

HIGHER EDUCATION LANGUAGE TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR COMPETENCES



*Mihaela Zavašnik **

Filozofski fakultet, Ljubljana

Foreign language (FL) skills play a key role in ensuring the social, cultural, and economic integration of Europe. The Bologna Process and the Lisbon Strategy put FL learning skills on the list of the basic skills regarded as indispensable for the future employability of students, student mobility and the demands of the knowledge based economy. For this reason, language learning needs to be an integral part of the education of all European citizens at all levels of education, including higher education (HE). Teaching FL in HE also makes significant demands on the teaching competences of language teachers. As there is hardly any country in Europe offering pre-service language teacher training for HE teachers, the support for their professional development is vital. This article reports on English as a foreign language (EFL) teacher education needs analysis in non-linguistic HE institutions/departments in Slovenia. In spring 2006, needs analysis was conducted among 45 (70 %) practising EFL teachers in HE institutions. The main aim of the study was to identify and evaluate 33 listed EFL teacher (sub) competences in two different categories: the target situation category and the present situation category. The analysis results indicate that besides linguistic competence in general there are also other (sub)competences of vital importance for effective EFL teaching in HE, especially lexical competence, grammatical competence, language teaching competence in general, the ability to apply various approaches, methods and techniques in relation to language skills, vocabulary and grammar teaching, the ability to critically evaluate, develop and apply teaching materials and resources, the ability to apply various assessment procedures, the ability to introduce, foster and apply strategies of autonomous learning and study skills, and subject-knowledge competence. Furthermore, it seems that there exists room for professional development programmes to cater for the teachers' knowledge and skills necessary to teach EFL in HE as the perceived gaps between the present and target situations are in some competences still statistically considered as *large*.

Keywords: language teaching, higher education, language for specific purposes, English as a foreign language, teacher training, needs analysis, teacher competences

1. INTRODUCTION



Higher education (HE) in Europe is currently strongly influenced by the Bologna Process. The main goal of the Bologna Process calls for a re-thinking of aims and organisation of HE in view of *'the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and social cohesion'* (Berlin Communiqué, 2003: 2). In order to reach such a European society, developing graduates' foreign language skills seems to be of crucial importance.

Foreign language (FL) skills play a decisive role for the employability of workers in the multilingual Europe, for the mobility of students, and for the development of multilingual communication skills accompanying the graduates' academic and professional education. Despite enjoying a relatively high degree of autonomy, higher education sector has responsibilities and duties regarding the promotion of languages, too. Universities should provide *'students, regardless of their field of specialisation, with opportunities for improving their knowledge in languages, for learning new languages, for becoming more independent in their language learning, and for taking a number of credits in languages'* (Mackiewicz, 2003: 97). Nevertheless, it can be noticed that FL learning in HE has not been given as much acknowledgement as at primary and secondary school levels. Unfortunately, it is regrettable to see that a number of universities, while attempting to transform traditional four- or five-year programmes into three-year undergraduate programmes, have made the language component optional or even dropped FL learning from their first-cycle programmes (see e.g. Council of Europe, 2007; Klapper, 2006; European Language Council & ENLU, 2006).

In 2003, the European Commission adopted the *Action plan for the promotion of language learning and linguistic diversity*. The Action plan proposed a series of actions to be taken at European level; among others it set up a project *European Network for the Promotion of Language Learning among all Undergraduates* (ENLU), which aimed to establish a European network of higher education institutions and other relevant bodies which share the conviction that FL competence is an essential part of every graduate. As part of the ENLU project, Tudor (2005) conducted a survey on the notion of HE language policy among 32 representatives of HE institutions in Europe. The results revealed that 10 HE institutions had a language policy implemented, 9 representatives said there was no language policy at their HE institution, and further 13 representatives stated that their HE institutions were developing a language policy. The majority of respondents (23) reported on the awareness of obstacles which could stand in the way of the realisation of a language policy. Three main categories of obstacles were identified, i.e. financial resources, awareness and attitudes of the decision makers, and organisational/institutional obstacles. The results indicate that the initiatives were taken to set up a language policy at certain institutions, but there are still wide gaps between a theoretical set up of a language policy and decisive steps to be made regarding the implementation of such a policy in practice. The new network, *Higher Education Language Policy* (HELP), which is based on the Nancy Declaration (European Language Council and ENLU 2006), now seeks ways to show how to bridge the gaps mentioned above.

