

Section 1

EDUCATION THROUGH THE PRISM OF FOUR LANGUAGE SKILLS

The aim of this text is to discuss what theoretical rationale ensues and what practical benefits are obtained if terms commonly employed by foreign language teachers are applied to the teaching and learning of other school subjects. Despite – or perhaps more validly: because of – being omnipresent in the education of all disciplines, language can be argued to be widely **taken for granted** and not sufficiently recognized as a means of – to put it chronologically – shaping, processing, conveying and discussing, say, mathematical, geographical, historical or social knowledge. **If conceptual and didactic categories pertaining to language remain unnoticed in the teaching and learning of subjects other than native and foreign languages, it is both surprising and disturbing in light of the “linguistic turn”** having been initiated as early as in 1921, whereby “language shapes the world being learnt by assignment of meanings” (Wasilewska 2017a: 137). Adding to this, if we look at education as a person’s creation of one’s individual narration about the world (as implied by the “narrativist” turn [Wasilewska 2017a: 137]) and if we look at language as a crucial component of a paradigm functioning in heterogenic types of settings (thus requiring a wide range of flexible functions) (cf. Wąsik 2010: 48), the absence or shortage of strictly language-related terms in the education of other school subjects appears tantamount to (a) not providing direct support in the construction of such a narration, (b) letting learners and teachers fail to understand how “sub-narrations” on various subjects complement and improve one another, and to (c) assuming that our knowledge is not affected by our language. Therefore, below we shall consider education through the prism of four language skills as the key categories with which foreign language

teachers construe (L1 or FL/L2) language education and with which, as a consequence, they generate their own educational narrations concerning their students' progress. It is assumed here that thanks to employing in the learning/teaching of all school subjects concepts related, firstly, to listening and reading, and, secondly, to speaking and writing, our thinking of education substantially advances and renders students' individual narrations more conscious, cohesive, flexible and verifiable. In our discussion below we shall additionally refer to four domains in which education inevitably proceeds and – quite unavoidably – involves language, that is students' beliefs, activity, personal experience and matrices of reality interpretation.

1. SPECIFICITY AND EXPANSION OF THE GLOTTODIDACTIC PARADIGM

There is a network of concepts which foreign language teachers rest upon systematically and consistently enough for us to refer to it as their “**glottodidactic paradigm**.” In order to reconstruct this paradigm validly and exhaustively enough, we need to outline the overall scope within which their conceptual categories fall so that our study does not confine itself to too narrow an area, which might put to question our reference to the category of a paradigm (understood here in Kuhn's terms as a cohesive network of glottodidactic achievements providing “model problems and solutions for a community of researchers” [here: conscious teachers] [cf. Kuhn 1970: 43]). Such a wide realm will undoubtedly be secured if we analyse glottodidactic concepts, which per se, as Dakowska shows, build up an autonomous paradigm sharing numerous terms with such disciplines as psychology, sociolinguistics, theory of communication, psycholinguistics, neurolinguistics (Dakowska 2010: 77) or pedagogy, with their impact on glottodidactic reasoning proving beneficial (cf. Komorowska 2010: 61) through the prism of four educational domains, meaning cognitive, affective, psychomotor domains, complemented by the dimension of learners' and teachers' worldviews (axiological domain). By juxtaposing the four educational domains, we arrive at a set of four areas which can be equated with and referred to as language matrices, experience, activity and beliefs, respectively. (These four labels have been consistently

applied under the aforementioned ERL framework and replaced the earlier used names, i.e. 'linguistic matrixes of reality interpretation,' 'personal experiencing of language,' 'language activity of children' and 'potential of language of general education.' The disadvantage of the former labels was that they did not have a parallel form, as a result of which they did not reflect the complementary character of the four areas.) It needs to be emphasized, however, that the point here is not to enumerate all or most of the concepts building up the glottodidactic paradigm (although many of them will be addressed in the next two sections pertaining to language skills), but to mark in each of the four domains a central "pulsating" theme vividly reflecting language teachers' overall educational perspective.

