

# Language Personality as a Four-Dimensional Construct Falling Outside University Students' Reflection

*The paper relates to a qualitative international study carried out with university students concerning their personal reflection on learning English. In the study the respondents were presented with questions on what they think of, what they can do, how they feel about and what they associate with the vocabulary they learn (the questions thus pertained to language beliefs, activity, affect and matrices of reality interpretation and encompassed four educational domains) and requested to write down their remarks on these questions in terms of facts and opinions (such as comments shown as examples reading 'I've been asked this question many times' (fact) and 'I think it's a very important question' (opinion)). The study clearly shows that university students' reflection on the vocabulary they learn pertains essentially to the psychomotor and cognitive domains (i.e. to what they can do with words and what they associate them with), and only marginally to the axiological and affective domains (i.e. to what they think of words and how they feel about them, respectively). Additionally, the data gathered shows that despite not having been asked by teachers questions concerning values or emotions concerning vocabulary, students themselves find these questions significant and beneficial for the language learning process. In the light of such lack of balance between the four domains and on the basis of findings proving commonsensical questions to fall outside students' educational L2 reality, the paper advocates the concept of language personality, understood as a construct comprising four domains, the effective development of which necessitates teachers' and students' increased reflection on what students think of and how they feel about the vocabulary (and language as a whole) which they study.*

**Keywords:** language personality, teaching, learning English, educational gains, L2 skills.

DOI 10.20339/PhS.2-19.021

## 1. Theoretical foundations: language reflection in four educational domains

As follows from the "linguistic turn" introduced by Wittgenstein's rationale, *language determines the assignment of meanings to the world being learnt* and, as Wasilewska notes, language is the medium thanks to which complex internal narrations convey meanings [1. P. 137]. This fact has far-reaching implications, one of which is that as far as education is concerned, language comes into play not after subject matter has been learnt, but during the process of learning. Hence, language shapes our world and provides us with concepts through which we understand it, rather than serving as a tool for naming what has previously been taken in. The simultaneousness of language and the (individual) world's formation has been well expressed in Likutei Sichos: "We ourselves are words. We think of ourselves as beings that speak words. But, no, those words are who we are, they extend from our essence and they define our being. They define our place in the world and they define the world in which we are placed" [2].

The above being the case, *language determines all categories of educational gains*, which can be divided on the most general level into knowledge, abilities, actions and values [3. P. 81]. This further implies that language "drives" education in its four comprehensive domains, namely: (1) when underlying the process of knowledge turning into abilities (e.g. a shift from rote memorization to authorial explanation), language operates for the benefit of *cognitive* domain; (2) when supporting the process of knowledge turning into values (e.g. a shift from repetition of moral principles to their articulation as implemented into personal sets of values), language serves education in the *axiological* domain; (3) when accompanying the process of actions turning into abilities (e.g. a shift from imitation of utterances to verbal performance in changeable contexts and circumstances), language benefits the *psychomotor* domain; and (4) when occurring in the process of actions becoming values (e.g. a shift from forced participation into autonomously chosen emotionally-sensed experi-

ence), language functions in the *affective* domain. Its presence and impact on the four levels occur regardless of a discipline or subject matter (although, of course, it is most evident when it is language itself that is the object of learning). In all disciplines we listen and/or read and/or speak and/or write, and yet language issues frequently remain outside students' and teachers' reflection as they "demonstrate" typically human tendency of not contemplating multiple 'literacy events' [4. P. 12]. Disregarding the omnipresence of language and students' position with regards to it in four educational domains is a gross negligence, with language being one of their key everyday "tools", without the awareness of which teachers are "unlikely to provide any necessary assistance" to students [5. P. 14]. As Pienaar notes, lack of conscious support with language development [MD: in all the four aforementioned dimensions] may result in not only poor attachment (to school and learning), but also a limited vocabulary and an inability to listen to and connect with others [6. P. 21]. The significance of language and reflection on it is apparent as we come to realise how comprehensive effects occur during the process of language learning and after it has been acquired: "After language acquisition, learning really gets off the ground: school, apprenticeship, university, lifelong further education, maybe from time to time a new activity field, a foreign language, a new hobby, or simply a new environment, spatially or socially [7. P. 49]. This being the case, it is advocated under the (comprehensive) humanistic approach to education that learners be seen "not so much as full-time linguistic objects at whom language teaching is aimed, but rather as human individuals whose personal dignity and integrity, and the complexity of whose ideas, thoughts, needs, and sentiments, should be respected" [8. P. 46].

