Culturally anchored lexical units in modern foreign language teaching

Maciej Jaskot – Marta Wojakowska – Wojciech Sosnowski

Abstract
The question of interculturality and the plurilingual and pluricultural competence connected with it is often found at the heart of contemporary language learning debate. The documents drafted by the Council of Europe seem to reflect this fact. Nowadays, language teachers face the challenge of designing a lesson unit which not only contains and practises all aspects of the language but also develops all skills and competences through the process of so-called integrated learning. Language teaching and learning is coupled with cultural and linguistic anthropology which is often termed as anthropological approach in language teaching. The approach calls on the term: cultureme which denotes language items present in any language class material whose cultural embedding requires a more extensive semantic and pragmatic commentary. The methods, means and techniques employed within the eclectic teaching framework aim to eliminate a learner's ethnocentric attitude and existing stereotypes which leads to the development of the plurilingual and pluricultural competence. Our research relies on our extensive experience acquired in the plurilingual and multicultural environment of 30 nationalities and 160 students of the College of Europe in Natolin while teaching Romance (French, Spanish, Italian) and Slavonic languages (Russian, Polish, Ukrainian).
Key words: anthropological approach in language teaching, plurilingual and pluricultural competence, student-centredness, linguacultural studies

Introduction

At present, the question of interculturality and the plurilingual and pluricultural competence connected with it is often found at the heart of contemporary language learning debate. Development of linguistic and cultural sensitivity entails a rejection of the long-lived European ideal of monolingualism which, in turn, requires a new didactic paradigm to be designed, implemented and promoted. It is noteworthy that plurilingualism is not only a phenomenon that is politically protected but is also regarded as an asset on its own which should be promulgated and universalised. This necessitates adoption of systemic solutions which will support its spread and promotion.

A language lesson seems to be the best place to discuss cultural content which, among others, enhances the awareness of similarities and differences between the foreign culture and one's own or develops the ability to distance oneself from the conventional attitudes to cultural differences. Such perception of the language lesson leads to equal treatment of cultures and minority languages as well as a transition into a pluralistic phase, which bolsters European integration. Plurilingualism is certainly one of the important challenges facing the modern world and is treated as such by the European Union and European Council.

The educational reality of contemporary language teaching

Nowadays, a vast majority of language lessons in state and private schools, language centres at universities and tertiary education institutions, and all types of courses take place without division into distinct lessons focussing on a single language skill or competence. Moreover, the learner does not tap into their existing language resources constituting the components of their plurilingual and pluricultural competence. An exception from this are specialist linguistic-philological university courses and some

intensive language courses which teach distinct aspects of grammar, writing skills, life and institutions of the language speaking cultures and countries sometimes called *realia*, business language, and language and music among others. However, a language teacher traditionally faces the challenge of building a lesson unit, which will develop all aspects, skills and competences of the language. This is so-called **integrated learning** within one lesson[1]. Integrated language learning is not only about combining language skills but also developing other, often very different, competences including the plurilingual and pluricultural competence[2]. Currently, the aim of learning languages does not stop at acquiring skills to communicate with persons coming from different cultural backgrounds and identities but also extends to acquiring intercultural competence (Andersen, Lund, Risager, 2006: 7-8). This is in line with the evolution, promoted by the Council of Europe, towards a global perspective in language teaching which incorporates the synergy of cultures and languages. The pursuit of such didactic aims entails moving away from isolated treatment of the language and culture. Language systems are thus no longer treated in separation from other languages with which they are in constant interaction.

Moreover, within the European Union and its partnership countries, courses with an extensive communication and culture component and integrated language skills learning (with emphasis on speaking) came into wider existence in 1997 as part of the Erasmus programme entitled *Erasmus Intensive Language Courses (EILC)*. The participants usually select course in English, French, Spanish or German. From the very start of the mass educational mobility[3] of European students it was known that prior to departure or during the stay, it is necessary to get to know not only the rudiments of the local language but also with the most important elements of the culture, history, tradition, and social life of the target country or region. This is the only approach that guarantees adaptation to the new educational and social conditions and improvement of intercultural communication which, in turn, has a positive influence on reaching the learning objectives. To date, EILC courses include most of the less frequently taught languages (except English, French, German, and Spanish) and are based from the very start on the assumption that the language component must be connected with the cultural one and general knowledge thereof. Such is the convention adopted by European tertiary education institutions as well as by us at the College of Europe in Natolin.