Ad Axiological ("worldview") domain. At the level of the language BELIEFS, the learning and teaching of a (foreign) language is seen as involving a **constant necessity to consider and choose wisely between correctness and fluency** (otherwise referred to as a dilemma whether to prioritise the form of language or the message conveyed), with indecision in this respect resulting in detrimental phenomenon of eclecticism (although, however, this effect, as Wenzel shows, can be successfully dealt with by taking for granted the conflict of aims resulting from the ideological contradiction and treating it as a phenomenon naturally accompanying teaching languages, with communicative ideology dealing with communicative aims, behaviouristic ideology with habit formation, cognitive psychological theories with conscious linguistic aims, and authentic language use with the so called 'cognitive appeal' (understood as a characteristic of the content rendering texts engrossing to learners) (2001: 23).) The general decision in this respect determines numerous more specific aspects of language teaching and learning, including more attention being paid as a result to either grammar or vocabulary, teachers and learners declaring themselves as more structures- or communication-oriented, or teaching methods being dominated by either drilling and translations or information gap strategies and group interaction techniques. This bipolar dimension is reminiscent of numerous oppositions drawn in multiple educational theories locating teachers' work and choosing between the scientific and the mundane, the language of textbooks and the language of pupils' private lives, theory and practice, scientific register and everyday talk.

Ad Psychomotor domain. At the level of language **ACTIVITY**, **higher perfection is rendered attainable by iterative treatment of subject matter**, that is by systematic returns to issues and problems practised at earlier stages, so that students handle them with increasing ease, which in the case of language learning means better pronunciation, more advanced vocabulary and grammar, or a higher pace of speech. In the case of all other school subjects the recurrent character of the content learnt is an obvious and unavoidable characteristic, which can be exemplified by fundamental mathematical calculations being returned to at every stage of more advanced operations, or by historical knowledge being presented briefly to young learners (as is the case, for instance, in Poland with 4th-graders history textbooks covering all epochs from the ancient times to events which took place as late as at the end of the 20th century (e.g. Olszewska et al. 2017) only to be elaborated on more extensively at all subsequent stages of learning despite concerning the same historical events or processes.

Ad Affective domain. At the level of language **EXPERIENCE**, learners' satisfaction with learning and other **positive emotions are reachable in any use of language by them regardless of how creative it is**, which permits teachers' and learners' **enthusiasm from (pure) reproduction**, too. This seems to remain in stark contradiction to the learning of other school subjects, in the case of which reproductive behaviours are a category frowned upon and disapproved of, especially now that constructive learning is widely advocated and valued. Additionally, reproduction is also associated with lower taxonomical levels, which encompass behaviours typical of weaker pupils, who are not capable of reaching higher levels and so need to be taken into account by, for instance, including in achievement tests, items that require only memorisation or imitation. It is partially due to such lower-level achievements and ensuing negative connotations that taxonomies tend to be disregarded on the grounds of arguments that they inhibit genuine education, do not grasp creation or knowledge construction, and as such get disparaged and eliminated altogether.

Ad Cognitive domain. At the level of language **MATRICES** (of reality interpretation – as construed by Wasilewska [2017a]), the thinking of conceptual categories mastered by learners is strongly determined by their position within the entire language system, that is by **to what extent particular lexical items**

represent prototype categories, or how frequent they are in everyday use among native speakers of a given language. This being the case, words, expressions or structures are assigned a lower or higher status depending on their likeness to the prototype or frequency of use. This, too, seems to stand in opposition to such pedagogical approaches that do not take into account the practical side of things, rejecting this criterion on the grounds of practicality or usability not serving best educational purposes and confining education to utilitarian activities.