It naturally follows that ***for any subject matter to have become an integral component of students' personality, it needs to have been incorporated into it in four levels.*** This process of substantive interiorisation can be well supported by students' verbalized reflection undertaken by means of the following four questions, which have the power of "educing what is potential in every learner" [9. P. 11]:

What do I *think of* the subject matter? (axiological domain).

What can I *do with* the subject matter? (psychomotor domain).

How do I *feel about* the subject matter? (affective domain).

How do I *understand* the world *through* the subject matter? (cognitive domain).

This is tantamount to observing that ***if it is language that drives our existence and experiencing of what we learn, then we need to apply it to every educational domain via verbalized reflection and thus create a direct link between our (language-reliant) beliefs, activity, emotions and cognition, on the one hand, and the subject matter learnt, on the other hand.*** Such an approach to language serves better effective communication and understanding-based interaction typical of educated people, whose experiencing of language reaches the four domains and who "know how to pay attention — to others and to the world around them. They work hard to hear what other people say. They can follow an argument, trace logical reasoning, detect illogic, hear the emotions that lie behind both the logic and the illogic, and ultimately empathize with the person who is feeling those emotions" [10. P. 2]. In compliance with the said comprehensive approach to language, recent proposals concerning, for example, particular language skills are broad and cover all the four domains — as is the case with, for instance, a common proposal formulated at the beginning of the 21st century for 'effective listening' consisting in "the dynamic, interactive process of integrating appropriate listening attitudes [affective domain], knowledge [cognitive domain], and behaviors [psychomotor domain] to achieve the selected goal(s) of a listening event [axiological domain]" [11. P. 268]. Such a proposal falls within a set of wider approaches aimed at the personalisation of education, seen as "the key to tackling the persistent achievement gaps between different social and ethnic groups" and meaning "a tailored education for every child and young person, that gives them strength in the basics, stretches their aspirations, and builds their life chances", which implies that personalisation "will create opportunity for every child, regardless of their background" [12]. Below a study is presented in which personalisation fulfilling such objectives is organised around four educational domains and four aforementioned respective questions, which make it possible to establish the degree in which such personalisation is genuinely implemented and to move beyond its "embryonic stages" [13] in today's education.

The four-tier framework can be readily applied to language as subject matter itself, which appears to be the simplest with a foreign or second language: when learning it, students systematically undertake reflection on their performance and so language is “brought to the surface” far more frequently than in the case of any other disciplines or subjects. Theoretically (and ideally), students develop and undertake regular reflection on:

LANGUAGE BELIEFS What we THINK <u>OF</u> language	LANGUAGE ACTIVITY What we DO <u>WITH</u> language
LANGUAGE AFFECT How we FEEL <u>ABOUT</u> language	LANGUAGE MATRICES How we <u>UNDERSTAND</u> THROUGH language

Considering interrelations between the four domains — for example, (a) the fact that emotional resonances are strongest when language is acquired early and learned to high proficiency [14. P. 2], and (b) the fact that “if a person cannot satisfy his basic needs physically and psychologically, he might fail to focus on his language learning whole-heartedly” [15. P. 3] — it appears highly commonsensical to advocate reflection on all the four facets, with a balance between them all being consistently retained. In the light of implications of the “linguistic turn” and the omnipresence of language across the educational board, ignorance of any of the four and lack of balance between the four facets are unequivocally detrimental to students’ comprehensive integration of subject matter. Their interrelation matters at all levels of proficiency and a deficiency in any of the four facets cannot be compensated for by excessive resources from the other facets, which can be best illustrated with students with the most remarkable abilities who, as Dörnyei notes, cannot accomplish long-term goals without sufficient motivation [16. P. 117], which is tantamount to saying that cognitive elements require comparable affective means. — How the four facets remain strongly correlated can be explained in general terms: for example, how much and what we say (language activity) is determined by whether we find saying things appropriate and worthwhile or not (language beliefs); how we feel about our own utterances (language affect) is most likely to affect our search for novel words or expressions (language matrices (of reality interpretation) as defined in [1]); how well we articulate things (language activity) has a direct impact on how pleased we are with our own statements (language affect); how we classify reality by means of available individual resources (language matrices) influences our convictions as to whether we see our (native or second/foreign) language sufficient to convey messages with ample precision (language beliefs) etc. Similar cause-and-effect relationships can be found between any two, three or four of the language facets presented in the graph above.