One of the most important enabling conditions to be taken into consideration for a

successful language policy development and its implementation relates to human resources, i.e. HE language teachers and language teacher training. Teaching FL in HE makes significant demands on the teaching competences of language teachers. The majority of HE language teachers are arts trained, following the same training routes as their primary and secondary school language teaching colleagues, usually occupy a lower rank on the academic ladder (Zavašnik, 2006; Klapper, 2006) and have little prospects of career advancement. As there is hardly any country in Europe offering pre-service language teacher training for HE teachers, the support for continuous professional development (e.g. postgraduate courses, in-service teacher training) is vital. So far, only a few scattered reports indicate that surveys have been conducted in order to identify the needs of HE language teachers (see Tudor, 2004). This means that catering for HE language teacher training and development has not been given as much attention as it could and should have been.



In the survey presented in this paper, we wished to establish what the perceived target needs of HE language teachers are and how they compare to those at present. By doing so, we attempted to capture different aspects of HE language teacher needs in view of their competences. An attempt to identify and evaluate the training needs of HE language teachers enables the second and third cycle Bologna programmes in preparation and/or (re)evaluation to be geared towards the needs perceived and expressed by the already practising HE language teachers.

In Slovenia (a country in which the survey was conducted), none of the universities or HE institutions has yet developed a coherent language policy. Non-linguistic faculties/departments have the right to establish their own language curriculum, which may differ for particular faculties. This means that the number of hours assigned to FL learning at an individual university/faculty is subject to the faculty's own desires. By doing so, there are some faculties where FL learning is mandatory, yet there are some where it is practically non-existent. Still, where there are FL courses offered, the English language remains the most widely learnt and taught FL in HE. As HE institutions in Slovenia are autonomous with regard to the offer of foreign language courses, the HE language teachers are equally autonomous with regard to the content of the course. A quick look at the 'course titles' of the language courses offered at HE institutions (see Djurić et al., 2008) reveals that the course title in most cases does not reflect the actual course content, so it is impossible to tell apart whether the course is 'specific' (as in Language for Specific Purposes/LSP) or 'general' in its content. Furthermore, as far as the status of HE language teachers is concerned, the survey carried out by Zavašnik (2006) revealed that the status question of HE language teachers is the one that sets them apart from their (non language teaching) colleagues. Namely, the majority of HE language teachers in Slovenia reported on a lower status/grade than other subject teachers and language teaching often being regarded as 'unacademic'.

It can be noticed that HE language learning and teaching in Slovenia faces numerous problems, which cannot be solved immediately. Nevertheless, the study in this paper touches upon one aspect of the problems, i.e. HE English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers' perceptions of their competences, with the aim to provide a deeper insight into the needs of HE language teachers.

2. METHOD



The study was based on a representative sample of the target group, i.e. EFL teachers at non-linguistic HE institutions/faculties/departments in Slovenia. Out of a pool of possible informants, 45 teachers (70%) completed the questionnaire. The teachers were sampled from all the existing Slovenian universities. All sampled teachers were more than 30 years old and almost half of them had had more than 20 years of experience in English teaching. The majority (64%) of them held at least a master's degree.

A questionnaire based on the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment* (2001) and the *European Profile for Language Teacher Education – A Frame of Reference* (Kelly et al., 2004) was developed and aimed to explore two categories of needs perceptions: the target situation category and the present situation category (see Appendix 1). The categories were divided into 33 (sub)competences. Some categories received more attention than others (e.g. linguistic and language teaching competences). The questions required ratings on a five point Likart (self-)assessment scale, with 1 being the lowest rating (*no importance or not acquired*), and 5 the highest (*very strong/vital importance or acquired a lot*). The survey was distributed among the teachers in spring 2006.

The data from the study was computer analysed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Information was coded according to the needs analysis questions. In order to determine the differences between the means of the categories, descriptives (mean, standard deviation) and the paired samples *t*-test were run. In addition, the Cohen *d* value (see Cohen 1988) – the effect size measure of the standardised differences between means – was determined. In scientific experiments, it is useful to know not only whether an experiment has a statistically significant effect, but also the size of the observed effects. In practical situations, effect sizes are helpful for making decisions. Cohen (1988) defined effect sizes as *small* ($d = 0.2$), *medium* ($d = 0.5$) and *large* ($d = 0.8$).