As the above shows, the glottodidactic paradigm “cuts across” all four educational domains, none of which is regarded as objectively more important than the others and all of which are by definition incorporated in the holistic language development of learners. However, there appears to be a varying degree in which the paradigm in question chimes with what we might refer to as the dominant contemporary “pedagogical paradigm,” whereby the most valued educational categories cover individuality, subjectivity, creativity or construction of knowledge. Namely, in the affective and cognitive domains the glottodidactic paradigm clashes with the pedagogical one in that the former seems not to prioritise the learners’ personalities or preferences, but promotes contentment with conventional (uninnovative) language behaviours. Hence, the relationship between the two paradigms at the level of general approaches can be presented as follows:

<p>(a) in the AXIOLOGICAL DOMAIN glottodidactic correctness-fluency balance – essentially consistent with pedagogical efforts to combine the world of schooling with the private world</p>	<p>(b) in the PSYCHOMOTOR DOMAIN glottodidactic iterative approach to subject matter – essentially consistent with pedagogical appeals for regular revisions</p>
<p>(c) in the AFFECTIVE DOMAIN glottodidactic enthusiasm with reproduction – inconsistent with pedagogical ambivalence about word-by-word non-personal repetitions</p>	<p>(d) in the COGNITIVE DOMAIN glottodidactic reliance on prototype categories – inconsistent with pedagogical equality between issues and terminology</p>

The above implies that if the glottodidactic paradigm was to be expanded over other disciplines and school subjects – due to benefits we shall leave apart at this point and return to at a later stage – such an expansion and deviation from the currently holding pedagogical paradigm would have two formats:

- “superficial/mild” expansion within the axiological and psychomotor domains, consisting in simply a kind of paraphrase, that is rendering the approach more fully consistent with the glottodidactic paradigm by, respectively, (a) distinguishing educational settings in which learners focus on the subject matter (content, thematic strata, material, problems, knowledge, etc.) from those in which they develop its form (language codes, registers, formal and informal synonyms, pace of speech, redundancy in texts, etc.), and (b) emphasising the cyclical character of issues and their mastery, also or particularly at the level of language;
- “deep/radical” expansion within the affective and cognitive domains, consisting in a conceptual process bearing features of a metamorphosis, that is rendering the approach (at least partially) consistent with the glottodidactic paradigm by, respectively (c) allowing or even inviting/promoting educational settings in which learners derive positive emotions from and develop on the basis of fixed or conventional formulations (definitions, citations, quotes, memorised and reproduced [orally or in writing] pieces of text, ready-made questions and answers, etc.), and (d) introducing and building upon terminological hierarchies in different subjects (primary and secondary lexical categories, insignificant labels serving school purposes only and so after school completion being rapidly forgotten, etc.).

2. EDUCATION THROUGH THE PRISM OF LANGUAGE RECEPTION

The dimension in which the glottodidactic paradigm manifests itself most explicitly is that of language skills. All the four premises of the paradigm outlined above are reflected on the most general level in the very (recently somewhat downgraded yet continuously crucial) division of skills into receptive and productive ones, with the former providing grounds for the latter and the latter being unavoidably less developed than the former. Below – basing on our shared belief that it is through language skills and related concepts that the

glottodidactic paradigm can truly bind pure theory with instructional practice, as stipulated by Jaroszewska (2014: 58) – we shall envisage education of all other subjects following the rationale of the glottodidactic paradigm, separately for reception and production. In both cases we shall, first, general implications following from the paradigm being followed and, then, outline a set of specific terms supporting such an expansion of the paradigm in question.

General implications

VIEWS. The recognition of ‘reception’ as one of the key categories driving students’ education expresses a somewhat plain belief that the ability to comprehend “incoming” content is significant and conducive to their development. Its salience – apart from other reasons also related to production, which is too to be discussed later – follows directly from its status in everyday communicative situations, in which, as observed by Chastain, we are always in a position to limit our utterance only to those elements that we have at our disposal, but we are unable to restrict and control utterances of our interlocutors (cited after Marton 1978: 132). This fact does not seem to be confined to any specific subjects or issues, but it applies to all disciplines and, this being the case, **in all school subjects acknowledgment of recognition (on the opposite end of production) builds up higher communicative competence**, which, after all, can be viewed as one of the main objectives of socially-constructed education.