## 2. Empirical framework: language reflection through facts and opinions

The considerations above resulted in a study based upon the premise that *language users’ reflection pertaining to the four educational domains constitutes their contemplation of what language anthropologists refer to as language users’ frame of reference*, which is necessary to go beyond if they are to understand the point of people from different cultures and to realize that the way in which you view the world is not the only way to view it and that all other points of view are not dangerous and will not cause you to “lose your footing in your own world or cause changes in your own world that you are not prepared to accept” [17. P. 5]. The study presented below assumes that for the frame of reference to successfully prevent such ethnocentrism, language learners need to reflect in a balanced way on the language which they learn and use, so that the crucial component of their personality falls subject to constant questioning and analysis and so that, as a result, it could be permanently improved and affect their entire personalities (as follows from the reasoning of the “linguistic turn”). The development and reflection on thus understood students’ frame

of reference fulfil the requirement of “truly personalized learning”, whereby “schools start with the student, not the subject matter [and] is less concerned with what knowledge is acquired and more interested in how knowledge is used”; the priority of such a school is “to know students and their families well enough to ensure that every learning experience excites the students to learn more” [18. P. 4].

The study in question, aimed at exploring the degree of balance in students’ reflection on language in four educational domains, was meant to address the two major problems:

- I. Re. relationship between four domains.  
How do (Polish and Spanish) students reflect on questions concerning English as a second language of an axiological, psychomotor, affective and cognitive character?
- II. Re. relationship between facts & opinions.  
To what extent does (Polish and Spanish) students’ reflection on English as a second language pertain to facts from their education and/or their personal opinions?

*Ad. I.* The first problem was generated by regular observations made during classes concerning productive L2 skills that students frequently commented on the level of their English speaking and writing abilities, but made hardly any remarks on their personal approach to specific lexical items learnt. In other words, their verbalized reflection on their L2 productive skills related to cognitive and psychomotor aspects (which can be argued to be more objective facets) rather than affective or axiological factors (arguably — facets bearing a stronger subjective component). The evident difference in the students’ references to these two sides of language learning experience led to the assumption that it would be confirmed in a study, which was amplified by the students being surprised throughout the said classes at questions concerning their views and emotions concerning the lexis being learnt and used. Their being surprised at such questions might be argued to imply that students’ personal approaches and feelings concerning the subject matter learnt are something that students view as the object of their private talks rather than an issue discussed openly in the classroom with teachers (who might possibly not be pleased with what their students think of the lexis introduced during classes and with how students feel about it).

*Ad. II.* The second problem focuses on whether students have been asked questions concerning language beliefs, activity, affect or matrices by their teachers or whether students themselves have come to realise the legitimacy and usefulness of such questions. Prior to the study it was assumed — in accordance with the first assumption in the preceding paragraph — that the students would not recall being asked too many questions pertaining to the subjective component (i.e. their language beliefs and affect), but they would provide more extensive responses when recalling teachers’ questions on the objective component (i.e. their language activity and cognition). At the same time it was assumed that this narrow scope of teacher questions recalled by students would be exceeded by their opinions, meaning that they would express balanced appreciation of questions concerning all four educational domains: it appears commonsensical to expect that language learners will find it natural to reflect and comment on what they think of the lexis they learn (axiological domain) and on how they feel about it (affective domain).

The respondents were presented (in a tabular form) with the set of eight questions shown below (two questions per a domain) and with the following instruction:

Think about learning English vocabulary and using it when speaking/talking.  
Look at the following pairs of questions and write down what you think about/of them in terms of:  
FACTS – e.g. *I've been asked this question many times or I've never been asked this question.*  
or  
OPINIONS – e.g. *I think it's a very important question or This question doesn't make sense to me.*  
(Explain why.)  
Use English or Polish/Spanish.  
You do **not** need to write down facts and opinions about all eight questions, but please, write down your thoughts in at least one box in each of the four pairs (so, make at least four comments)

[language beliefs]

1. Which of the words you've learnt do you find most valuable?
2. What do you think of the words you've learnt?

[language activity]

3. How difficult is it for you to use the words you've just learnt?
4. What mistakes do you make with the words you've learnt?

[language affect]

5. How do you feel about using the words you've just learnt?
6. What emotions do the words you've learnt create in you?

[language matrices]

7. What associations have you got with the words you've just learnt?
8. What categories do the words you've learnt belong to?