3. RESULTS

With respect to the importance of competences (i.e. **target situation**) for effective EFL teaching in HE (see Table 1 below), the mean values of the sample indicated the highest levels (i.e. of vital/very strong importance) for the following competences: linguistic competence in general (4.88), lexical competence (4.82), the ability to introduce, foster and apply strategies of autonomous learning and study skills, independent language learning strategies (4.75), the ability to critically evaluate, develop and apply teaching materials and resources (4.73), language teaching competence in general (4.68), the ability to apply various assessment procedures and ways of recording learners' progress (4.68), grammatical competence (4.64), personal qualities (4.64) and the ability to apply various approaches, methods and techniques (4.62). The lowest mean values were observed for literary competence (2.42) and competence related to the knowledge/skills of historical grammar and comparative linguistics (2.91). The mean values of the sample were not lower than 2.0 indicating that none of the competences


was rated of *no importance* according to the assessment scale.

The second category observed, i.e. **present situation** (see Table 1 below), revealed the following results. The highest mean values indicating the highest perceived needs of HE EFL teachers were observed for grammatical competence (4.27), personal qualities (4.22), linguistic competence in general (4.18), lexical competence (4.18), the ability to critically evaluate, develop and apply teaching materials and resources (4.11) and orthographic competence (4.09). The following competences received the lowest ratings: linguistic and educational research competences (3.25), curricular and educational law knowledge (3.27), literary competence (3.36) and ICT competence (3.40). Nevertheless, the lowest mean values still scored as *average* according to the assessment scale.

Table 1 also shows the differences between the results in both categories. Cohen *d* was run for the effect size of the **differences between means of the graduation and target situation perceptions** of HE teacher competences. It is immediately apparent that the differences between the two categories are statistically highly significant. The majority of Cohen *d* measures (26 out of 33) are higher than 0.5 ($d > 0.5$), indicating that the effect sizes of the differences between the perceptions of the present situation and the target situation are defined (at least) as *medium*. 13 Cohen *d* measures are found to be defined as *large* ($d > 0.8$), indicating that the effect sizes of the differences between the perceptions of the present situation and the target situation are so big to be seriously considered in practical situations. The largest gaps ($d > 0.8$) were perceived in linguistic competence in general ($d = -1.39$), lexical competence ($d = -1.18$), ICT competence ($d = -1.18$), the ability to apply various assessment procedures and ways of recording learners' progress ($d = -1.14$), the ability to introduce, foster and apply strategies of autonomous learning and study skills, independent language learning strategies ($d = -1.12$), professional development competence ($d = -1.11$) and general language teaching competence ($d = -1.08$). The majority of the remaining Cohen *d* measures which were defined as *large* ($d > 0.8$) can be observed with the competences related to language teaching in general, especially the ability to apply various approaches/methods and techniques ($d = -0.89$) and subject-knowledge competence ($d = -0.97$). HE language teachers perceive that they have not acquired these competences to the extent they feel they should have.

The lowest effect size differences are found with phonological competence ($d = +0.02$), the ability to recognize and use register differences, dialect and accent ($d = -0.24$), orthographic competence ($d = -0.29$), general teaching competence ($d = -0.32$) and pragmatic competence ($d = -0.42$). The perceived present situation levels of these competences most closely approached the perceived target levels, indicating that with respect to these particular competences, the Slovenian HE EFL teachers deem that they have acquired enough knowledge in comparison to the perceived importance/need/wish.



Table 1. HE EFL teacher representations of the mean values, differences and Cohen *d* at present and target situations (N=45)