When establishing the academic unit under the name Languages and Intercultural Dialogue Office (LIDO), we wanted the name to reflect this fundamental element of the language teaching mission. We conducted our research among our students who hail from 30 countries and 5 continents (approximately 160 course participants per year learning 9 languages: Arabic, English, French, German, Italian, Polish, Russian, Spanish, and Ukrainian). Our research on plurilingual and pluricultural competence is based on many years of experience in teaching multicultural groups, student feedback surveys and interviews as well as the project work and tasks carried out during the courses.

---

[1] The duration of a lesson unit varies depending on the level and conventions. In case of schools, it is usually 45 minutes and 60-90 minutes elsewhere (universities, tertiary education institutions).

[2] The plurilingual and pluricultural competence was first described in 1997 by Genèvieve Zarate, Daniele Coste and Daniele Moore. Then, it appeared in 2001 in CEFR which was amended with descriptors for this specific competence.

[3] This mobility was gradually increasing with the implementation of the Bologna Process and unification of the undergraduate, postgraduate and doctoral programmes. The process aimed to create *European Higher Education Area*. 30 countries have joined the Bologna Process.

Contemporary educational reality shows that monolingual and monocultural groups in Europe are a myth. This applies to every level, from kindergarten through primary and secondary schooling onto tertiary education.

Methodological assumptions behind plurilingual and pluricultural education
According to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) we assume that the overarching objective of teaching is coaxing the learner into action (savoir-faire[4] is the main pillar helping to achieve this). In the widely-used approach known as the *lexical approach*[5], the central position is occupied by vocabulary and hence it is vocabulary that lesson time should be devoted to. Once the vocabulary is mastered, the learner is assisted in reaching learner autonomy and undertaking practical tasks. In order to facilitate and enhance language acquisition, apart from understanding the basic semantic meaning of a lexical unit, it is important that the learner should be aware of the national-cultural component of these language units.

We make an assumption that in language learning it is not enough to teach the language as a sum total of relational meanings and teaching solely the language system does not lead to mastering speech (parole). As a result, it may turn out there is no pragmatic equivalence at the level of the lexical unit as well as phrase, sentence or text. It is known that knowledge of lexical-grammatical structures does not guarantee correct communication. This has led to greater acknowledgement of the role of knowledge of the culture and realities of a given community in effective communication (Kramsch, 2014: 30-55).

In our communicative and cultural approach, it should be remembered that communication concerns both non-verbal and verbal levels. This stems from the fact that "culture includes human behavior: gestures, language etiquette, customs and customs, forms of organization, as well as artifacts such as books, paintings, buildings that create the material and social achievements of humanity" (Panther, Nutzinger, 2004: 298). For this reason, we combine language learning with the anthropology of language and culture thus subscribing to the interdisciplinary character of research and the strategy employed is termed as the **anthropological approach to language learning**.

In accordance with the model of intercultural communicative competence put forward by Balboni[6], the following can be included in the category of non-verbal codes: 1. Mimicry, gestures, body language, scents; 2. Physical distance between interlocutors; 3. Objects, clothes, status symbols etc.. The following situations can serve as examples of unique communicative acts: 1. Cocktail party, dinner; 2. Conversations over the phone; 3. Working in a team; 4. Political discourse, negotiations etc.. Among the fundamental cultural values the following are found: 1. Space and time; 2. Level of formality; 3. Hierarchy, status, respect; 4. Family (also in a broader meaning); 5. Honesty, loyalty, fair play; 6. The world of metaphor etc.. On the other hand, **verbal codes** are: 1. Timbre, tempo of speech; 2. Choice of lexis; 3. Grammar problems; 4. Text structure; Socio-pragmatic aspects (Balboni, 2011: 19-21).

That is why when approaching a lesson unit lexically (lexemes, phrases, sentences, texts), it would be ideal - apart from introducing lexical level units – to also focus on other levels of the communication process such as prosody, kinesics,

---

[4] By this we mean not only particular lexemes but also units at the lexical level: phrases, sentences, texts.

