

Konrad Kazimierz SZAMRYK

University of Białystok, Poland

COLLOQUIAL SPEECH CREATION IN THE *POLSKY, KROK PO KROKU* TEXTBOOK FOR TEACHING POLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE (LEVEL A1)

This article presents different ways of creating colloquial speech in the *Polski, krok po kroku* textbooks on teaching Polish as a foreign language (level A1). It seems that spoken colloquial Polish has not been used in any textbook for to the extent found in the series presented. In the handbook, the authors use syntax, vocabulary, graphics and punctuation in the broadest scope, while inflection, word formation and phraseology appear to a narrower extent. The difficulty, but also the attractiveness of the said textbook series appears to be the consequence of introducing the element of spoken language in the unofficial variety.

It should also be noted that in the series we are actually dealing with written language, i.e. creation of utterances by means available in the written variety, which creates the impression of a spoken variety of the language. Such creation exists in the written form, but cannot do without the spoken “base”.

Keywords: colloquial speech, colloquial Polish, speech creation, textbook, handbook, teaching Polish, Polish as a foreign language

Most textbooks for teaching Polish as a foreign language – also at the most elementary level A1 – advocate teaching spoken, colloquial language in a universal version (Piętkowa 1993:58). Colloquial Polish¹ is present particularly in course materials written in the spirit of the communicative approach (Szamryk 2016:108–109), which, in teaching foreign languages, not only has changed the methods, but also the teaching subject itself – the spoken language, and, more precisely, colloquial language, has become prevalent (Tambor 2010:312–314).

It seems, however, that spoken colloquial Polish has not been used in any textbook for teaching Polish as a foreign language to such extent as in the series *Polski, krok po kroku*. I. Dembowska-Wosik, a reviewer of the said series, indirectly

¹ In Polish linguistics two concepts of colloquialism are used. In a broader (anthropological) context, colloquial Polish is a sematic and cultural category, consisting of two registers: neutral and featured (emotional). In a narrower context, colloquial Polish forms a stylistic and semantic category, primarily spoken, less precise, emotionally featured (Zdunkiewicz-Jedynak 2008:96-97). In this paper, when I mention colloquial Polish, I refer to the

draws attention to this fact when writing about problems and difficulties arising from the dialogue structure:

“The texts included in the textbook series *Polski, krok po kroku* are worth noting. On the one hand they are distinguished by their natural character and humour, on the other hand – particularly in the first chapters of the textbook – they contain many elements still unknown to the learners, which significantly hinders their comprehension and requires explanation from the teacher, which (with consistent avoidance of the intermediary language) may prove a backbreaking, if not impossible, task.” (Dembowska-Wosik 2014:414).

and:

“The authors of the series, however, were unable to avoid several setbacks, which slightly hinder working with the book. The first is the language of texts mentioned above, which – although natural and pleasant to read – is, however, often excessively difficult for A level students”. (Dembowska-Wosik 2014:415).

I. Dembowska-Wosik’s commentary requires some elaboration. Both “natural and pleasant to read [language – note by K.Sz.] (...) however often excessively difficult for A level students”, and “elements still unknown to the learners” are, to a large extent, manifestations of colloquial Polish. The difficulty, but, at the same time, the attractiveness of the said textbook series, appears to be the consequence of introducing the element of spoken language in the unofficial variety.

It should be remembered, however, that in the series in question we are in fact dealing with a written language, i.e. creation of utterances by means available in the written variety, which creates an impression of a spoken variety of the language. Such creation exists in the written form, but may not do without the spoken “base” (Skudrzykowska 1994:84). It is also of note that the written language consists of only selected elements characteristic of spoken Polish, while others are reduced or completely disregarded (see: Wilkoń 2000:44–47), as we are dealing with a text prepared in advance, which has been subjected to creation, but as such, is more organized and easier to comprehend than spontaneously spoken texts. Therefore, the objective of this paper is to present how the effect of spoken colloquial Polish has been created in the textbook for teaching Polish as a foreign language *Krok po kroku, polski (poziom A1)*².