Competences	Present situation M (SD)	Target situation M (SD)	Differences	t-test (df)	Cohen <i>d</i>
1	4.18 (0.58)	4.88 (0.38)	- 0.70	- 7.39	- 1.39
2	4.18 (0.62)	4.82 (0.38)	- 0.63	- 6.88	- 1.18
3	4.27 (0.62)	4.64 (0.67)	- 0.36	- 2.97	- 0.54
4	4.02 (0.66)	4.55 (0.62)	- 0.52	- 4.54	- 0.79
5	3.79 (0.85)	3.80 (0.99)	+ 0.02	+ 0.14	+ 0.02
6	4.09 (0.64)	4.33 (0.85)	- 0.22	- 1.53	- 0.29
7	3.50 (0.76)	2.91 (0.97)	+ 0.59	+ 3.76	+ 0.65
8	3.88 (0.61)	4.31 (0.76)	- 0.45	- 3.96	- 0.65
9	3.93 (0.66)	4.31 (0.79)	- 0.40	- 3.91	- 0.55
10	3.84 (0.71)	4.02 (0.94)	- 0.20	- 1.50	- 0.24
11	3.90 (0.67)	4.17 (0.80)	- 0.29	- 2.38	- 0.42
12	3.84 (0.60)	4.20 (0.86)	- 0.38	- 2.86	- 0.50
13	3.36 (0.91)	2.42 (1.05)	+ 0.93	+ 5.19	+ 0.84
14	3.97 (0.69)	4.68 (0.55)	- 0.72	- 6.94	- 1.08
15	4.00 (0.71)	4.53 (0.72)	- 0.54	- 4.75	- 0.75
16	3.97 (0.76)	4.62 (0.61)	- 0.65	- 5.86	- 0.89
17	4.06 (0.75)	4.31 (0.76)	- 0.25	- 2.12	- 0.41
18	4.11 (0.72)	4.73 (0.53)	- 0.63	- 5.03	- 0.77
19	3.52 (0.66)	4.02 (0.86)	- 0.50	- 4.03	- 0.72
20	3.88 (0.72)	4.48 (0.66)	- 0.61	- 4.83	- 0.84
21	4.00 (0.68)	4.68 (0.55)	- 0.68	- 6.11	- 1.14
22	3.97 (0.69)	4.75 (0.43)	- 0.77	- 6.90	- 1.12
23	3.38 (0.75)	3.75 (0.82)	- 0.38	- 2.95	- 0.51
24	3.68 (0.77)	4.11 (0.98)	- 0.40	- 2.60	- 0.32
25	3.70 (0.73)	4.22 (0.95)	- 0.52	- 4.74	- 0.92
26	3.25 (0.86)	3.88 (0.88)	- 0.68	- 4.05	- 0.87
27	3.40 (0.84)	4.33 (0.67)	- 0.93	- 5.57	- 1.18
28	3.59 (0.87)	4.20 (0.86)	- 0.65	- 3.64	- 0.55
29	3.90 (0.60)	4.57 (0.62)	- 0.68	- 7.08	- 0.97
30	3.65 (0.83)	4.40 (0.86)	- 0.77	- 6.62	- 1.11
31	4.22 (0.77)	4.64 (0.52)	- 0.43	- 3.77	- 0.53
32	4.06 (0.69)	4.46 (0.69)	- 0.40	- 4.12	- 0.58
33	3.27 (0.75)	3.66 (1.00)	- 0.40	- 2.86	- 0.46

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of the survey was to develop a list of HE EFL teacher competences and evaluate them at two different categories of perceptions – target situation and preset situation

– by their main informants. The conducted survey can help us to identify the needs of HE language teachers and detect the most critical points for their professional development.

The analysis of the results showed that HE EFL teachers perceive that their vital needs lie in both the linguistic and language teaching domains, particularly in:

- linguistic competence in general,
- lexical competence,
- the ability to introduce, foster and apply strategies of autonomous learning and study skills, independent language learning strategies,
- the ability to critically evaluate, develop and apply teaching materials and resources,
- language teaching competence in general,
- the ability to apply various assessment procedures and ways of recording learners' progress,
- grammatical competence,
- personal qualities and the ability to apply various approaches, methods and techniques.



Nevertheless, it should be pointed out that apart from literary competence and competence related to the knowledge and skills related to historical grammar and comparative linguistics other competences listed still scored as being of *average/considerable* importance/need. Perhaps surprisingly high scored lexical competence and the ability to critically evaluate, develop and apply teaching materials and resources. The high score of the former can be a reflection of HE EFL teachers teaching language for specific purpose to make language learning relevant to students' needs which calls for a higher specialisation of vocabulary and thus placing higher demands on the language teacher acquisition of specific lexis. Such assumption is also closely linked with a relatively high perception need of HE EFL teachers regarding their subject-knowledge competence (i.e. knowledge of the subject the language is related to) and could lead to the belief that the majority of HE language teachers in Slovenia teach language for specific purposes. If the assumptions are true, then the perceived high target levels of the ability to critically evaluate, develop and apply teaching materials and resources are not surprising as language for specific purposes teachers generally face the lack of teaching materials in comparison to general English teachers for whom numerous language textbooks exist. The lack of teaching materials urges teachers to develop their own materials in order to satisfy the students' language needs arising from a variety of their specialisations.