ACTIVITY. The introduction of the category of ‘reception’ into education means reasoning and acting against such approaches to learning which do not sufficiently take into account students’ abilities and which can be revealed through statements such as ‘students have mastered a given topic,’ ‘students know a specific issue,’ or ‘students are well familiar with particular subject matter.’ Comments along such lines mean next to nothing and so can be argued to be detrimental to learning in that they promote its falsified picture as if it consisted in reaching points where learning educational content is complete and can no longer be taken forward by, for instance, relating it to other issues (being) studied. Whilst one way of acting against such approaches simplifying and homogenising the process of learning has been the use of educational taxonomies and considering the complexity

and advancement of students' behaviours (as opposed to thoughts or ideas), **it is through consideration of students' receptive skills that teachers become particularly alert to the range of language-based (also superficially passive) behaviours and appreciative of students' capacity of (only) comprehending, on the one hand, and of crossing their personal "barrier of silence," on the other.**

EXPERIENCE. One of the implications of receptive skills being crucial from the communicative perspective (as we said above, sometimes even more essential than language users' production) and constituting a part of taxonomically-considered language behaviours is that reception per se constitutes a platform for multiple personal experiences, shaped by, among other things, language users' approach to whom they happen to read or listen to. What follows is that under the generally understood "glottodidactic paradigm" discussed herein **the concept of 'listening comprehension' has an equally high status to that of 'reading comprehension,' which is rarely the case with other, that is not language-oriented subjects,** in which the latter tends to be commonplace, whereas the former does not. This might be strongly related to the inconsistency mentioned earlier and the low level of enthusiasm generated by reproduction outside (especially foreign) language lessons. As simple as it is, listening comprehension offers a wide range of gains to, say, geography or science lessons, and tests assessing constitute a deep-reaching personal experience.

MATRICES. The personal edge of educational experience embedded in language use is also supported by assigning to learning various quantitative measures, apart from qualitative measures. Whilst in the case of language studies, quantitative measures serve an important informative function, in other school subjects they are rather absent and, accordingly, it is not a common practice to rest on language-based observations concerning quantity (that is to say that measures such as a number of words understood or variety of structures in texts applied for comprehension exercises remain within the glottodidactic domain). By the same token, seldom does talk concerning relationships between words, hierarchies or prototype categories concern learning any other subject than language (which these days can be most easily verified by "googling" such concepts). This **lack of comparative language-**

based measures, similarly to the case mentioned earlier, **can be argued to be detrimental to learning and to support a falsified image of the world in that it (implicitly) suggests that things, names and words are of an equal status.**

Specific terms

VIEWS. The quality- and quantity-driven reflection on reception implies paying attention to the **characteristics of input**, whereby the glottodidactic paradigm reaches beyond the scope of subjects other than language, in the case of which it is the content that matters rather than the form. Plain though it sounds, through such form-orientation – to put it diagnostically – a learner’s situation on encountering any given matter is better understood. Without being well-informed in **textual characteristics**, a teacher (of any given subject) will unavoidably fail to recognise the source of students’ problems with the text, not to mention the ability to resolve such difficulties – this can be viewed as one of the major premises of the entire glottodidactic approach.

ACTIVITY. The approach in question rests on a network of terms bringing the input “under control” and thus directing teachers’ and learners’ actions in all the aforementioned dimensions. As an example, we can refer here to the concept of texts’ **authenticity**, which is deeply rooted in the glottodidactic paradigm and which is juxtaposed against the didactic (artificial) character of texts. It can be employed for the assessment of students’ progress, with more knowledgeable or advanced learners being capable of comprehending authentic input. The degree in which stretches of text are to be found in regular textbooks no doubt relates to the educational outcomes obtained by learners.

