Универзитет „Гоце Делчев“ – Штип
С. Македонија

Воронешки државен универзитет
Русија

Университет имени Гоце Делчева,
г. Штип, С. Македония

Воронежский государственный университет
Россия

Goce Delcev University in Stip,
N. Macedonia

Voronezh State University
Russia

Петта меѓународна научна конференција

Пятая международная научная конференция

Fifth International Scientific Conference

ФИЛКО
FILKO

ФИЛОЛОГИЈА, КУЛТУРА И ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ ФИЛОЛОГИЯ, КУЛЬТУРА И ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ
PHILOLOGY, CULTURE AND EDUCATION

ЗБОРНИК НА ТРУДОВИ
СБОРНИК СТАТЕЙ
CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

8-9 октомври 2020 / 8-9 октября 2020 / 8-9 October 2020
Штип Штип Stip

Универзитет „Гоце Делчев“ – Штип
С. Македонија
Университет имени Гоце Делчева, г. Штип,
С. Македония
Goce Delcev University in Stip,
N. Macedonia

Воронешки државен универзитет
Русија
Воронежский государственный университет
Россия
Voronezh State University
Russia

Петта меѓународна научна конференција

Пятая международная научная конференция

Fifth International Scientific Conference

ФИЛКО
FILKO

ФИЛОЛОГИЈА, КУЛТУРА И ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ

ФИЛОЛОГИЯ, КУЛЬТУРА И ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ

PHILOLOGY, CULTURE AND EDUCATION

ЗБОРНИК НА ТРУДОВИ
СБОРНИК СТАТЕЙ
CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

8-9 октомври 2020 | 8-9 октября 2020 | 8-9 October 2020
Штип Штип Stip

ЗБОРНИК НА ТРУДОВИ
СБОРНИК СТАТЕЙ
CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

ФИЛКО
FILKO

Јазично уредување
Даница Атанасовска-Гаврилова (македонски јазик)
Марјана Розенфелд (руски јазик)
Биљана Иванова (англиски јазик)
Снежана Кирова (англиски јазик)
Татјана Уланска (англиски јазик)

Техничко уредување
Костадин Голаков
Наташа Сарафова
Ирина Аржанова
Кире Зафиров

Адреса на организацискиот комитет:
Универзитет „Гоце Делчев“ – Штип
Филолошки факултет
ул. „Крсте Мисирков“ бр. 10-А
Пош. фах 201, Штип - 2000, Р. Македонија

Воронешки државен универзитет
Филолошки факултет
г. Воронеж, пл. Ленина, 10, корпус 2, к. 34, Русија

CIP - Каталогизација во публикација
Национална и универзитетска библиотека “Св. Климент Охридски”, Скопје

316.7(062)

МЕЃУНАРОДНА научна конференција филологија, култура и образование (5 ; 2020 ; Штип)
Зборник на трудови / Петта меѓународна научна конференција ФИЛКО филологија, култура и образование, 8-9 октомври 2020, Штип = Сборник статей / Пятая международная научная конференция ФИЛКО филология, культура и образование, 8-9 октября 2020, Штип = Conference proceedings / Fifth International scientific conference FILKO philology, culture and education, 8-9 October 2020, Stip. - Штип : Универзитет “Гоце Делчев”, 2021. - 465 стр. ; 21 см

Трудови на мак., рус. и англ. јазик. - Библиографија кон трудовите

ISBN 978-608-244-787-2

1. Напор. ств. насл.
а) Културологија -- Собири

COBISS.MK-ID 52932613

ОРГАНИЗАЦИСКИ КОМИТЕТ

Драгана Кузмановска, Филолошки факултет при УГД
Жана Грачева, Филолошки факултет при ВГУ
Весна Коцева, Филолошки факултет при УГД
Татјана А. Тернова, Филолошки факултет при ВГУ
Виолета Димова, Филолошки факултет при УГД
Генадиј Ф. Коваљов, Филолошки факултет при ВГУ
Костадин Голаков, Филолошки факултет при УГД
Лариса В. Рибачева, Филолошки факултет при ВГУ