With regard to the acquired present needs the results indicate that HE EFL teachers feel most confident in grammatical competence, personal qualities, linguistic competence in general, lexical competence, the ability to critically evaluate, develop and apply teaching materials and resources, and orthographic competence. The high score of the ability to critically evaluate, develop and apply teaching materials and resources is also reflected in an extensive series of HE English language textbooks published in Slovenia by the Slovenian authors. On the other hand, teachers feel least competent in linguistic and educational research competences, curricular and educational law knowledge, literary competence and ICT competence. The result is not surprising since apart from literary competence, none of

the mentioned competences has been included in any of pre-service, post-graduate or other in-service teacher training programmes in Slovenia.

Comparing both categories the results revealed the existence of some large gaps between the perception of competences between the target and present situation categories. The effect sizes exceeded the Cohen d value 0.8 ($d > 0.8$) in 13 competences. The results show that HE EFL teachers expressed having difficulties in meeting the perceived target levels of needs in time of research. The largest gaps were perceived in linguistic competence in general, lexical competence, ICT competence, the ability to apply various assessment procedures and ways of recording learners' progress, the ability to introduce, foster and apply strategies of autonomous learning and study skills, independent language learning strategies, professional development competence, general language teaching competence, the ability to apply various approaches/methods and techniques and subject-knowledge competence. In other words, the results indicate that HE language teachers felt that their competence in the areas indicating large gaps might not be up to the challenge of effective language teaching. This could be due to the failing pre-service and continuous professional development programmes of HE language teachers in Slovenia.

The findings raise numerous issues regarding the professional development of HE language teachers. On the basis of the results, several practical recommendations can be considered, especially regarding the second and third cycle programmes of the Bologna process.

Firstly, modern languages departments, which are the primary carrier of the HE language teachers' trainings, should strengthen and carefully examine the studies and research in relation to the needs of HE language teachers taking into consideration their largest identified perceived gaps and structure the Bologna programmes around them. The first and second cycle of the Bologna programmes should be geared towards more general linguistic and language teaching competences identified by the major stakeholders, i.e. practising language teachers at all levels, but already offering some modules and credit points in terms of competences for HE language teachers, whereas the third cycle Bologna programme should focus more on specific language and teaching competences. Also, the second and third cycle programmes should seek ways to establish special Master and Doctoral programmes for HE language teachers. Similar initiatives have already been taken up in some countries, e.g. Belgium (see Tudor, 2004). Such programmes would offer the possibility of catering for more focused and locally relevant HE teacher development.

Secondly, more consideration should be given to the local, regional, national and international cooperation of HE language teachers. Smaller countries (like Slovenia) normally face problems with regard to a small number of HE language teachers, who usually work in isolation. Cooperation on various levels and regarding special purposes (e.g. sharing of resources, materials development, assessment, joint instruction, teacher mobility and/or exchange) would strengthen good practices and initiate projects, which would help to establish pedagogical structures necessary for HE language teacher education and training across Europe.

Thirdly, raising the awareness of all HE institutions regarding the realisation of coherent



language policies is crucial. As far as a language component in non-linguistic faculties/departments is concerned, it is generally seen by managers as a non-cost effective and non-academic component. Also, HE language teachers' qualifications and expertise are often questioned. Apart from language teachers, other academic staff need to be made aware of how important it is to include foreign language learning in every curriculum. The necessity for the inclusion of a foreign language component into all programmes can be motivated by the fact that a considerable amount of business across Europe is being lost as a result of lack of foreign language skills (see CILT, 2006). By supporting language learning in HE, a significant credit would be added to HE language teachers enabling them achieve higher qualifications, expertise and status.

Finally, it is necessary to strengthen the need for constant HE language teacher needs assessment. It is recommended this be a top priority for the modern language departments, associations, networks and other stakeholders in order to keep up with the demands the European society is placing upon HE language teachers.