narrower perspective. I assume, mainly following Władysław Lubaś, that **colloquial Polish** is a language variety of general character, limited in communication mainly to acts of speech on the level of individual and local contacts, partially subjected to codification, distinguished by strong expression and valorisation (Lubaś 2003:243-245). It is in opposition to the general, standard variety with a high degree of acculturation and in opposition to particular varieties, such as dialects, jargons, idiolects. Thus, it is in an intermediate position between the general, standard variety and the particular varieties (SPLP:V).

² I. Stemppek, A. Stelmach, S. Dawidek, A. Szymkiewicz, *Polski, krok po kroku. Poziom A1*, Krakow 2011, hereinafter referred to as: *Kpk1*.

In order to introduce the impression of oral discourse, the authors of the *Kpk1* textbook willingly use graphic means, demonstrating difficulties connected with pronouncing Polish words. Hyphens are used in the text to reflect spelling: *Aha, rozumiem U-w-e S-t-e-i-n* (10³), *S-z-k-o-l-a* (10), *d-o-m* (11) and syllabication of words: “*Przed-sta-wia się*” *Uff! To skomplikowane!* (9), *Wi-tka-cy???* (38), “*pu-de-lek*” (41). On the other hand, the repetition of the first syllables of a word (finished with ellipses): *Prze..., prze... - ojej, rozumiem!* (9) is aimed to imitate stuttering pronunciation, which, in this case, is not a disorder, but results from difficulties with articulating a consonant cluster of a word that is unknown to the student.

The introduction of a mathematical sign “+” and a hyphen is aimed at recreating pronunciation which reconstructs the noun formative base of an adjective of quality and a suffix *-owy*⁴, e.g.: *No, malina+owy, truskawka+owy* (54) and a hyphen: *Malina -owy* (54).

The effect of oral discourse was also achieved by multiplying letters in semilexes⁵ serving retarding functions. This way a prolonged phone articulation is presented, which imitates the speaker’s thinking, not as much arising from insufficiently developed linguistic competencies, but rather in connection with the process of simultaneous thinking (decision making) and speaking: *Na pocztę? Yyy, tam jest zawsze kolejka* (102), *Eeee, nie wiem* (147), *Ja nie pojedę, bo... eee, Japończycy na pewno potrzebują wizy, a nie mam już czasu...* (148). The process of structuring an utterance in one’s mind was also presented with application of ellipses: *Adam... to kolega Karola* (31), *To skomplikowane..., ale z zawodu jestem muzykiem. Gram na gitarze, akordeonie, na pianinie... Jestem też instruktorem tanga* (37), and a compilation of ellipses and semilexes in the retarding function: *Wolisz... yyy, no preferujesz, bardziej lubisz* (53), *Hm... dobra kawiarnia... A może klub?* (67), *Hm, hm. To znaczy... z wami wszędzie!* (69). At times, an ellipsis simply signifies voice suspension: *Poznałam bardzo interesujących ludzi, rozmawiałam po polsku, tańczyłam i... wróciłam do domu w niedzielę rano* (85).

In textbooks for teaching Polish as a foreign language exclamatory sentences are often used (Piętkowa 1993:59–60). The examples noted from the *Kpk1* confirm that observation: *Ja się uczę polskiego, bo mój chłopak jest z Polski!* (18), *Bardzo mi miło!* (20), *Ja tylko ćwiczę narzędnik!* (55). One may also get the impression that in the analysed textbook exclamations are overrepresented, which can be seen on the basis of a material sample. In 10 scenes of dialogue I randomly selected from the *Kpk1* book there were 81 declarative, 41 interrogative and 40 exclamatory

³ *Kpk1* page numbers were provided in parenthesis.