EXPERIENCE. In order to encompass the range of possible input, **language corpora** are employed as an integral glottodidactic means. By recording numerous instances of uses of words, expressions and whole sentences which pupils can consult throughout their language studies, the corpora render possible input more far predictable and add to the learners’ personal sense of security. They can be argued to build up a true picture of language by showing explicitly that users of everyday language strikes a balance between the ready-made and the spontaneous. Implementation of similar corpora for the purposes of other subjects appears both feasible and highly recommendable.

MATRICES. Under the glottodidactic paradigm language elements studied are assigned a number of characteristics determining learners' approach to those elements and, consequently, the effects of learning. Such can be the case with the **coherence-cohesion** differentiation (with the former relating to the semantic "fluidity" [logic] of the text and the latter relating to explicit textual indicators of relationships between different parts of texts). Comparatively strong influence on the learning of content can be exerted by a set of other language-related textual characteristics, be it **markedness-unmarkedness, redundancy-entropy**, etc.

3. EDUCATION THROUGH THE PRISM OF LANGUAGE PRODUCTION

Under the glottodidactic paradigm a student's shift from reception to production signifies the moment when his or her knowledge turns active (we shall leave aside here a discussion on the legitimacy of this statement, which under contemporary pedagogical approaches raises serious objections with active knowledge not necessarily requiring its written or oral articulation). Ceasing to be latent (hidden) and becoming directly observable (audible), a student's interlanguage starts to effectively function on an interpersonal level as if it came out of its hideout. It is at the stage of language production that – on a personal level – students themselves have every right to consider particular language elements successfully integrated into their vocabulary repertoire, they are in a position to present themselves to other language users and, consequently, to include a given foreign language as one of their personal skills (in the wide non-technical understanding of the word).

General implications

IEWS. In order to support such activation of knowledge, the glottodidactic paradigm stipulates that two types of classroom settings be recognised: fluency-oriented and correctness-oriented. The rationale behind it is that in the former settings students are encouraged to speak freely without their errors being corrected, whereas in the latter language accuracy is at stake and the message conveyed remains of secondary importance. If we envisage this di-

vision being implemented in the education of other school subjects, it would imply, for example, on the one hand, students talking at length on, say, geography-related issues without their teacher's language-related intervention (as a setting supporting fluency) and, on the other hand, students repeating content- (e.g. geography-) related statements (as a setting supporting correctness). Artificial as the latter may appear, **in the event of the content- and form-centred settings not being recognised** (with the content/form opposition being tantamount to fluency/correctness), **the load borne by students expected to speak proves too high, as a result of which they are more likely to abstain from language production altogether**. Regardless of what school subject is at stake, this language burden is determined by aspects related to all the four aforementioned domains (e.g. lack of knowledge, social anxiety, etc.), and so students' production is best facilitated – even if through artificial means – if handled step by step and separately in terms of correctness (language form) and fluency (message conveyed).

ACTIVITY. What follows is that comparably applicable to the education of all school subjects is the framework of reference to four language skills (such as CEFR, which is most frequently referred to despite its limitations – cf. e.g. Daszkiewicz 2006) systematically encountered in talk or publications falling within the glottodidactic paradigm. The assumption underlying the framework, whereby a person's language skills do not necessarily develop at an equal space and as so it is possible for a person to be, say, at the A2 level in writing but B1 in speaking, lends itself easily to settings outside strictly language-oriented education. In the case of, say, geography, which we have referred to several times above, this means that a student may find it at greater ease to present issues orally, yet struggle when it comes to noting the same issues down (for reasons covering the four aforementioned domains and retaining a uniquely personal character). Hence, **by employing language skills-based frameworks in general education students' active knowledge is better grasped and his or her development in any school subject is better supported**.

EXPERIENCE. What constitutes in the glottodidactic paradigm a substantial push towards production generating the experience of personal satisfaction with learning are conventional word combinations (among other terms, referred to as formulaic speech, social-exchange conventions, polywords, etc.