In accordance with the two assumptions made prior to the study (Ad. I & Ad. II above), Questions 1, 2, 5 and 6 had been expected to be found uncommon (particularly Questions 2 and 6, which call for far-reaching linguistic reflection of an evaluative (Q2) and emotional character (Q4)). Conversely, Questions 3, 4, 7 and 8 had been presumed to seem highly familiar to students (especially Questions 4 and 7, which reflect common instructional practices focused on error correction and mastery of thematic fields, respectively). Hence, roughly half the questions posed — despite their commonsensical character and full legitimacy in the light of holistic approaches to language education conforming to implications of the “linguistic turn” — had been assumed to bear an element of novelty to the respondents. The observations which had been made prior to the study and which have been referred to above imply that the respondents take it for granted that English lexis needs to be acquired and do not find their own personal views and emotions concerning it to matter too much. A premise that this paper is based on is that reflection concerning all four domains counts and benefits language skills and so the fact of students' personal stance being disregarded by themselves or by their teachers has a detrimental effect. In the light of the theoretical considerations presented above, the lack of such reflection on the part of students is tantamount to them depriving themselves of the personalized edge of language learning; a truly personalized version of language learning and reflection on the process needs to encompass all — our language beliefs, activity, affect and matrices of reality interpretation.

### 3. Findings and inferences: on the lack of balance across educational domains

Before specific findings are cited and discussed, it is worth noting that as many as nearly one third of all the respondents failed to reflect on the eight questions, but, instead, they answered them (referring to a sequence of classes concerning written English, during which various semantic and syntactic devices had been introduced). This happened despite the fact that the instruction cited above was accompanied with an explicit request made by word of mouth “Do not answer the questions you see but comment on them”. This misunderstanding on the part of respondents clearly proves the very idea of asking questions across the four educational domains to be a novel experience, as a result of which, the task of reflecting on the eight questions shown turned out to be a challenge reaching beyond those students' current language awareness.

**Axiological domain: language beliefs.** In their comments on the first two questions (concerning the subjective value of the lexis learnt) the respondents noted few facts but many opinions. Most importantly, a vast majority of their responses revealed a clear clash between the two: whilst the most frequent comment on Questions 1 & 2 read *I've never been asked this question* when it came to facts, the remarks made with regards

to opinions were remarkably positive, reading, for example *I think it's a wise question* (Q1), or *If valuable is supposed to mean useful, precious to me, then such a question lets you find internal motivation to learn and in this way make it more effective* (Q1), or *It's an interesting question-it lets you understand the essence of language* (re. Q2), or *I think that this question is important because it is good to know what are pupils are thinking about what they learnt and if they are necessary or not* (re. Q2).

Such a **discrepancy between lack of students' encounters with questions such as the two under consideration and their strong convictions as to the purposefulness of posing them** may raise concerns as to whether students' subjectivity is properly respected. After all, the clash observed here means that students themselves recognise the beneficial effect of sharing their beliefs on how valuable particular language elements are, but they are not asked by their teachers to express their opinions in this respect (which would be one way of raising students' language awareness). Furthermore, if (some of) students trust such questions to boost their internal motivation and if, additionally, the same questions well serve teachers' diagnostic purposes, the absence of such questions is a heavy loss in the language learning and teaching process.

**Psychomotor domain: language activity.** Although the next two questions (concerning difficulties in use and mistakes made) does not relate strictly to the psychomotor domain only and when considered deeply it touches upon cognition as well as the other two domains, they focus on the productive use of language, which in the case of (Polish and Spanish) respondents is frequently defective in terms of the very articulation of sounds, accent, intonation etc., which are characteristics falling into the physical qualities of language.