⁴ In the CD attached to the book with dialogue recordings the authors proposed the following reading of the notation: *malina+owy* [*malina plus owy*] *truskawka+owy* [*truskawka plus owy*], however my teaching experience shows that students read the above examples also ignoring the plus sign, i.e.: *malina-owy, truskawka-owy*.

⁵ The term *semilexeme* (a defective word) is understood as such words, which have a very general meaning and are characterised by inflectional defects (SPLP:IX).

utterances. For comparison, in the *Hurral* textbook, in an analogous material sample, the proportions were as follows: 106 declarative, 35 interrogative and 6 exclamatory utterances. It thus appears that in the *KpkI* the number of exclamations is similar to the number of interrogative utterances, while in the *Hurral* the interrogative utterances have a significant quantitative advantage over the exclamations, although such big disproportion is not observed in the case of comparison of interrogative and declarative utterances in both textbooks.

R. Mayenowa claimed that punctuation marks, even those connected with expression, did not have gradating value (1974:385). More recent works dedicated to punctuation correctness, however, indicate a possibility of modulating expression with application of multiplied question marks or exclamation marks (Karpowicz 2009:165–169). Examples of this technique may also be found in the analysed textbook. Utterances with multiple exclamation marks indicate very strong emotional charge of utterances: *Bo jest mały. Za mały!!!* (20), *Nie wiemy!!!* (24), *Angela mówiła, że Polki uwielbiają romantycznych mężczyzn!!!* (88), *Fason świetny, rozmiar idealny, ale kolor!!!* (154), similarly as utterances finished with three question marks imply emotions of great astonishment, combined with disbelief: *Angela....., to jest? Torba???* (22), *Nie rozumiem! Trzy rodzaje? Co to jest???* (24), *Kto to jest Adam???* (31), *I to jest minus???* (124). The effect of surprise and consternation of the speaker was achieved in course materials by application of a combination of a question mark and an exclamation mark at the end of an utterance (also in duplicated form): *Czekałaś na mnie na górze?!* (96), *Ty spóźniona?!* (124), *A to? Co to? Mydło? Szampon?! Twoje kosmetyki z książkami?* (129). This method of modulating the emotional charge of an utterance is well known also in the general Polish variety (Karpowicz 2009:167), and in contemporary prose (Skudrzykowa 1993:49).

An interesting example of achieving maximum emotional charge in an utterance is a combined use of capital letters and a triple exclamation mark: *CZEŚĆ!!! Czego słuchasz?* (106). Such notation may serve different functions – for example, in contemporary prose for youth it was a graphic marker denoting significance of words uttered by characters (Święcicka 1999:47–48). *KpkI*, however, refers to internet texts' convention, where spelling with capital letters is a substitute of shouting (Grzenia 2006:120), which makes us aware of the context of a dialogue. On the drawing included next to the text *Angela* – one of the characters in the *KpkI* textbook – is shouting at Mami, who does not hear her, as she is listening to music on headphones.

The use of graphic means to create an illusion of oral discourse often involves breaking the spelling rules. In order to read the text in conformity with the authors' intentions, i.e. to notice the superstructure in the form of an element evoking oral discourse, not only must the learner understand the message on a linguistic level, but he/she must also have literary competencies, i.e. knowledge of the standards and patterns of the literary tradition, which enables members of a given audience to produce and understand, the texts which refer to those standards and patterns (STL). Literary competence, typical of an interpretative community – mainly shaped in the

native language of the learner – must be activated and transposed to the ground of Polish reading texts, in order to enable invoking relevant presuppositions and connotations. This way, using common cultural experience, the learner is in some way forced to interpret the text.

In written texts, the differences between the official, the neutral, and the colloquial Polish become apparent mainly at the level of syntax and lexis (Piętkowa 1993:59–60, Święcicka 1999:9, 235, Synowiec 2007:57), and to a smaller extent at the level of inflection or word formation (Wilkoń 2000:44–45).