МЕЃУНАРОДЕН ПРОГРАМСКИ КОМИТЕТ

Виолета Димова (Македонија)
Даниела Коцева (Македонија)
Драгана Кузмановска (Македонија)
Ева Ѓорѓиевска (Македонија)
Марија Кусевска (Македонија)
Силвана Симоска (Македонија)
Татјана Стојановска Иванова (Македонија)
Лариса В. Рибачева (Русија)
Софија Алемпиевиќ (Русија)
Татјана А. Тернова (Русија)
Татјана Атанасоска (Австрија)
Олег Н. Фенчук (Белорусија)
Јулиа Дончева (Бугарија)
Билјана Мариќ (Босна и Херцеговина)
Душко Певуља (Босна и Херцеговина)
Волф Ошлис (Германија)
Волфганг Моч (Германија)
Габриела Б. Клајн (Италија)
Михал Ванке (Полска)
Мајкл Рокланд (САД)
Даниела Костадиновиќ (Србија)
Селена Станковиќ (Србија)
Тамара Валчиќ-Буликќ (Србија)
Ахмед Ѓуншен (Турција)
Нецати Демир (Турција)
Шерифе Сехер Ерол Чал›шкан (Турција)
Карин Руке-Брутен (Франција)
Танван Тонтат (Франција)
Марија Рејес Ферер (Шпанија)

Технички секретар

Наташа Сарафова
Јована Караникиќ-Јосимовска
Ирина Аржанова
Главен и одговорен уредник
Драгана Кузмановска

РЕДАКЦИОННЫЙ СОВЕТ

Драгана Кузмановска, Филологический факультет при УГД
Жанна Грачева, Филологический факультет при ВГУ
Весна Коцева, Филологический факультет при УГД
Татьяна А. Тернова, Филологический факультет при ВГУ
Виолета Димова, Филологический факультет при УГД
Геннадий Ф. Ковалев, Филологический факультет при ВГУ
Костадин Голаков, Филологический факультет при УГД
Лариса В. Рыбачева, Филологический факультет при ВГУ

МЕЖДУНАРОДНАЯ РЕДАКЦИОННАЯ КОЛЛЕГИЯ

Виолета Димова (Македония)
Даниела Коцева (Македония)
Драгана Кузмановска (Македония)
Ева Гёргиевска (Македония)
Мария Кусевска (Македония)
Силвана Симоска (Македония)
Татьяна Стояновска-Иванова (Македония)
Лариса В. Рыбачева (Россия)
Софья Алемпиевич (Россия)
Татьяна А. Тернова (Россия)
Татяна Атанасоска (Австрия)
Олег Н. Фенчук (Беларусь)
Юлиа Дончева (Болгария)
Биляна Марич (Босния и Херцеговина)
Душко Певуля (Босния и Херцеговина)
Вольф Ошлис (Германия)
Волфганг Моч (Германия)
Мария Рейес Феррер (Испания)
Габриелла Б. Клейн (Италия)
Ева Бартос (Польша)
Михал Ванке (Польша)
Майкл Рокланд (США)
Даниела Костадинович (Сербия)
Селена Станкович (Сербия)
Тамара Валчич-Булич (Сербия)
Ахмед Гюншен (Турция)
Неджати Демир (Турция)
Шерифе Сехер Эрол Чал›шкан (Турция)
Карин Рукэ-Брутэн (Франция)
Танван Тонтат (Франция)

Ученый секретарь

Наташа Сарафова
Йована Караникич-Йосимовска
Ирина Аржанова

Главный редактор
Драгана Кузмановска

Языковая редакция
Даница Атанасовска-Гаврилова (македонский язык)
Марьяна Розенфельд (русский язык)
Бильяна Иванова (английский язык)
Снежана Кирова (английский язык)
Татьяна Уланска (английский язык)

Техническое редактирование
Костадин Голаков
Наташа Сарафова
Ирина Аржанова
Кире Зафиров

Адрес организационного комитета
Университет им. Гоце Делчева – Штип
Филологический факультет
ул. „Крсте Мисирков“ д. 10-А
Пош. фах 201, Штип - 2000, Р. Македония

Воронежский государственный университет
Филологический факультет
г. Воронеж, пл. Ленина, 10, корпус 2, к. 34, Россия
Э-почта: filko.conference@gmail.com
Веб-сайт: http://js.ugd.edu.mk./index.php/fe

EDITORIAL STAFF
Dragana Kuzmanovska, Faculty of Philology, UGD
Zhana Gracheva, Faculty of Philology, VGU
Svetlana Jakimovska, Faculty of Philology, UGD
Tatyana A. Ternova, Faculty of Philology,VGU
Violeta Dimova, Faculty of Philology, UGD
Genadiy F. Kovalyov, Faculty of Philology, VGU
Kostadin Golakov, Faculty of Philology, UGD
Larisa V. Rybatcheva, Faculty of Philology, VGU