As Daszkiewicz shows, conventional utterances provide learners with a unequivocally positive sense of linguistic achievement, which appears to be underrated across the educational board [cf. Daszkiewicz 2016]. Additionally, language conventions prove beneficial on pedagogical, didactic, linguistic and psycholinguistic perspectives, constituting – somewhat paradoxically – grounds for students’ oracy-based personal experience [Daszkiewicz 2018]. Whilst their conducive role in language learning is beyond dispute, their potential for the education of other school subjects is – if at all – far less appreciated. Their applicability can be best justified if we realise that **it is largely the use of language conventions that one can make others find one competent in any given issue or subject. In other words, be it geography, mathematics or biology, the formulaic speech of these disciplines is highly indicative of a person’s familiarity with them.** What follows is that, although specialist knowledge in any given subject requires unique statements and novel word combinations, the initial stage of progress in it does involve acquisition of the conventional terms and their combinations. At the same time, quite paradoxically, beginner learners, in any school subject, may be expected to be penalised for the use of conventions, which could be viewed as signalling lack of understanding or creativity, which strongly reminiscent of foreign language learning, throughout which students may be expected to be “holier-than-thou” if instructed to shun very simple word combinations and formulaic utterances, which after all, are most common among native users of any foreign language they might happen to learn. (To complete this point, it is worth adding that the element of conventionality may prove to operate beneficially with other language skills, the aggregation or configuration of which will invariably remain a highly personal construct; for example, in the case of writing for practical research purposes it is the edge of conventionality accompanying such texts that, as Bacha notes, renders it a motivating basis in helping lower language-proficient learners to improve [2002: 170]; by the same token, conventionality may operate as a significant factor shared by written texts which can be analysed and described independently of particular contexts, writers or readers, frequently referred to as ‘texts as objects’ [e.g. Hyland 2016: 4] – both these relations merit systematic empirical studies).

MATRICES. The reasoning mentioned earlier reliant on quantitative measures (word frequency, number of words in a sentence, etc.) means that on the level of language production the language used by students is referred to with evaluative or even judgmental terms: *more frequent* means *better*, whilst *rarer* is construed as *weaker* or even *worse*. It is one of the main differences in the approach to language learning and the attitude to general education as in the latter case the contemporary pedagogical paradigm stipulates that students' language should not fall subject to evaluation, not to mention judgments. What is more, under the glottodidactic paradigm the concept of "high-quality" language (used in, for instance, a good speech) is also characterised by some other features (i.e. quick pace, absence of fillers, etc.), which is the case of other subjects may be handled with greater tolerance and so language use scoring low in such terms will be accepted on the grounds of reluctance to prescribe and impose on students any particular form of language. **Through this higher level (in language education) and lower level (in the education of other school subjects) of language prescription are reflected two different ideas of how language works and shapes our personal world.**

Specific terms

VIEWS. Thinking in terms of language production implies attention being paid to the **characteristics of output**. Generally speaking, the effort undertaken in this vein by learners and teachers is meant to combat the **fossilisation** of language marking in the glottodidactic paradigm the stage of language users' stagnation consisting in employing repeatedly the same set of words, expressions or structures. In the sphere of a foreign language a person's productive use of language is most likely to become fossilised if no deliberate measures are taken to reach beyond the repertoire of words that is known to allow language users to communicate effectively and in the case of English to be limited to less than one thousand words (of not very precise meanings).

ACTIVITY. The outcome of procedures counteracting fossilisation remains partially dependent on effective **elicitation** on the part of teachers necessitating the use of not-yet-fossilised language elements. Although it may be claimed that in the case of other subjects excessive attention being paid to the novel character of elicited utterances is detrimental to learners' cognitive

mastery of given subject matter (as then there occur two difficulties at a time, that is a pupil needs to control the form and the content simultaneously), effective elicitation strengthens the relationship between the two.