The authors of the *Kpkl* textbook decided to give the dialogues a typically colloquial syntactic structure, thus in the analysed book many syntactic structures typical of spoken Polish may be distinguished. In the dialogues there frequently appear incomplete, unfinished and interrupted utterances, e.g.: *Robią tam bardzo dobre drinki i...* (67), *Ale...* (79). *Tam jest muzeum, kawiarnia i...* (94) *Tam jest katedra i...* (94), sentence fragments, e.g.: *A ja to co?* (105) *A może lepiej nie* (102), *Koniec, kropka!* (147), also including compound utterances consisting of several sentence fragments, e.g.: *Ja mogę w Internecie, Javier, ty w gazecie, Angela w radiu, a Mami w telewizji po wiadomościach* (107), *Fason świetny, rozmiar idealny, ale kolor!!!* (154) and elliptical sentences, e.g.: *A ja [mieszka]*⁶ *w Tokio!* (29), *No, jeszcze [zrobimy] zakupy dla mamy i [wracamy] do domu* (51). *Gdzie [jest] Javier?* (96), *[kiedy jest] Zima, to jest zimno* (106), *[tak] Myślisz?* (115). Many utterances consist of simple sentences, e.g.: *Jest piękna i utalentowana. Ona jest aktorką. Jest bardzo popularną aktorką. Pracuje w teatrze w Berlinie* (37) *Yyy, tam jest zawsze kolejka. Ja nie cierpię kolejek! Poza tym jestem bardzo* (102) or compound sentences consisting of a number of independent clauses (also sentence fragments), e.g.: *Proponowałem kawę, lody, obiad, kino, weekend w Zakopanem, prosiłem o numer telefonu, i nic!* (88), *Twoja żona jest bardzo ładna – jest piękna!* (37), *Tam są schody, idealne miejsce* (95), *Jest sympatyczny, przystojny, każda dziewczyna chciałaby się z.....spotykać.* (115), *Mami może spokojnie uczyć się, rysować, palować i długo spać* (122). Utterance fragments frequently function as their independent parts, e.g.: *Fason świetny, rozmiar idealny, ale kolor!!! Okropny! Obrzydliwy! Koszmarny!* (154), *Jak się czujesz? Lepiej?* (168), *Dzwoniłem do was wszystkich. Bez skutku!* (104). These elements form appositions concerning previous structures.

The authors willingly introduce repetitions of words or whole expressions e.g.: *Yyy, to moja znajoma, to znaczy przyjaciółka..., to znaczy moja dziewczyna...* (71), which may indicate an ironic character of the message, e.g.: *Tak, tak, na pewno. Do widzenia.* (48) – the utterance of a saleswoman, who did not believe that an underage person is buying cigarettes for her father; *Wszystko moja droga! Wszystko!* (87) – Javier's response to a question about what he was doing in Zakopane; impatience, irritation or dismissive tone of voice, e.g.: *Dzwonię do ciebie i dzwonię*

⁶ Skipped linguistic elements were indicated in brackets.

(104), *Tak, tak, i okna, i drzwi, i krzyż...* (95), *Prawda, prawda* (115) – lenient reaction to untrue information in a discussion.

Interrogative sentences – just as in the spoken language – start with particles *a, i*, e.g.: *A gdzie ja mogę kupić mapę?* (51) *A co może nam pani polecić?* (65), *A jak często masz urlop?* (76), *A ty pewnie nie dzwoniłeś do Mami i Angeli?* (104), *A ile kosztuje bilet?* (133), *I jak? Smakuje Ci?* (66), *I jak smakuje?* (66), *I co teraz, pani wszystkowiedząca?* (95) *I gdzie jest Karolina?* (96).