Here, there has been much more balance observed between the volume of comments made by the respondents with regards to facts and those conveying their opinions. Accordingly, frequent comments went along the statement *I've been asked this question quite a lot during learning English* (Q3) or *Sometimes I've been asked this question, but usually it was just stated (what mistake I do)* (Q4). What needs to be emphasized here is that the respondents signaled their **inclination to share responsibility for such reflection with teachers**. The bilateral element was observed in different comments made by the respondents such as *I've heard it [this question: What mistakes do you make with the words you've learnt?] a few times at school especially when I had a problem with using a word correctly. I ask it myself* (Q4) or *It's an important question in language learning so that the teacher could know what causes a problem to me* (Q3). Not unexpectedly, at the level of opinions, the student-teacher interaction for the sake of a shared goal was also noted here with regards to the concept of feedback, typically associated with the domain in question: *I think it is also important question because it is good to have feedback about things that we teach and if pupils understand* (Q3). Both questions were evaluated as positively as was the case with questions pertaining to facts, which can be exemplified with the following, highly representative comments: *It's an important question as it makes a learner realise where the problem is (if they have one)* (Q4), *I believe it's an important question because it helps me decide at what level I am* (Q3), or *I think that questions about difficulties in word use should appear from the teacher's side during English studies* (Q3), or *Sometimes it is good to think about "what is difficult" for us, because when we face the problems, we learn faster* (Q3).

**Affective domain: language affect.** The next two questions (concerning feelings associated with lexis and emotions generated by its use), similarly to those on language beliefs (Q1&Q2), resulted in responses recalling very few facts of such questions being asked, but at the same time a number of appreciative opinions as to the purposefulness of putting feelings and emotions into play with lexis. Accordingly, the most common response with regards to facts here read *Nobody has asked me this question* (both Q5 and Q6). The appreciative opinions on the two questions pertained to language learning having a holistic character, as expressed in: *I think it's an important question because the language we use shapes our personality* (Q6), or *This question may be useful when one tries to remember words and associate them with emotions to support remembering* (Q6), or *It may prove effective as it assigns some value and a personal element to the words learnt, through which it is easier to memorise them and for longer* (Q5).

Most interestingly, those respondents that expressed skeptical opinions regarding the fifth and sixth questions (although these respondents appeared in minority) viewed them as **irrelevant or unnecessary to learning**, as if they have “fallen victim” to the “conspiracy of silence” concerning emotions generated by language elements. Hence remarks reading, for example, *This question does not make sense, because in my opinion words do not create emotions in us* (Q6), or *I think that this question is unnecessary because it is hard to speak about emotions while learning vocabulary. Maybe when we are talking about vocabulary connected with emotions* (Q6), or *Sometimes it is very hard to think about emotions that some words create in us, because sometimes you just learn them without specific emotions*.

With the respondents claiming not to have been taught to reflect and talk about the emotional side of language, it proves quite typical of them to demonstrate **highly diversified approaches** to the two questions concerning this domain (especially the one on how they feel about the words just learnt): whilst some students signal strong ambivalence with regards to them (e.g. *I don't even know what answer would I give for this kind of question* (Q5)), others show faith in their educational potential and relationship with other language learning gains (e.g. *How I feel when using a word is important; either I will then use it or not, which will have influence on my vocabulary* (Q5)).

**Cognitive domain: language matrices.** The last two questions (concerning word associations and categorization) generated a comparable volume of responses pertaining to facts and opinions. In the former case most of the students admitted having been asked these two questions (particularly Question 5 on word association, which some students see as an integral element of language teaching and learning, as expressed by *If ‘categories’ are to be understood as, e.g. jobs, food, feelings, etc., then vocabulary has always been expressed in this way* (Q8)), whilst in the latter case they expressed enthusiasm and conviction that the two questions are most purposeful in learning, which can be exemplified with: *It makes sense! So that I know when to use it* (Q8), or *Grouping words always helps in learning them* (Q8), or *I think it's a fairly important question as it lets you delve into the functions of language* (Q8), or *I think it's important, because by asking about categories, you can find out if the person asked is aware of the words s/he has learnt* (Q8), or *I think that this question is important to see how students understand this words and to see if they can connect it with grammar. If they have any doubts we can help them to understand it* (Q8).

With word associations and classifications being a common element of language teaching and learning, some respondents admitted finding them **useful and natural despite not having reflected on these issues** (e.g. *I've never thought about it* (Q7)), whilst some others questioned the popular ways of approaching word categorisations (lacking in a personal edge) and, at the same time, expressed their agreement as to word classifications making a lot of sense (e.g. *I don't like this questions because I was made to divide words into nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc. It was boring. It would be a nice question if I could come up with my own categories* (Q8)).

As we juxtapose the responses pertaining to all the eight questions and refer to the main two problems, we can present the chief findings as follows:

I. How do (Polish and Spanish) students reflect on questions concerning English as a second language of an axiological, psychomotor, affective and cognitive character?