[5] In language teaching, this term is often juxtaposed with the *grammar approach*

[6] Intercultural communication, regulated by deep civilisational values, employs two types of grammars: verbal and non-verbal and is realised in communicative acts. The acts are regulated by universal rules as well as cultural ones with the latter being a potential source of cultural misunderstandings (Balboni, 2011: 19-23)

proxemics, language politeness, other non-verbal communication (e.g. the question of punctuality).

The process of developing the plurilingual and intercultural competence – methods, means and techniques
In order to achieve the assumed didactic goals, it is useful to use several approaches to language teaching which will complement each other. A well-known XIXth-century linguist, Henry Sweet, once said: „there is no royal road to languages" (Sweet, 1964: 70). At the present stage of development of postmodernist language learning, we speak of the post-communicative or **eclectic** method (Scrivener 2005, Gębal, 2010, Sosnowski, 2009, 2014). The method combines techniques deriving from various methods or approaches to language teaching to achieve the best results and suit the learners' needs and abilities, their personalities and interests. The eclectic approach in language teaching is based on:

1. a system integrating language skills through a variety of teaching techniques[7] and resources, with particular emphasis on the use of online technologies[8];
2. techniques of working in class consider the learning styles of all types of learners, i.e. auditory, visual, digital and those who have high bodily-kinaesthetic intelligence;
3. encouraging learners to study language and culture, unlocking their linguistic, intellectual, cognitive, emotional and creative potential;
4. learner-centeredness and abolition of the central positioning of the teacher in class which empowers the learner as a co-creator and actor of the didactic process.

Textbooks available on the market do not fully address the question of developing the plurilingual and pluricultural competence using the eclectic method. Let us restate the most important assumptions behind plurilingual language teaching:

- forming an attitude of curiosity about languages known as *awakening to languages*
- creating connections between languages which the learner knows and which they are learning within all 4 skills (reading, listening, writing, speaking) known as *integrated didactic approach to different languages studied*;
- moving away from the ethnocentric approach to culture and language.

Materials writers who write classic textbooks and usually happen to be the native speakers of the language often select aspects of cultural reality and pertinent elements of country-specific general knowledge. Each time, it is a subjective choice even if it is largely based on the teaching experience of the authors. Hence, the

---

[7] Including a return to translation exercises. This is related to the inclusion of mediation competence in the CEFR. The abolition of translation exercises in language teaching methodology has impoverished learners' mediation skills. A natural, even desirable communicative situation is the question "and how to say ... (word, dish, phrase, etc.) in ..." e.g. observed in class: T: Laura, go up to the blackboard and write ... After the teacher repeated the instructions three times in a foreign language, another student who understood what the teacher said translated the message into Laura's first language.

[8] As we are now working with a generation of digital and visual learners, we use virtually all learning software and applications such as *quizlet, kahoot, padlet, menti, glogster, wordwall, edupuzzle* among others.

situations generated by them will be, to a lesser or larger extent, disconnected from the situation which the student and the teacher find themselves in at any particular moment while the space for teaching multilingual and multicultural competence is located here and now, i.e. in a given foreign language lesson. Even if it is an artificially created environment and most communication situations are adapted to the lesson's objectives. Intensive intercultural communication is based on the linguistic information contained in each student's native language system and cultural sphere.

Anthropological approach in language teaching and culturally anchored units
The aforementioned anthropological approach in language teaching refers both to the premise of interculturality and to a cultural view of the language, and should therefore be understood in the spirit of cultural linguistics, also known as *linguaculturology* (see Vorob'ev, 1997, Vasilûk 2010), which we understand according to the definition by J. Anusiewicz (1994) as follows:

> Cultural linguistics is a science that studies the relationship between language and culture. Language is treated as its precondition, implicator, component, reservoir, "transmission belt", an interpreter and interpretee containing the most important cultural content. The basic task of cultural linguistics is the study of the four-part relationship: language - culture - man (society) - reality.

It is this focus on the relationship between language - culture - man (society) and reality that constitutes the methodological foundation for the introduction of the so-called situational tasks (see further) in foreign language classes, as they allow for the practical (active) analysis, interpretation and reconstruction (despite the artificiality of the context of the classroom) of the form of conceptualisation of the world reflected in language structures (Sękowska, 2000), so that the learner is able to see the similarities between the structure of cultural and linguistic patterns.

Employing solutions referring to linguaculturology in the language teaching process allows to design lesson units which generate and implement long-term transmission of cultural information. Clear understanding of the process of this interaction and thus identifying and understanding how cultural information translates into the language units used by the language learner's is one of the aims of the anthropological approach in language teaching.