Among phenomena from the borderline of syntax and lexis there are conative and phatic signals, used to open and maintain interaction between interlocutors. These elements may appear at the beginning of an utterance (*śłuchaj, wiesz, no, no wiesz, no dobrze*), e.g.: *Śłuchaj, czy mogłabyś mi pomóc zrobić zakupy na piknik?* (99), *Wiesz, w Polsce nie pytamy kobiet, ile mają lat* (35), *Wiesz, ja się boję koni.* (99), *No wiesz, najpierw cebula jest smażona (...)* (62), *No, nie wiem* (101), *No dobrze, kto stoi na górze, a kto na dole?* (95), as well as at the closing of an utterance (*tak, prawda*): *Rozumiem, self-service, tak?* (51) *W doniczce, tak?* (60), *To po polsku się mówi, że jestem*, *tak?* (71). *Urzędowy, tak?* (102) *Fajna fotografia, prawda?* (22), *A “napisać” i “przeczytać” to nie jest rzeczownik, prawda?* (24), *W Argentynie tego nie macie, prawda?* (107), and sporadically also in inter-word position, e.g.: *A to urodziny, tak, nie imieniny?* (136).

The examples, presented, above mainly typical of spoken texts, may facilitate and encourage students to freely speak the Polish language. Due to a simplified syntax, which to a greater extent than in other textbooks resembles a freely spoken language, the student may feel less restricted and limited in the independent formulation of longer utterances. On the other hand, it should not be forgotten that using colloquial syntactic structures in course materials increases the probability of their learning. This is also a way to create a conviction about the marginalized role of syntax in learning the Polish language.

Colloquial vocabulary forms an important spoken element in the *Kpk1* textbook. In the analysed role plays and dialogues, but also in the exercises, we find over 100 colloquial lexemes⁷, of which only 8 words: *cześć, no, bo, polski* ‘the Polish language’, *impreza, wiesz, komórka, w porządku* appear with a frequency above 10 uses in *Kpk1*. Moreover, among the frequently appearing colloquialisms (a frequency of 3 to 10 uses) there are lexemes: *dziewczyna* ‘girlfriend, fiancée’, *tata, fajny, jasne* ‘of course’, *mama, super, okropny, o tak* ‘good, agreed’, *strasznie* ‘very, immensely’ *halo*.

Common and generally well known colloquial words noted from the *Kpk1* belong to different thematic fields⁸. The most numerous group are expressions of

⁷ This number includes traditional lexemes and multi-component expressions, meeting the semantic indivisibility criterion. For purposes of calculations semilexemes and phrasemes were not included (see: SPLP:IX).

⁸ The classification of words according to semantic fields, which I applied for the purposes of this outline, is significantly subjective, and particular fields also contain units loosely related with the semantic core of proposed fields in terms of meaning. Such, largely simplified, picture of linguistic fields – was forced by the relatively limited scope of presented material.

politeness, honorifics and conative expressions, usually aimed at initiating or closing contact: *bez dyskusji, chodzi (o), cześć, do jutra, dobra, dzięki, halo, hej, kochana* ‘a term used to address a woman indicating familiarity’, *kropka* ‘the end, the discussion is over’, (*moja*) *droga, na razie, ok, pa, po staremu, tu* ‘speaking; the term used, among others, in a telephone conversation’, *w porządku*⁹ and particles, filler pauses, exclamations and conjunctions (synsemantic words): *ach tak, bo, co* ‘what do you think about it’, *coś ty, fakt, faktycznie, jasne, kurczę, no, o Boże, o tak, prawda, serio, słuchaj, wiesz*. Colloquial vocabulary in the *Kpk1* textbook is to a significant degree associated with the circles concerning family and friends: *mama, tata, babcia, wujek, chłopak* ‘fiancé, partner’, *dziewczyna* ‘girlfriend, fiancée’, *pogadać, randka, impreza, umówić się, wpaść* ‘come over, visit’, work: *firma, komórka, korek* ‘traffic jam’, *ochrona, robota, stacjonarny* ‘landline phone’, *sześć, telefon* ‘telephone number’, emotions: *beznadziejny, bosko, dobry* ‘successful, brilliant, fantastically, fantastyczny, fatalnie, fuj, hurra, kiepski, klimat ‘ambience of a place or work’, *koszmarny, niezły, okropny, strasznie* ‘terribly’, *straszny, super, w końcu, wściekły*, and human character: *fajny, gadatliwy, marudny, okropny, stuprocentowy*. Also fields identifying measures, weights, degrees and units of time are abundant: *bałagan, kilo, malutki, strasznie* ‘very, intensely’, *straszny* ‘big, enormous’, *potwornie* ‘very’, *zero, z hakiem, od ręki, moment, normalnie* ‘usually, on a daily basis’.

