka, W.T. (red.) 1992. *Język polski jako obcy. Programy nauczania na tle badań współczesnej polszczyzny. Zbiór materiałów opracowanych przez Komisję Ekspertów Ministerstwa Edukacji Narodowej*. Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński.

- Miodunka, W.T. 1999. Od Studium Języka Polskiego do Zakładu Językoznawstwa Stosowanego. 20 lat kształcenia cudzoziemców w Instytucie Polonijnym UJ. W: Miodunka, W.T., Rokicki, J. (red). *Oswajanie chrześcija w trzcinnie, czyli o kształceniu cudzoziemców w Instytucie Polonijnym UJ*. Kraków: UJ, 34–48.
- Miodunka, W.T. 2013. Glottodydaktyka polonistyczna w rozwoju nauczania i badań polszczyzny w latach 1950–2012. W: Dunin-Dudkowska, A., Małycka, A. (red.). *70 lat współczesnej polszczyzny. Zjawiska, procesy, tendencje*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS, 681–710.
- Myczko, K., Skowronek, B., Zabrocki, W. 2008. *Perspektywy glottodydaktyki i językoznawstwa. Tom jubileuszowy z okazji 70. Urodzin Profesora Waldemara Pfeiffera*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
- Pfeiffer, W. 2001. *Nauka języków obcych. Od praktyki do praktyki*. Poznań: Wagros.
- Prizel-Kania, A. 2013. *Rozwijanie sprawności rozumienia ze słuchu w języku polskim jako obcym*. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.
- Rabiej, A., 2007. *Specyfika nauczania języków obcych dzieci na przykładzie języka polskiego jako obcego (niepublikowana rozprawa doktorska)*. Kraków.
- Seretny, A. 1998. *Definicje i definiowanie*. Kraków: UJ.
- Seretny, A., Lipińska, E. 2005. *ABC metodyki nauczania języka polskiego jako obcego*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Seretny, A. 2011. *Kompetencja leksykalna uczących się języka polskiego jako obcego w świetle badań ilościowych*. Kraków: UJ.
- Skowronek, B. 2013. *Glottodidaktik und Fremdsprachenunterricht in der Diskussion*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
- Spyt, A. 1999. Z dziejów nauczania cudzoziemców języka polskiego w Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim. W: Miodunka, W., Rokicki, J. (red.). *Oswajanie chrześcija w trzcinnie, czyli o kształceniu cudzoziemców Instytucie Polonijnym UJ*. Kraków: UJ: 26–33.
- Zajdler, E. 2010. *Glottodydaktyka sinologiczna*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademickie Dialog.
- Żurek, A., Stankiewicz, K. 2014. *Ukryty program nauczania polskiego i niemieckiego jako języków obcych. Konteksty kulturowe*. Łask: Oficyna Wydawnicza Leksem.