INTERNATIONAL EDITORIAL BOARD
Daniela Koceva (Macedonia)
Dragana Kuzmanovska (Macedonia)
Eva Gjorgjievska (Macedonia)
Marija Kusevska (Macedonia)
Silvana Simoska (Macedonia)
Tatjana Stojanovska-Ivanova (Macedonia)
Violeta Dimova (Macedonia)
Larisa V. Rybatcheva (Russia)
Sofya Alempijevic (Russia)
Tatyana A. Ternova (Russia)
Tatjana Atanasoska (Austria)
Oleg N. Fenchuk (Belarus)
Yulia Doncheva (Bulgaria)
Biljana Maric (Bosnia and Herzegovina)
Dushko Pevulja (Bosnia and Herzegovina)
Wolf Ochlies (Germany)
Wolfgang Motch (Germany)
Gabriella B. Klein (Italy)
Ewa Bartos (Poland)
Michal Wanke (Poland)
Danijela Kostadinovic (Serbia)
Selena Stankovic (Serbia)
Tamara Valchic-Bulic (Serbia)
Maria Reyes Ferrer (Spain)
Ahmed Gunshen (Turkey)
Necati Demir (Turkey)
Şerife Seher Erol Çalişkan
Karine Rouquet-Brutin (France)
That Thanh-Vân Ton (France)
Michael Rockland (USA)

Conference secretary
Natasha Sarafova
Jovana Karanikic-Josimovska
Irina Arzhanova

Editor in Chief
Dragana Kuzmanovska

Language editor
Danica Atanasovska-Gavrilova (Macedonian)
Maryana Rozenfeld (Russian)
Biljana Ivanova (English)
Snezana Kirova (English)
Tatjana Ulanska (English)
Technical editing
Kostadin Golakov
Natasha Sarafova
Irina Arzhanova
Kire Zafirov

Address of the Organizational Committee
Goce Delcev University - Stip
Faulty of Philology
Krste Misirkov St. 10-A
PO Box 201, Stip - 2000, Republic of Macedonia

Voronezh State Universiy
Faculty of Philology
10 pl. Lenina, Voronezh, 394006, Russia
E-mail: filko.conference@gmail.com
Web-site: http://js.ugd.edu.mk./index.php/fe