Colloquial vocabulary in the *Kpk1* textbook does not appear in connection with one, specific subject or lesson, but is used on the occasion of introducing various content. Usually colloquialisms from a given linguistic field are used in a lesson dedicated to a specific issue. For instance, in the case of subjects dedicated to food and shopping (lessons 8–10) lexemes: *biała* ‘coffee with milk’, *czarna* ‘coffee without milk’, *drink, kilo, pyszny, przepyszny, niezły, okropny* appear. These words add variety to a dialog or exercise, therefore many subjects are only represented by one or several colloquialisms, e.g.: medical conditions: *kac*, free time: *impreza, kryminal, walentynki*, countries: *Stany, Anglia*, shopping: *brać* ‘to buy’, *opłacać się, gratis, kasa*, languages: *polski, hiszpański*.

It should be added that colloquial vocabulary in *Kpk1* materials is not signalled or highlighted in any way in the text. Also, in language textbooks intended for Polish children and youth colloquialisms are not marked (Synowiec 2007:54–55). It should be noted, however, that disregarding colloquial qualification (unless the information about a colloquial character of a word is provided by the teacher) may promote making stylistic mistakes, consisting in assigning a word to an inadequate language register.

⁹ Due to the trip of one of the book’s characters to Zakopane, in an exercise, which has a character of a comic book, the form *panoczek* (87) appears, which is a dialect form – typical of, among others, southern and western Maiopolska – the word *panoczek* ‘a man from the city, also a honorific’ (MSGP). This form is also well known to Polish language users from other regions of Poland.

To a certain extent, in the *Kpkl* textbook, also expressions and phrasemes¹⁰ are used to indicate a spoken language style, for example such as: *czarna magia* ‘something completely incomprehensible’: *Ale na przykład tango, czy akordeon, to dla mnie czarna magia!* (38), *raz kozie śmierć!* (158) ‘let it be, it does not matter’. In order to explain them in the textbook a strategy is used of a character – a foreigner, indicating that an idiom used by another character is confusing. Then the Polish speakers from the reading explain the problematic expression, whereby also a foreigner actually learning the Polish language receives a plain explanation of an idiom, as, for example, is the case in the fragment quoted below:

Mami: Poproszę kawę.

Karol: Jaką kawę? Białą czy czarną?

Mami: Białą? Kawa zawsze jest czarna. Tylko herbata jest czarna, zielona, biała.

Karolina: Biała – to znaczy z mlekiem.

Mami: Teraz rozumiem. Poproszę białą kawę.

In papers dedicated to creation of colloquial dialogues in written texts it is emphasized that inflection is used by authors to achieve the effect of oral discourse in a rather insignificant degree (Skudrzykova 1994:85–87). It is thus not surprising that also in the *Kpkl* textbook only several examples of unofficial spoken elements connected with words inflection may be found.

Most frequently we are dealing with occurrence of redundant personal pronouns in the first and the second person of the singular apart from finite verb forms e.g.: *Mami, a co ty robisz dzisiaj?* (41), *Ja też lubię słuchać muzyki* (43), *A gdzie ja mogę kupić mapę?* (51), *Ja wolę masło* (53), even in those sentences, which do not have a contrastive function: *Wiesz, ja się boję koni.* (99). *Ja nie cierpię kolejek* (102), *Ty to umiesz organizować pracę jak prawdziwy biznesmen* (107). It seems that in the textbook the redundant element in the form of a personal pronoun indicates the manner of speaking typical of colloquial Polish, but also facilitates teaching foreigners conjugative verb forms.