LANGUAGE BELIEFS questions not encountered, yet seen as significant	LANGUAGE ACTIVITY questions well known, seen as a shared task of teachers and learners
LANGUAGE AFFECT questions not encountered and seen as essentially irrelevant	LANGUAGE MATRICES questions well known, seen as a natural part of learning

As the graph shows, *“the right side” of language reflection, comprising the psychomotor and cognitive domains, is more familiar to language learners*, whilst the two on the left side (axiological and affective) “remain outside the language classroom”. This proves the assumption made above with respect to the first problem right, although it must be complemented by the finding that it makes sense for the respondents to ask questions relating to language beliefs (such as *Which words do you find most valuable?* or *What do you think of the words you’ve learnt?*) as opposed to questions inciting reflection on language affect (such as *How do you feel about using the words you’ve learnt?* or *What emotions do the words you’ve learnt create in you?*).

II. To what extent does (Polish and Spanish) students’ reflection on English as a second language pertain to facts from their education and/or their personal opinions?

LANGUAGE BELIEFS few facts, many opinions	LANGUAGE ACTIVITY balance between facts and opinions
LANGUAGE AFFECT few facts, many opinions	LANGUAGE MATRICES balance between facts and opinions

In analogy to the previous point, here, too, *the students’ reflection concerning the “subjective” component as defined earlier (and pertaining to the axiological and affective domains)* (on the left) *proves markedly different from that concerning the “objective” element of language learning (psychomotor and cognitive edge)* (on the right). Despite this finding, language learners — when prompted by specific domain-oriented questions — prove to essentially appreciate across the educational board, which speaks in favour of their common sense and, at the same time, unravels a shortage of questions pertaining to language beliefs and emotions/feelings in language classrooms. Joint consideration of the two questions leads to the conclusion that it is predominantly the case with the affective domain, which thus requires a radically different approach on the part of teachers and learners.

### 3. Implications and recommendations: on the concept of four-tier language personality

The observations above lead directly to a general conclusion that the personal emotional side of language learning is essentially disregarded when the process is reflected on and when the students are asked about the lexis which they are learning. From the perspective of recent theories and empirical findings concerning the holistic nature of language learning and the significance of language for our entire existence, this omission is a *fundamental error* of language education. A powerful factor is left out if students’ language beliefs and language affect are not brought to the fore through an explicit discussion of them and regular work aimed at their positive character boosting the effects of language learning. The absence of focus and improvement of language beliefs and language affect can be compared to a hardly sensible situation of, for example, a cyclist instructed on the physics of motion (cognitive aspects) and trained to apply muscle tension well (psychomotor aspects), but, at the same time, not prompted to reflect on his/her aspirations concerning particular hills (axiological aspect) or not encouraged to feel emotional about any single success (affective aspect).

From this perspective to it is worthwhile talking about *language composing* (rather than language construction) when referring to the way an individual student learns a foreign/second language: the process of composing, as in music, is, by definition, filled with and driven by one’s personal approach, individual views, experience and preferences, which enable one to “filter” the incoming content, to enthuse over some pieces (of music or language) but reject and feel skeptical about others. The similarity between the learning of language and the composing of music (in that certain pieces build up conventions which we just have to acquire regardless of how we feel about them, whilst other elements and combinations can be selected depending on our personal preferences) is worth emphasizing, as it has the potential of helping language learners retain



balance across the four aforementioned educational domains (and between the “subjective” (left) and the “objective” (right) side of language learning).

If two out of four domains do not become subject of language learning reflection, this implies that — very generally speaking for the sake of clarity of the entire picture — one half of the students’ *language personality* falls outside their own and their teachers’ systematic considerations. This fact is worth noting and addressing with language learners, whose responses discussed above imply that they tend not to consider their language personality as a complex construct, but rather view their language through the prism of separate (essentially cognitive and psychomotor) components and, consequently, consider such aspects of their language proficiency, skills, pronunciation, accent, intonation etc. Such a position with regards to one’s (foreign or native) language is deficient and only fragmentary, and, what is more, it prevents language learners from recognizing strong links between the four tiers of their language personality (as exemplified earlier).