СОДРЖИНА / СОДЕРЖАНИЕ / CONTENT

1. **Suzana R. Bunčić** - ANDRIĆ'S EARLY STORIES WITH ELEMENTS OF ALLEGORY AND SATIRE 13
2. **Катерина Видова** - ГЛАГОЛСКИОТ ПРИЛОГ ВО УЛОГА НА ПРИЛОШКА ОПРЕДЕЛБА ВО МАКЕДОНСКИОТ ЈАЗИК И НЕГОВИТЕ АНГЛИСКИ ПРЕВОДНИ ЕКВИВАЛЕНТИ 19
3. **Ана Витанова - Рингачева** - СОБИРАЧИТЕ НА МАКЕДОНСКОТО НАРОДНО ТВОРЕШТВО ОД ЦЕПЕНКОВ ДО ДЕНЕС (НА 100-ГОДИШНИНАТА ОД СМРТТА НА МАРКО ЦЕПЕНКОВ) 27
4. **Бранка Гривчевска** - МОДУЛАЦИЈАТА КАКО ПРЕВЕДУВАЧКА ПОСТАПКА ВО МАКЕДОНСКИОТ ПРЕВОД НА РОМАНОТ „ПАЛОМАР“ ОД ИТАЛО КАЛВИНО 33
5. **Сашка Грујовска-Миланова** - ИНТЕГРАЦИЈА НА ГЕРМАНИЗМИТЕ ВО МАКЕДОНСКИОТ ЈАЗИК 43
6. **Јованка Денкова** - СОЦИЈАЛНИТЕ РАСКАЗИ НА АНТОН ПАВЛОВИЧ ЧЕХОВ И БОРИС БОЈАЏИСКИ 49
7. **Марија Ѓорѓиева Димова** - ИНТЕРДИСКУРЗИВНИТЕ ДИЈАЛОЗИ НА ЛИРИКАТА 57
8. **Ивана Ѓоргиева, Александар Нацов** - ГАСТРОНОМСКИ КАРАКТЕРИСТИКИ НА ИСТОЧНИОТ РЕГИОН НА СЕВЕРНА МАКЕДОНИЈА 69
9. **Биљана Иванова, Драгана Кузмановска, Снежана Кирова** ПРЕДНОСТИ ПРИ УЗУЧУВАЊЕТО НА СТРАНСКИ ЈАЗИК ОД НАЈМАЛА ВОЗРАСТ 75
10. **Билјана Ивановска, Марија Кусевска, Цвета Мартиновска Банде** ЈАЗИЧЕН КОРПУС НА МАКЕДОНСКИТЕ ИЗУЧУВАЧИ ПО АНГЛИСКИ И ГЕРМАНСКИ КАКО СТРАНСКИ ЈАЗИЦИ 79
11. **Лела Ивановска** - КРЕАТИВНОСТА ВО НАСТАВАТА ПО АНГЛИСКИ ЈАЗИК КАКО СТРАНСКИ ЈАЗИК 87
12. **Natka Jankova Alagjozovska** - INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION CONGITION OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS IN OUR COUNTRY AND ABROAD 95
13. **Сашка Јовановска** - УСВОЈУВАЊЕ ВТОР ЈАЗИК- ПЕДАГОШКА ГРАМАТИКА 105
14. **Луси Караниколова-Чочоровска** - „ПРОСВЕТИТЕЛСТВОТО ВО ЈУЖНОСЛОВЕНСКИТЕ ЛИТЕРАТУРИ“ (ПРЕГЛЕД) 113
15. **Карначук Ирина Юрьевна** - ПОРЯДОК СЛОВ И ИНВЕРСИЯ КАК СПОСОБЫ ВЫРАЖЕНИЯ ЭКСПРЕССИВНОСТИ 119
16. **Милена Касапоска-Чадловска** - ГРАМАТИКАТА ВО УЧЕБНИЦИТЕ ПО ФРАНЦУСКИ ЈАЗИК ЗА СРЕДНО ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ 123
17. **Лидија Ковачева** - ДЕМОНОЛОШКИТЕ ПРЕТСТАВИ КАЈ АСИРЦИТЕ И БАБИЛОНЦИТЕ 133
18. **Славчо Ковилоски** - ПРОТОТИПИ НА ЖЕНСКИ ЛИКОВИ ВО МАКЕДОНСКАТА КНИЖЕВНОСТ И ФОЛКЛОРОТ ОД XIX ВЕК 141
19. **Весна Кожинкова** - РЕФЕРЕНЦИЈАЛНОСТА ВО РОМАНОТ „МЕМОАРИТЕ НА АЛБЕРТ АЈНШТАН“ ОД КИРЕ ИЛИЕВСКИ 149