In addition, in inflection of the acronym SMS¹¹ a form of accusative equal to genitive was introduced: *Czekam jeszcze na SMS-a* (69), *im SMS-a, kiedy coś zaplanujemy* (147). Today, it is a variety acceptable by less restrictive standard of

¹⁰ I disregard those examples of phrasemes, which appear in lesson 25 *Ani ręką, ani nogą...* as they form an intentional teaching subject in that didactic unit.

¹¹ Apart from traditionally distinguished groups of masculine nouns, which in the singular have accusative equal to genitive (e.g. nouns denominating the deceased, supernatural and fantastic, names of dances, games, money, fungi, fruits, dishes, viruses and bacteria, cigarettes, alcohols, manufactured goods (Jadacka 2005:23, Bugajski 2008:71)), in colloquial variety of the Polish language also a group of words connected with electronic communication (e.g. *laptop, netbook, smartfon, blog, e-mail*) adopt Accusative=Nominative. (Bugajski 2008:67–71).

the Polish language, although in an exemplary way, in declension of that word the use of accusative identical to nominative is recommended (WSJP, Poprawnie 2007:170, IPJ PWN¹², WSOJP).

Sporadically, in the *Kpkl*, there appear forms of vocative equal to nominative, e.g.: *Cześć Sylwia!* (99), *Karol! Jesteś okropny* (102). As was noted by H. Jadacka, the use of nominative instead of vocative is typical of colloquial Polish and may be acceptable only at the level of a usable standard (2005:61–62).

At the word formation level, diminutive forms of first names are used, e.g.: *Basia, Amelka, Zosia, Janka, Małgosia* (72). Whereas, on the basis of the text of the exercise, it transpires that names of children and youth were used in the diminutive form: *Amelka* (3 years old), *Małgosia* (13 years old), *Janka* (21 years old), and the names of adults: *Barbara* (married, a mother of one child), *Zosia* (married, a mother of two), despite the fact that the analysed utterance bears the marks of formal tenor, as it is finished with the sentence: *Bardzo mi miło Państwa poznać.* (72).

In the textbook *Polski, krok po kroku 1* (A1 level) the creation of dialogues in spoken language is visible nearly at all linguistic levels. The authors used syntax, vocabulary, graphics and punctuation in the broadest scope, while inflection, word formation and phraseology to a narrower extent¹³. The diversity and superficiality (maybe apart from syntax) of introduced linguistic elements result in the fact that the colloquial variety of the Polish language in the *Kpkl* does not form the subject of intentional and conscious teaching, and mainly serves creating an impression of oral discourse, natural character and linguistic freedom typical of daily, inoformal contacts. On the other hand, however, if we assume that every language textbook propagates specific models of correctness and appropriateness in terms of language and culture, then in the book *Polski, krok po kroku 1* priority is given mainly to the colloquial, every day patterns and those that are used by Poles in casual contacts.

ЛІТЕРАТУРА// BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bugajski 2008:** Bugajski M. Puszczam strzałę bo mam stresa. (Uwagi o formach biernika rzeczowników męskich). // *Reverendissimae Halinae Satkiewicz cum magna aestimatione*, ed. G. Dąbkowski, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo i Drukarnia Plejada, 67–75.
- Dembowska-Wosik 2014:** Dembowska-Wosik I. Recenzja serii materiałów do nauczania jppo „Polski, krok po kroku”. // *Acta Universitatis Lodzianensis. Kształcenie Polonistyczne Cudzoziemców*, Vol.. 21, 413–416.

¹² <http://sjp.pwn.pl/poradnia/haslo/SMS-czy-SMS-a;5033.html> (access on 4.04.2016).

¹³ In novels for youth the notation reflecting different phonetic processes, e.g. consonant simplifications or dissimilation was used as an element of creating the oral discourse impression (Święcicka 1999:41–42).