EXPERIENCE. Whilst in numerous cases learners' language production is externally elicited by teachers' actions, there are other instances in which under the glottodidactic paradigm it is viewed to be internally driven. Such is the case with these cases of language use which are generated by the so-called **information gap**, creating a learner's need to find out what is missing. What pays to observe here is that whilst elicitation is a concept reliant on teachers' and pupils' cognitive potential, the idea of information gap rests strongly on the affective dimension and the learner's personal experience of the generated deficiency of data.

MATRICES. The language product elicited or constructed as a result of one's need for information remains subject to **language interference**, that is influence of one's former (native) language(s) on the language(s) acquired. Whether language users are aware of the process or not, it pertains to both the form of languages per se as well as to the image of the world generated by each of them. What follows from this observation with regards to other school subjects is that if languages (terminological networks on the semantic level) interfere with one another, the learners' image of the world generated by technical terms (which may be referred to the "geographical world," "biological world" etc.) is equally affected and differs depending on the language(s) interfering.

4. LANGUAGE-GROUNDED MULTI-DIRECTIONAL EDUCATION

The above implies that if the general education of primary-, secondary- and tertiary-level students was to be considered through the prism of concepts "belonging" to the realm of L2/FL teaching, their obstacles, progress and achievements in learning would be better diagnosed, comprehended and evaluated, with these benefits resulting in overall awareness of language and ensuing enhancement of entire educational systems. Such a far-fetched in-

ference rests on the following points following from the “linguistic turn” and from the glottodidactic considerations above:

- on the personal level:

SCHOOL STUDENTS are driven throughout their entire education by their personal language patterns comprising four language skills, the activation and arrangement of which will inevitably varies from subject to subject. In other words, if a given student copes well with written texts in science but struggles when speaking about the same issues, it may be the other way round with another student that might be keen on talking (speaking) but approach reading with marked reluctance. This can be seen as an argument speaking in favour of introduction of language-based STUDENT PROFILES, which might indicate students’ natural linguistic inclinations and inform teachers on, say, whether students are correctness- or fluency-oriented (which as far-reaching implications not only to the learning of language), how extensive students’ vocabulary is (this information needs to be presented in both quantitative and qualitative terms, with the latter implying that particular students may prove to find a particular type of language elements more useful or accessible), or how long they can speak about a given topic, etc.

SCHOOL TEACHERS significantly affect what their students think of language, what they can do with it (i.e. how capable they are in terms of listening, reading, speaking and reading), how they feel about their own language performance (e.g. how motivated they are to write or how pleased they are with what and how they have uttered), and how they perceive the reality surrounding them with language. Although this has not been subject to empirical research, we can assume – on the grounds of language education not being officially recognised as either a component underlying general education or (at least) a separate subject combining L1 and FL/L2 – that this impact remains beyond most teachers’ awareness, not to mention their deliberate actions, plans or instructional aims. What follows from the considerations of skills presented in this chapter and the entire book, though, is that it is highly recommendable that teachers be advised to draw up some kind of LANGUAGE STATEMENTS, presenting their approach to the four language skills and expectations as to the extent to which their students should develop

them. General language plans might also be drawn up at the school level, i.e. by schools developing their "language codes" specifying how schools view and shape students' listening, reading, speaking and writing skills, on the basis of which teachers' declarations might be developed, with some room left to take into account particular school subjects (for in e.g. mathematics the skills of writing and speaking may by definition be considered of lesser significance than in, say, history or geography – which is not to say that the skill of speaking does not count in maths altogether) and teachers' authorial elements implemented into the instruction process.

- on the textual level:

TEXTS RECEIVED by students bear features which are of a technically linguistic character and which, as such, tend to be considered by language teachers but disregarded in the education of other subjects. Yet, as a matter of fact, it is hard to think of convincing arguments why such textual qualities of texts the degree of their authenticity, the extent to which they concern prototypical manifestations of general concepts, or structural aspects determining their coherence and cohesion, etc. should lie beyond the scope of teachers of general education and subjects such as mathematics, biology or physics. Taken together, such qualities might define the LINGUISTIC AFFILIATION of spoken and written texts, which, if discussed by students and teachers across various subjects, could promote more advanced educational diagnostics, comprehension of issues and, consequently, increased educational effectiveness.