It should be noted that we do not only mean language units with evident cultural roots[9] such as phraseological units but also those which are able to reflect various historical ways of exploring the world and thus preserve particular kind of cultural information.

In light of the above, a reference should be made to the literature on cultural linguistics in which culturally anchored units are discussed and named in various ways: cultural components, culturally connotated lexis, realia, lexis characteristic for a given country, lexis specific to/typical for a particular culture, sometimes also culture symbols, key words (Wierzbicka, 2007).

---

[9] Some researchers question the existence of separate individuals with strong cultural roots, e.g. Zhao-Huang claims that: "As language is created and used in context, it is inevitable to be tinted with the color of cultural idiosyncrasies. 'Culturally loaded word' is a misnomer because all words are culturally loaded, and there is no need to distinguish so-called culturally loaded words from those that are supposedly not" (Zhao, 2004: 181)."

Within the anthropological approach to language learning, we refer a term we find to describe the units of interest most accurately, that is, the notion of the cultureme as defined by M. Rak (2015: 13):

> [Culturemes are] ethnolinguistic units, key words, which in the expression plan are represented by single lexeme, and in the content plan have such rich meanings that it is possible to understand the specificity of a given national, ethnic or regional community. It is through cultures, among other things, that a community defines its identity, attitude to tradition and values, as well as the way of coping with the reality. As they are frequently impossible to translate, the lexemes that represent them have an ethnocentric attitude (they are often components of the autostereotype) as words of collective memory.

The term *cultureme* was born outside linguistics in S. Lem's cultural theory, in which it means, above all, minimal indivisible cultural units: rituals, values, stereotypes.

There is no doubt that individual languages differ precisely in the systematics of informational differences (perception and conceptualisation of the world) and not in individual cultures, although it is worth noting that the national specificity of the content expressed by a culture is revealed most fully only in comparison with possible embodiment units in another language; namely, in asymmetry and lacunarity which reflect both interculturality and intra-culturality. Therefore, attempts to convey the linguistic and cultural material in language A with the help of language B are constantly associated with difficulties in reconstructing the entire linguistic consciousness and are connected, in one way or another, with the need to combat semantic gaps. This necessity confirms the validity of referring during a lesson unit to the languages the learner knows and learns, as we mentioned earlier.

Nowadays, even in the simplest teaching material for learning foreign languages, there are units which are culturally embedded[10] and require more semantic and pragmatic commentary as well as visualization, which the teacher can achieve with the help of audio-video technology solutions. The choice of the task-based approach in language teaching was determined by the fact that lexis connected with realia and culture of a given language-speaking area is given one of the most prominent positions in it. As a result, we introduce the following categories during a lesson unit:

1. Culturemes (at the lexeme level) e.g. Spanish: *puente, corrida*; French: *Catherinette;* Italian: *menefreghismo*,; Polish: *laurka, majówka*; Russian: *коммуналка*, *дача*, Ukrainian: *калина, хата* among others;
2. Phraseological culturemes: Spanish: *armarse la marimorena, remover Roma y Santiago*; Italian: *Natale con i tuoi e Pasqua con chi vuoi*; Polish: *wyjść ja Zabłocki na mydle*, *narobić bigosu*; Russian: *свежий как огурчик*, *кашу маслом не испортишь*, Ukrainian: *село неасфальтоване, як Марко по пеклі, наплювати в борщ* among others;
3. Cultureme terms related to cuisine[11]: Spanish: *tortilla, gazpacho*; French: *salade russe, bouquet garni*; Italian: *arancina (supplì),*

---

[10] This phenomenon pertains to even the simplest lexemes e.g. Polish: *kanapka* (Jaskot, 2016)
[11] Our research confirms that food and drink are one of the most characteristic symbols of intercultural communication.

spaghettata; Polish: *drożdżówka, ryba po grecku*; Russian: *блины, оливье, морс*, Ukrainian: *сало, вареники among others*

4. Adresative forms: Spanish: *usted, tío*; French: *garçon*; Italian: *lor signori*; pl. *pani magister, panie władzo*; Russian: *девушка, гражданин*; Ukrainian: *добродію директоре among others*