- Grzenia 2006:** Grzenia J. *Komunikacja językowa w Internecie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Hurra1:** Małolepsza M., Szymkiewicz A. *Hurra!!! Po polsku 1. Podręcznik studenta*. Kraków: Prolog. 2002.
- Jadacka 2005:** Jadacka H. *Kultura języka polskiego. Fleksja, słowotwórstw, składnia*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Karpowicz 2009:** Karpowicz T. *Kultura języka polskiego. Wymowa, ortografia i interpunkcja*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Kpk1:** Stempel I., Stelmach A., Dawidek S., Szymkiewicz A. *Polski, krok po kroku. Poziom A1*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo: polsh-courses.com. 2011.
- Lubaś 2003:** Lubaś W. *Polskie gadanie. Podstawowe cechy i funkcje potocznej odmiany polszczyzny*. Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski.
- Mayenowa 1974:** Mayenowa M. *Poetyka teoretyczna. Zagadnienia języka*. Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- MSGP:** *Mały słownik gwar polskich*. Ed. J. Wronicz. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Lexis. 2010.
- Piętkowa 1993:** Piętkowa R. Normatywność w podręcznikach języka polskiego dla cudzoziemców. // *Z problemów współczesnego języka polskiego*. Ed. A. Wilkoń, J. Warchała, Katowice: Uniwersytet Śląski. S. 56–66.
- Poprawnie 2007:** *Poprawnie po polsku: poradnik językowy PWN*. Comp. A. Kubiak-Sokół. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Skudrzykowa 1993:** Skudrzykowa A. *O pewnym sposobie tworzenia iluzji mówioności*. // *Z problemów współczesnego języka polskiego*. Ed. A. Wilkoń, J. Warchała, Katowice: Uniwersytet Śląski. S. 42–55.
- Skudrzykowa 1994:** Skudrzykowa A. *Język (za)pisany*. Katowice: Uniwersytet Śląski.
- Synowiec 2007:** Synowiec H. *Potoczność w wybranych podręcznikach kształcenia językowego*. // *Potoczność a zachowania językowe Polaków*. Ed. B. Boniecka, S. Grabias. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej. S. 49–60.
- SPLP:** *Słownik polskich leksemów potocznych*. Ed. W. Lubaś. Vol. 1–7 (). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Lexis. 2001–2014.
- STL:** *Słownik terminów literackich*. Ed. J. Sławińskiego, Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich. 2002.
- Szamryk 2016:** Szamryk K. *Problemy związane z leksyką potoczną (na przykładzie materiału z podręczników na nauki języka polskiego jako obcego na poziomie A1)*. // *Z problematyki kształcenia językowego*. Ed. E. Awramiuk M. Karolczuk. Białystok: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku. S. 107–119.
- Święcicka 1999:** Święcicka M. *Kreacja dialogu potocznego we współczesnej polskiej prozie dla młodzieży*. Bydgoszcz: Wydawnictwo Uczelniane Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej.
- Tambor 2010:** Tambor J. *Granice potoczności w nauczaniu języka polskiego jako obcego przemiany leksykalne, fonetyczne, fleksyjne i słowotwórcze we współczesnej polszczyźnie*. // *Polonistyka bez granic*. Vol. 2. *Glottodydaktyka polonistyczna*. Ed. R. Nycz, W. Miodunka, T. Kunz. Kraków: Universitas. S. 311-320.
- Wilkoń 2000:** Wilkoń A. *Typologia odmian językowych współczesnej polszczyzny*. Katowice.
- WSJP:** *Wielki słownik języka polskiego*. www.wsjp.pl

WSOJP: *Wielki słownik ortograficzny PWN*. Ed. E. Polański. Warszawa:

Wydawnictwo naukowe PWN. 2011.

Zdunkiewicz-Jedynak 2008: Zdunkiewicz-Jedynak D. *Wykłady ze stylistyki*. Warszawa:

Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.