To support the development and conscious reflection on students’ language personality, it is worth noting a set of *recommendable questions* to be posed on a regular basis. The simplest may consider students’ most favourite or least liked FL/L2 words (which is a point that — much to the author’s surprise and disappointment — proved to be very rarely raised by the respondents’ teachers) or, as in the study under analysis, words found very useful or completely unnecessary. Other questions may concern (a) with regards to the axiological domain: which words students find worth using due to the impression specific words might create, how extensive a repertoire of words they aim at, how long words they find suitable for their personal needs, and at the most general level — what they think of the lexis they have been learning; and (b) with regards to the affective domain — if they have personal emotional stories related to specific words, how they feel about situations when slang, a jargon or a local dialect is applied, when they will feel satisfied as to the number and character of lexis they have learnt, or, again most generally speaking, how they feel about the vocabulary studied. Ideally, after having been introduced into regular reflection on such and similar issues, every student might become able to define for herself/himself his/her own language personality (which might be a test described both in qualitative and quantitative terms, meaning that it might be worthwhile specifying how diversified language needs to be used by a student and, also, how long s/he needs to speak for in order to pass the test). This would be the best real way of fulfilling requirements that the “linguistic turn” stipulates and thus putting the theory into educational practice.

## References

1. Wasilewska A. (2017). Expansion of linguistic paradigm. In: Daszkiewicz M., Wasilewska A., Filipiak E., Wenzel R. Educational Role of Language. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo “Katedra”, p. 137–150.
2. Calvert I. (2017). Teaching in a sacred language: Hebrew educational terminology and its resulting pedagogical prescriptions. A plenary talk given at the 2nd International Pedagogical and Linguistic Conference Educational Role of Language. Social and Cultural Determinants. University of Gdansk, 12–13 June 2017 (The cited thought is presented in a wider context at [https://www.chabad.org/parshah/article\\_cdo/aid/3283948/jewish/The-Word.htm](https://www.chabad.org/parshah/article_cdo/aid/3283948/jewish/The-Word.htm)).
3. Niemierko B. (2009). Diagnostyka edukacyjna. Podręcznik akademicki. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
4. Barton D. (2007). Literacy. An introduction to the ecology of written language. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
5. Beacco J.C., Fleming M., Goullier F., Thürmann E., Vollmer H. (2016). A handbook for curriculum development and teacher training. The Language Dimension in All Subjects, Council of Europe.
6. Pienaar F. (2017). Oracy and well-being. In: Speaking Frankly. The case for oracy in the curriculum, Voice 21/English-Speaking Union, p. 19–23.
7. OECD (2006). Schooling for tomorrow. Personalising education. OECD Centre for Educational Research and Innovation.
8. Khatib M., Sarem S.N., Hamidi H. (2013). Humanistic education: Concerns implications and applications. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, Vol. 4, No. 1, January 2013, p. 45–51.
9. Wenzel R. (2015). Language education and teaching by the learner’s text creation. In: Janczukowicz K., Rychło M. (Ed.). General Education and Language Teaching Methodology. The Gdańsk School of ELT, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, p. 113–134.
10. Cronon W. (1998–9 Winter). ‘Only Connect’: The goals of a liberal education. Phi Beta Kappa, The Key Reporter, 64, 2, p. 2–4.
11. Thomson K., Leintz P., Nevers B., Witkowski S. (2010). The integrative listening model: an approach to teaching and learning listening. In: Wolvin A.D. (Ed.) Listening and Human Communication in the 21st century, Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, p. 266–286.

12. Kelly R. (2005). UK Government White Paper: higher standards, better schools for all, Department for Education and Skills (UK). URL: [www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/publications/schoolswhitepaper/](http://www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/publications/schoolswhitepaper/)
13. Suggett D. (2007). Foreword. In: Personalising Education: from research to policy and practice, Paper No. 11, September 2007, Office for Education Policy and Innovation.
14. Caldwell-Harris. (2014). Emotionality differences between a native and foreign language: theoretical implications. *Frontiers in Psychology*, September 2014, p. 1–4.
15. Wang G. (2005). Humanistic approach and affective factors in foreign language teaching. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 2(5), p. 1–5.
16. Dörnyei Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. In: *Language Teaching*, Vol. 31, Iss. 03, July 1998, p. 117–135.
17. Ottenheimer H.J. *The anthropology of language. An introduction to linguistic anthropology*, Wadsworth: Cengage Learning.
18. Littky D., Allen F. (1999). Whole school personalization: one school at a time. *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 57, No. 1, p. 2–6.



**Daszkiewicz Michał,**  
PhD, University of Gdańsk, Poland

e-mail: [pedmd@univ.gda.pl](mailto:pedmd@univ.gda.pl)