5. Neologisms and neosemanticisms: Spanish: *aznarismo*; French: *lundimanche*; Italian: *aberlusconiano*; Polish: *słoik, urlop tacieżyński, Adrian, parawaning*; Russian: *Крымнаш, интердевочка*; Ukrainian: *Майдановець among others*

6. Fixed phrases constituting part of the language etiquette: Spanish: *¡Que te vaya bien!*; French: *ça va? ça va*; Italian: *Tanti auguri!*; Polish: *sto lat*; Russian: *с праздником, давай выпьем на посошок*; Ukrainian: *будь ласка, многая літа* among others;

7. Selected quotes which are precedent texts: Spanish: *Vuelva usted mañana*, *España es diferente*; French: *et la marmotte, elle met le chocolat dans le papier alu*; Italian: *Il bel paese*; pl. *Czy to jest miłość, czy to jest kochanie, oczywista oczywistość*; Russian: *процесс пошёл, спокойной ночи, малыши*, Ukrainian: *все буде в шоколаді; Маємо те, що маємо* among others;

8. Proper names having precedent characteristics: Spanish: *Fulano, Babia*; French: *la langue de Molière*; Italian: *Tizio, Caio, Pierino*; pl. *zaczarowany ołówek, pan Hilary*; Russian: *Колобок*; Ukrainian: *Галя among others*

The choice of all these lexical units is not accidental. Teaching practice shows that it is the teacher who is best able to present and practice with the students the meaning and sphere of functioning of particular lexemes and phrases (mainly if they are culturemes) by conveying denotational meanings (meanings that are assigned to particular words), connotational (concerning stylistic properties of words and phrases) and finally pragmatic (deciding how to interpret the whole utterance). To this end, the teacher uses a variety of techniques and teaching aids so that the student is able to assimilate as much meaning as possible during the lesson and is also able to use words in the right context.

Among the techniques we prefer in teaching and learning those that stimulate interaction: explication[12], dialogues between people (e.g. of different role and social rank), role plays e.g. by creating situations characteristic of a given culture and morality (e.g. situation on a Polish allotment - *działka*) and playing various roles, games and plays with an intercultural element, e.g. by including adresative forms in addressing another person in a foreign language. All kinds of situations may have a proposed scenario: an interview with a famous person, how to behave at a wedding, hotel etc.. It seems reasonable to create such situations during a lesson by means of appropriate situational tasks (e.g. for the Polish language: today Piotr has a name day, let's give wishes to the birthday boy; today is Mother's Day, let's make a drawing – *laurka* – for your mother, etc.). Creating such situations, even if they seem artificial, allows to refer to the emotional sphere of the learners, which, in consequence, favours the assimilation of vocabulary and any additional information from the teacher. Also important are all kinds of acts of speech fulfilling specific language functions, e.g. apologies, congratulations, orders, toasts. We not only rely on recorded and replayed scenes, but we also work with specific written and spoken texts. Materials may or may not be authentic[13] and take into account the realities of a given country, e.g. newspapers, magazines, maps, advertisements, TV or radio programmes. When

---

[12] As per Anna Wierzbicka's model (1999).
[13] More about graded texts in Sosnowski 2017.

planning the lesson, we also need to anticipate non-verbal behaviours, for example, prosodic elements (Russian: *a*, Spanish: *¿eh?,* Italian: *cosa*, French: *pff*), typical gestures accompanying a verbal situation (e.g.: Polish: *jak mi tu kaktus wyrośnie*; Russian: *у меня есть вопрос*, Italian: *ma cosa dici?*, Spanish: *pero mucho,* French: *mon oeil*), mimicry, body language, importance of colours, the location and conditions for communication, type of interpersonal relation and physical distance. All the above-mentioned methods, measures and techniques are aimed at eliminating the learner's ethnocentric attitude and existing stereotypes, which leads to the development of plurilingual and pluricultural competence. Our teaching experience is based primarily on working in heterogeneous groups. This means that the teacher is very likely to be unfamiliar with all the cultural codes of the students in the group. Therefore, he or she must assume that we are learning from one another. In this way both sides of the learning process become experts in anthropology.