The present survey offers a partial insight into the needs of HE language teachers thereby providing a potentially successful model for other researchers and interest parties around Europe. Hopefully, its recommendations and/or disseminations will improve the overall situation of HE language teachers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- *Berlin Communiqué. Realizing the European Higher Education Area.* (2003): <http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/pdf/Communique1.pdf>. (5.9.2008)
- CILT. (2006): *ELAN: Effects on the European Economy of Shortages of Foreign Language Skills in Enterprise*, http://www.cilt.org.uk/research/projects/employment/elan_finalreport.pdf. (5.9.2008)
- Cohen, J. (1988): *Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ, USA, Erlbaum.
- Council of Europe. (2001): *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge, CUP.
- Council of Europe. (2007): *From linguistic diversity to plurilingual education: Guide for the development of language education policies in Europe*. http://www.coe.int/T/DG4/Linguistic/Source/Guide_Main_Beacco2007_EN.doc. (5.9.2008)
- Djurić, M., V. Jurkovič, Š. Godnič Vičič. (2008): *Languages for specific purposes in Slovenian higher education: course titles, language levels, course hours, objectives and materials* [In Slovenian]. In: Skela, J. (ed.), *Learning and teaching foreign languages in Slovenia: State of the Art*: Ljubljana, Tangram, 523-542.





- European Language Council and ENLU. (2006): *Nancy Declaration. Multilingual Universities for a Multilingual Europe Open to the World*. http://www.campuseuropae.org/en/support/docs/langlearning/enlu_nancy_declaration.pdf. (5.9.2008)
- Howard, R. G. Brown (eds.). (1997): *Teacher education for LSP*. Clevedon, USA, Multilingual Matters.
- Kelly, M. et al. (2004): *European Profile for Language Teacher Education - A Frame of Reference*. UK, University of Southampton.
- Klapper, J. (2006): *Understanding and developing good practice. Language teaching in higher education*. London, CILT.
- Mackiewicz, W. (2003): *Language policy and language education policy at European Union level*. In: David Head et al. (eds.), *Setting the agenda for languages in higher education*: London, CILT, 89-100.
- Tudor, I. (2004): *Benchmarks for higher education language policy. Report prepared on the basis of the activities of ENLU Task force 1 – 2004*. http://userpage.fu-berlin.de/~enlu/downloads/TF1_report_final.rtf. (5.9.2008)
- Tudor, I. (2005): *Higher education language policy in Europe: a snapshot of action and trends*. http://userpage.fu-berlin.de/~enlu/downloads/HELP_Snapshot.rtf. (5.9.2008)
- West, R. (1994): *ESP-State of the Art*, *Language Teaching* 27 (1), 1-19.
- Zavašnik, M. (2006): *ESP teacher needs analysis in view of their competences* [PhD dissertation]. University of Ljubljana, Slovenia.

Appendix 1. HE EFL teacher competences

Competence	Target situation level ^a	Present situation level ^b
1 Linguistic competence	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
2 Lexical competence (knowledge of, and ability to use, the vocabulary of a language, consists of lexical elements and grammatical elements)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
3 Grammatical competence (knowledge of, and ability to use, the grammatical resources of a language)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
4 Semantic competence (ability to deal with the awareness and control of the organisation of meaning)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5



	5 Phonological competence (knowledge of, and skill in the perception and production of phonemes, distinctive features, syllabi structure, prosody etc.)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	6 Orthographic competence (knowledge of and skill in the perception and production of the symbols of which written texts are composed)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	7 Knowledge and skills related to historical grammar and comparative linguistics	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	8 Sociolinguistic competence (knowledge and skills required to deal with the social dimension of language use)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	9 Linguistic markers of social relations, politeness conventions, expressions of folk wisdom	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	10 Ability to recognize and use register differences, dialect and accent	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	11 Pragmatic competence (knowledge and skill of the principles according to which messages are organised, structured and arranged, used to perform communicative functions, and sequenced according to interactional and transactional schemata)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	12 Sociocultural competence (knowledge of and understanding other cultures and their customs, fostering cultural and linguistic diversity etc.)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	13 Literary competence (ability to critically evaluate literary works, ability to apply critical evaluation in language teaching etc.)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	14 Language teaching competence	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	15 Ability to plan and apply lessons effectively (i.e. syllabi, aims etc.)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	16 Ability to apply various approaches, methods and techniques in relation to language skills, vocabulary and grammar teaching etc.)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	17 Ability to manage the classroom effectively (i.e. techniques and procedures employed by the teacher in the classroom to control student behaviour, including setting up different tasks, dealing with disruptive behaviour, using audiovisual aids, managing classroom dynamics etc.)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	18 Ability to critically evaluate, develop and apply teaching materials and resources	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	19 Ability to apply various theories and methodologies relevant to language teaching	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	20 Ability to adapt teaching to individual needs of learners (i.e. carry out needs analysis)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	21 Ability to apply various assessment procedures and ways or recording learners' progress	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	22 Ability to introduce, foster and apply strategies of autonomous learning and study skills, independent language learning strategies	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	23 Pedagogical & andragogical competences (ability to analyse educational concepts, theories and other general educational issues (i.e. education, schooling, upbringing)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	24 General teaching competence	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5