TEXTS PRODUCED by students are highly indicative of the developmental stage of their language beliefs, the potential of their language activity, their personality experiencing of language and their matrices of reality interpretation. Only if these four issues (language-activity-experience-matrices) are considered jointly, can we recognise what the language used by students actually means and how it can be interpreted or assessed. In other words, the same utterance produced by two different students does not imply the same competence, position or approach. Conversely, markedly disparate utterances can prove to signal comparable language personalities. Recognising these aspects requires teachers' consistent reflection and instruction carried out in terms of fossilisation, elicitation, vocabulary corpora, information gap

and others, which can be aided by students being viewed through the category of PERSONAL UTTERANCES looked at through the prism of qualitative and quantitative terms.

On the most general level, looking at general education through the prism of language is tantamount to admitting that **by exceeding (the limits of) our language, we exceed ourselves**. Even though this may not sound to many as a novel statement (as it reflects Wittgenstein's well-known observation), it has not, most regrettably, been put to practice: in our educational systems language is not recognised as a dominant strand of students' development and overall existence, and not prioritised by recognising its universal character running across all disciplines and school subjects. It appears that at the level of early education the dominant role of language is better articulated and exploited, with children being instructed to, say, name the actions they and others perform, explain their understanding of simple terms, or, generally speaking, learn by doing things with words. Such actions can be very simple and consist – in accordance with the popular instructional rule referred to as “+1” – in implementing just one word or phrase into a person's vocabulary repertoire: a person's use of that new added language element will constitute a novel experience both to that person herself or himself as well as to the person's listeners or interlocutors, which can be read as implying that the world of both these people widen thanks to the novel element having been applied and construed.

This exceeding of ourselves takes place with all four language skills, at the receptive and productive level, with the latter case being directly “observable” and the former remaining latent but still highly significant. Should such glottodidactic concepts as vocabulary corpora, linguistic conventions, elicitation of utterances, information gap, or language fossilisation be familiar to teachers of all subjects and introduced into their instructional routines, their students' progress and exceeding themselves might be much closer “at hand.” The implementation of glottodidactic categories into general education would make it possible for teachers and students themselves to discuss educational issues by formulating such statements as “his geographical knowledge still does not allow too long utterances,” “her historical competence has ceased to be fossilised and she is capable of producing longer ut-

terances on the recent topics," or "thanks to implementing the concept of information gap into our classroom, the vast majority of students articulate the new subject matter without fail."

Such statements imply that the application of the glottodidactic paradigm can take education in multiple new directions. Although this may be a repetition of what we have said earlier, but at this stage it is worth noting again that there appear no convincing arguments why the aforementioned glottodidactic concepts should not be employed by teachers of all school subjects. We naturally recognise that not all students' knowledge, abilities or competence has a form that is subject to verbalisation (which is the case with multiple educational gains such as mathematical operations, aesthetic sense, physical abilities, ethical values or social skills, etc. falling in all the four educational domains referred to earlier), but it is beyond any doubt that much of what can be expressed or described verbally frequently remains unnamed.

General education is bound to improve if it becomes (more) focused on students' **LANGUAGE PERSONALITIES** construed in terms of four language skills employed across the educational board. They could be referred to by means of the aforementioned student linguistic profiles indicating, among other facets, students' inclinations with regards to each skill, i.e., for example, their tendency to regard speaking as a component serving education (SPtoL) or an ability stemming from it (LtoSP). **It is simply surprising that in the era in which we have become aware of the significance of language and how it shapes our world, school talks on, for example, what students think of speaking much (language beliefs), what register of language they are capable of listening with comprehension (language ability), how they feel about what they have written (language experience), or how their choice of books relates to how they see the world (language matrices of reality interpretation), are not a regular school practice.**