In our case, interculturalism has many dimensions. Here is an example: a learner from cultural circle A (e.g. Arabic) works with a learner from cultural circle B and C (e.g. German because he or she is a German citizen, but his or her parents are from Macedonia) - they master the cultural codes of area D (e.g. Russian-speaking) under the supervision of a teacher from cultural circle E (the teacher is a Pole educated in Russia), teaching takes place in cultural circle F (in Poland), with students from cultural circles G (e.g. Greek), H (e.g. English), I (e.g. French), J (e.g. Irish), K (e.g. Chinese) etc.. Due to such cultural diversity we use a student-centred approach and with maximum use of the group's potential we master up to 10-15 cultural codes.

The teaching process is therefore a field for exchanging experiences not only relating to language as a system of language signs, but increasingly to the individual cultural experience of learners. This is exceptionally important because, as EU integration progresses, more and more professionally active adults are choosing to emigrate temporarily or permanently for work. In addition, as a result of internationalisation and the globalisation of businesses, people employed in their home countries are also increasingly confronted with working in multicultural environments. In view of these factors, it is of great importance to be properly prepared to face different attitudes and ways of thinking, as well as to cooperate with their representatives without any conflicts.

Conclusions

The problem of culturally anchored language units was first encountered by translation theoreticians. Since 1953, (Fiodorov, 1953) this subject has been discussed in academic literature. Foreign language teachers were next to confront this problem. The intercultural approach developed as the communicative approach developed[14]. At different stages of the development of foreign language teaching the attitude to cultural content and realia was different (Smith, 2000). In 1985 Allen (1985) presented the postulate of teaching language through culture as opposed to teaching culture through language. In practice, teaching language through culture consists of introducing cultural elements from the very first language lessons. However, the author's postulate to teach only in the target language proved less effective[15], as our

---

[14] We wish to stress the fact that the very notion of the communicative method was "unfortunate" from the very beginning, because in the history of methodology, all the approaches assumed language communication in the final stage (from the grammar translation method through the audio-lingual method, suggestopedia and others). We do not consider theoretical lectures on descriptive grammar of a given language to be a language teaching method.
[15] A library search of British textbooks (1995-2020) for foreign language learning (except English) confirms this thesis. Almost all materials rely on extensive commentary in English both

research shows. Indeed, learners often request an explanation of certain content in the intermediary language[16]. Teaching culture through the target language can be done at higher levels when learners are able to read cultural materials in the target language. We agree that the most effective process of cultural communication takes place in the language of the given culture, however, our observations seem to have confirmed that the code of culture can be transmitted and understood at lower levels too (e.g. in Catalan culture on 23 April you can receive or give someone a rose or a book. In Polish, Russian, and Ukrainian cultures, when a knife or fork is accidentally dropped on the floor, a comment is usually made that a hungry guest may come in any language. Such information may be provided in any language understood by the learners).

There seems to be a view shared by many teachers and researchers that intercultural competence is unteachable (Balboni 2007: 16, Hofstede, 1991: 230-231). Our view is different, as we claim that this competence should be developed with all methods, means and techniques on hand in order to continuously improve it. The aim of teaching every foreign language should be not only to develop linguistic competence but also communicative and socio-cultural competences. Therefore, this aspect should be taken into account when planning lessons and timetabling the course curriculum. It is crucial that both the student and the teacher be aware of their own prejudices and stereotypes. It is important to learn to review and reinterpret them, avoiding the tendency to divide and classify cultures as "better" or "worse", based on one's own life experience. One should be aware that changing attitudes, eliminating stereotypes takes time, and sometimes, for various reasons, it is impossible to achieve (Hofstede, Pederson, 2002: 19; Sujecka-Zając, 2018). Both in the teaching and learning process, integrated language learning is not only about combining language skills, but also about the development of a variety of competences, including the pluricultural and plurilingual one. Our observations show that the integrated teaching, which we mention in the introduction, has significantly developed the learners' multilingual and multicultural repertoire compared to the initial situation. This is satisfactory, but it should not be forgotten that the acquisition of plurilingual and pluricultural competence is a long and two-way process that starts at the first encounter with a reality that is alien to us and continues, in fact, for the rest of our lives.

It is important to make use of students' pluricultural and pluricultural potential in class, as this can be an opportunity to foster their intercultural attitudes. That is why we propose a **student-centred approach** to learning and teaching, which changes the role of the teacher from a frontal position to a moderator. It is worth taking into account the personal theories of the teacher and the student and what their goals, needs, expectations and ideas resulting also from previous experiences are. The aim is to empower (not necessarily in terms of language instruction, as this is impossible for practical reasons, i.e. insufficient knowledge of the language) the learners to see who they are and what they need. A lesson unit is also a space for conveying the culture of a given language area, among other things by introducing lexical units with strong cultural roots.