25 Competence in educational psychology (ability to recognize the diversity of learners, developmental characteristics and the complexities of the learning process)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
26 Linguistic & educational research competences (ability to carry out and integrate linguistic and educational research in teaching, e.g. action research, corpora research)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
27 ICT competence (ability to integrate ICT into teaching, ability to use ICT for personal planning, organisation and resource discovery, ability to use computer software as a research tool etc.)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
28 Professional & scientific communication competences	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
29 Subject-knowledge competence (knowledge of the subject the language is related to, e.g. tourism, economics, geography)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
30 Professional development competence (ability to reflect upon and evaluate one's own teaching, awareness of the need for continuous professional development, foster collaboration and team work, networking etc.)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
31 Personal qualities	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
32 Interpersonal qualities	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
33 Curricular & educational law knowledge (ability to critically evaluate nationally adopted curricula in terms of aims, objectives and outcomes, ability to critically evaluate all necessary documentation related to teaching, e.g. rules, etc.)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

^aNone (1), Minor/Weak (2), Average/Considerable (3), Strong/Great (4), Very strong/Vital (5)

^bNone/zero (1), Little (2), Average (3), Much (4), A lot (5)

PERCEPCIJA KOMPETENCIJA UČITELJA STRANOG JEZIKA U VISOKOM OBRAZOVANJU

Sažetak

Vještina poznavanja stranoga jezika ima ključnu ulogu u osiguravanju društvene, kulturne i ekonomske integracije Europe. Bolonjski proces i Lisabonska strategija stavljaju vještinu poznavanja stranoga jezika među osnovne vještine koje se smatraju neophodnima za daljnje zapošljavanje studenata, mobilnosti studenata i zahtijeva društva znanja. Iz tog razloga, razvila se potreba za učenjem stranoga jezika kao integralnog dijela obrazovanja svih europskih građana na svim stupnjevima obrazovanja, uključujući i visoko obrazovanje (VO). Poučavanje stranoga jezika u VO nalaže određene kompetencije učitelja stranoga jezika. Budući da skoro niti jedna država u Europi ne nudi preddiplomsko obrazovanje za učitelje stranoga jezika u visokom obrazovanju, podrška kroz stručno usavršavanje je ključna. Ovaj članak pokazuje analizu potrebe u obrazovanju učitelja engleskoga jezika u nejezičnim VO institucijama / odsjecima u Sloveniji. U proljeće 2006. provedena je analiza potreba među 45 (70%) učitelja engleskoga jezika u institucijama VO. Cilj istraživanja bio je prepoznati i vrjednovati 33 popisane (pod)kompetencije učitelja engleskoga kao stranoga jezika u dvije različite kategorije: kategorija ciljanog stanja i kategorija trenutnog stanja. Analiza rezultata ukazuje da uz lingvističke kompetencije općenito, postoje i druge (pod)kompetencije koje su od ključnog značaja za uspješno poučavanje engleskoga jezika u VO, posebice leksička kompetencija, gramatička kompetencija, vještina poučavanja jezika općenito, sposobnost primjene različitih pristupa, metoda i tehnika u odnosu na jezične vještine, poučavanje vokabulara i gramatike, sposobnost kritičkog vrjednovanja, razvoj i primjena materijala za poučavanje i različitih izvora, sposobnost primjene različitih metoda praćenja, sposobnost uvođenja, promicanja i primjene strategija za autonomno učenje i vještine učenja te kompetenciju poznavanja predmeta poučavanja. Nadalje, čini se da postoji prostor u kojem programi stručnoga usavršavanja mogu poboljšati znanje i vještine učitelja kako bi poučavali engleski jezik u visokom obrazovanju, jer se opaženi jaz između ciljanog stanja i trenutnog stanja vezanog uz neke kompetencije još uvijek smatra statistički značajnim.

Ključne riječi: poučavanje jezika, visoko obrazovanje, poučavanje jezika struke, engleski kao strani jezik, obrazovanje učitelja, analiza potreba, kompetencije učitelja