The teaching process becomes thus a field for exchanging experiences not only relating to language as a system of language signs, but, increasingly, to the individual cultural experience of learners. "In the process of teaching a foreign language in a multilingual and multicultural environment, the teacher has to face a series of challenges that can be seen through the prism of linguaculturology in its

---

on the grammar and culture of the language area. Bilingual glossaries are regularly included in most lessons, texts or translation exercises.

[16] It may be their mother tongue or a language they already know very well, e.g. the language of instruction in a given university.

broadest sense (Jaskot, 2016: 146). This results in the fact that all the lexical units introduced in the classroom need to be rethought by the teacher and all situations requiring commentary need to be anticipated. The teacher, as the initiator of the didactic process and moderator of the classes, decides for himself or herself which language units require more commentary. The teacher, as the creator of the teaching process and moderator, decides for himself which language units require more commentary. The ability to provide such commentary on culture codes, culturemes and lexis with no equivalent requires special preparation. However, we are convinced that introducing information about the pragmatic use of language units increases the attractiveness and usefulness of our classes, expands their academic component and guarantees the learner's success in future communication.

Bibliographic references

Allen, W. (1985). Toward cultural proficiency. In A. C. Omaggio (Ed.), Proficiency, curriculum, articulation: The ties that bind (137-166). Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference.

Andersen, H. L., Lund, K., & Risager, K. (Eds.) (2006). Culture in Language Learning. Aarhus Universitetsforlag.

Anusiewicz, J. (1994). Lingwistyka kulturowa. Zarys problematyki. Wroclaw: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wroclawskiego.

Babbie, E. (2007). Badania spoleczne w praktyce. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo PWN.

Balboni, P.E. (2007). La comunicazione interculturale. Venezia: Marsilio.

Beacco, J.C., & Byram, M. (2007). De la diversite linguistique e l'éducation plurilingue : Guide pour l'elaboration des politiques linguistiques educatives en Europe. Strasbourg: Conseil de l'Europe.

Byram, M., Zarate, G., & Neuner, G. (1997). La competence socioculturelle dans l'apprentissage et l'enseignement des langues. Strasbourg: Conseil de l'Europe.

Candelier, M., Kervran, M., & Remy-Thomas, F. (2003). Une approche plurielle des langues a l'ecole primaire: Construire de nouvelles competences preparatoires a la traduction. Le français aujourd'hui, 142(3), 55-67. https://doi.org/10.3917/lfa.142.0055

Carap. Un Cadre de Refeerence pour les Approches Plurielles des Langues et des Cultures. Compeetences et ressources (2007). Centre europeeen pour les langues vivantes, Conseil de l'Europe: Graz.

Castellotti, V. (2006). Pratiques reflexives en contexte plurilingue : le portfolio europeen des langues pour le college. In M. Molinie & M.F. Bishop (Eds.), Autobiographie et reflexivite (69-82). Les Belles Lettres,

CECRL (2001). Cadre européen commun de reference pour les langues – apprendre, enseigner, evaluer. Conseil de l'Europe: Les Editions Didier.

Fiodorov, A. V. (1953). Osnovy obschei teorii perevoda. Moskva: Biblioteka filologa.

Gebal, P. (2010). Dydaktyka kultury polskiej w ksztalceniu jezykowym cudzoziemcow. Krakow: Universitas.

Hofstede, G. (1991). Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind. London: McGraw-Hill.

Hofstede, G. J., Hofstede, G. H., & Pedersen, P. (2002). Exploring culture: Exercises, stories and synthetic cultures. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Jaskot, M. (2016). Odniesienia kulturowe w nauczaniu jezyka obcego w grupie wielokulturowej - pulapki i wyzwania. Linguodidactica, 20, 133-149.

Kramsch, C. (2014). Language and Culture. AILA Review, 27, 30-55, https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.27.02kr

Kucharczyk, R. (2018). Nauczanie jezykow obcych a dydaktyka wielojezycznosci. Na przykladzie francuskiego jako drugiego jezyka obcego. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Werset.

Lobocki, M. (2007). Metody i techniki badan pedagogicznych. Krakow: Wydawnictwo Impuls.

Martinelli, S., & Tayor, M. (2000). Uczenie sie międzykulturowe. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo FRSE.

Panther, S., & Nutzinger, H.G. (2004). Homo oeconomicus vs. homo culturalis. Kultur als Herausforderung der Okonomik. In G. Bluumle, N. Goldschmidt, R. Klump, B. Schauenberg, H. Senger, Perspektiven einer kulturellen Okonomik (287-309). Munster: LIT-Verlag.

Mangiante, J.-M., & Parpette, C. (2004). Le francais sur objectif specifique: De l'analyse des besoins a l'elaboration d'un cours. Paris: Hachette.

Rak, M. (2015). Kulturemy podhalanskie. Krakow: Ksiegarnia Akademicka.

Scrivener, J. (2005). Learning teaching. Oxford, U.K: Macmillan.

Sekowska, E. (2000). Nurt antropologiczno-kulturowy we wspolczesnym polskim jezykoznawstwie. Poradnik Jezykowy, 6, 11-20.

Sowa, M. (2011). D'une activite pedagogique a l'activite professionnelle: Le cheminement vers la competence. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL.

Smith, A.N. (2000). Four decades of 'Bonjour': The story of one teacher's practice. In D. Birckbichler, R. M. Terry & J. Davis (Eds.) Reflecting on the past to shape the future, pp. 19-50. Lincolnwood: National Textbook.

Sosnowski, W. (2009). Nauczanie kulturoznawstwa na poziomie podstawowym (A2) na przykladzie lekcji o rosyjskich imionach, nazwiskach i imionach odojcowskich. In L. Szypielewicz (Ed.) Nauczanie jezyka rosyjskiego studentow na kierunkach filologicznych i niefilologicznych. Warszawa: Instytut Rusycystyki Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Sosnowski, W. P., & Tulska-Budziak, M. D. (2014). S Rossiej na "Ty"!: Scenarii urokov po russkomu jazyku kak inostrannomu. Moskva: "Russkij jazyk. Kursy".

Sosnowski, W. (2017). Od slowa do dzialania, czyli o nauczaniu slownictwa poprzez tekst, Jezyki Obce w Szkole, 03, 41-46.

Sweet, H. (1964). The practical study of languages: A guide for teachers and learners. London: Oxford University Press.

Sujecka-Zajac, J. (2016). Kompetentny uczen na lekcji jezyka obcego: Wyzwania dla glottodydaktyki mediacyjnej. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Werset.

Troncy, C. (2016). Didactique du plurilinguisme: Approches plurielles des langues et des cultures : autour de Michel Candelier. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.

Vasiluk, I. P. (2010). Prikladnaja lingvokul'turologija: Metodologiceskie principy otbora ucebnogo materiala i organizacii processa obucenija russkomu jazyku kak inostrannomu. Moskva: Rossijskij Universitet Druzhby Narodov.

Vorob'ev, V. V. (2008). Lingvokul'turologija. Moskva: Rossijskij Universitet Druzhby Narodov.

Wierzbicka, A. (1999). Jezyk, umysl, kultura. Warszawa: PWN.

Wierzbicka, A. (2019). Slowa klucze: Rozne jezyki - rozne kultury. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Wilczynska,W., & Michonska-Stadnik, A. (2010). Metodologia badan w glottodydaktyce. Wprowadzenie. Krakow: Wydawnictwo Avalon.

Zhao, H. (2004). The paradox of cultural translation: How to treat cultural information in bilingual dictionaries. In C. Sinwai (Ed.), Translation and Bilingual Dictionaries (177–185). Tubingen: Niemeyer.

Words: 5941
Characters: 40 647 (22,58 standard pages)

Maciej Jaskot, PhD
Pedagogical University of Cracow
Instytut Neofilologii
ul. Podchorążych 2
30-084 Kraków
Poland
maciej.jaskot@up.krakow.pl

Wojciech Sosnowski, PhD
Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences
ul. Bartoszewicza 1b m. 17
00-337 Warszawa
Poland
wojciech.sosnowski@ispan.waw.pl

Marta Wojakowska, PhD
University of Warsaw
Instytut Romanistyki
ul. Dobra 55
00-312 Warszawa
Poland
mb.wojakowska2@uw.edu.pl