20. **Кристина Костова, Марија Крстева, Наталија Попзариева, Крсте Илиев, Драган Донев -** ДРАМАТА ВО СРЕДЕН ВЕК КАКО ОСНОВА ЗА ОЗНАЧУВАЊЕ НА КУЛТУРНИОТ ИДЕНТИТЕТ ВО АНГЛИЈА 155
21. **Мирјана Коцалева, Александра Стојанова, Билјана Златановска, Наташа Стојковиќ -** ПРИМЕНА НА РАЗЛИЧНИ МЕТОДИ НА УЧЕЊЕ НА ИНФОРМАТИЧКИТЕ ПРЕДМЕТИ 163
22. **Весна Коцева -** ГЛАВНИ КАРАКТЕРИСТИКИ НА КОМУНИКАТИВНИОТ ПРИСТАП 169
23. **Весна Коцева, Марија Тодорова -** ОСНОВНИ НАЧЕЛА НА ПРИРОДНИОТ ПРИСТАП НА КРЕШЕН И ТЕРЕЛ 177
24. **Даниела Коцева, Шукрије Барути, Снежана Мирасчиева -** ЈАЗИКОТ И ГОВОРОТ ВО ФУНКЦИЈА НА ОПШТЕСТВЕНА И ИНДИВИДУАЛНА АДАПТАЦИЈА 183
25. **Даниела Коцева, Снежана Мирасчиева -** РЕФЛЕКСИЈАТА НА ОДДЕЛНИ ТЕЛЕВИЗИСКИ СОДРЖИНИ И ПОЈАВАТА НА НАСИЛСТВО КАЈ ДЕЦАТА 191
26. **Драгана Кузмановска, Лидија Ристова, Биљана Иванова** МОЌТА НА ФРАЗЕОЛОГИЗМИТЕ ВО СВЕТОТ НА РЕКЛАМИТЕ 199
27. **Marija Kusevska -** WHERE DIRECTNESS AND INDIRECTNESS RESIDE 207
28. **Лидия Лумпова -** СООТНОШЕНИЕ ГОЛОСА АВТОРА И ГОЛОСОВ ГЕРОЕВ В ХУДОЖЕСТВЕННЫХ СИСТЕМАХ ТОЛСТОГО И ДОСТОЕВСКОГО (НА МАТЕРИАЛЕ РОМАНА -ЭПОПЕИ Л.Н. ТОЛСТОГО «ВОЙНА И МИР», РОМАНОВ Ф.М. ДОСТОЕВСКОГО «ПРЕСТУПЛЕНИЕ И НАКАЗАНИЕ», «ИДИОТ», «БРАТЬЯ КАРАМАЗОВЫ») 215
29. **Ранко Младеноски -** ХИПОТЕКСТОТ ВО ПОЕЗИЈАТА НА БЛАЖЕ КОНЕСКИ 223
30. **К.А. Нагина -** ТВОРЧЕСТВО Л.Н. ТОЛСТОГО В ПРОСТРАНСТВЕ СОВРЕМЕННОГО ФИЛОЛОГИЧЕСКОГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ 233
31. **Георгий Недюрмагомедов -** ФОРМИРОВАНИЕ МЕТАПРЕДМЕТНЫХ УМЕНИЙ УЧАЩИХСЯ ОСНОВНОЙ ШКОЛЫ В ПРОЦЕССЕ УЧЕБНОЙ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ 241
32. **Першина Татьяна Ивановна -** ОРГАНИЗАЦИЯ ПРОЕКТНО-ИССЛЕДОВАТЕЛЬСКОЙ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ ОБУЧАЮЩИХСЯ ПО ГЕОГРАФИИ 247
33. **Мария Попова -** РОЛЬ И ФУНКЦИИ МУЗЕЕВ В ФОРМИРОВАНИИ СОВРЕМЕННОГО ГУМАНИТАРИЯ 253
34. **Vesna Prodanovska-Poposka -** ACQUIRING PROPER PRONUNCIATION: AN OVERVIEW OF A SET OF EXERCISES FOR IMPROVING ENGLISH LONG /i:/ AND /u:/ VOWELS 259
35. **Цветанка Ристова Магловска, Младен Мицевски** ИСКУСТВЕНО УЧЕЊЕ КАКО АЛАТКА ЗА ИНСПИРИРАЊЕ НА УЧЕНИЦИТЕ ВО УГОСТИТЕЛСКОТО ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ 265
36. **Петја Рогич, Драган Донев -** МИНАТИТЕ ВРЕМИЊА ВО БУГАРСКИОТ И МАКЕДОНСКИОТ ПРЕВОД НА „ВУЈКО ВАЊА“ ОД АНТОН ПАВЛОВИЧ ЧЕХОВ ВО ОДНОС НА МИНАТИТЕ ВРЕМИЊА ВО СРПСКИОТ ПРЕВОД 273

37. **Наташа Сарафова** - ВЛИЈАНИЕТО НА ГЛОБАЛИЗАЦИЈАТА И КУЛТУРНИТЕ ПОЛИТИКИ ВРЗ ВИДЛИВОСТА НА НАЦИОНАЛНИТЕ КНИЖЕВНОСТИ (Пример : Норвешка книжевност) 281
38. **Наташа Сарафова, Марица Тасевска** - АСПЕКТИ НА КНИЖЕВНИТЕ ИНДУСТРИИ ВО НОРВЕШКА 291
39. **Simona Serafimovska** - STRUCTURE OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS AT THE UNIVERSITIES IN THE REPUBLIC OF NORTH MACEDONIA 297
40. **Елена Владимировна Сидорова** - ЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ОШИБКИ В ПИСЬМЕННЫХ РАБОТАХ УЧАЩИХСЯ 305
41. **Александра Стојанова, Мирјана Коцалева, Наташа Стојковиќ, Билјана Златановска** - ПРИМЕНА НА VARK МОДЕЛОТ ВО ПРОЦЕСОТ НА УЧЕЊЕ 311
42. **Анета Стојановска-Стефанова, Марија Магдинчева-Шопова** - ПРЕДИЗВИЦИТЕ ОД ПОЛИТИЧКАТА ГЛОБАЛИЗАЦИЈА ЗА ДРЖАВИТЕ 319
43. **Aleksandra P. Taneska, Blagojka Zdravkovska-Adamova** CREATING SYLLABUS AND DEVELOPING GRADING CRITERIA FOR MACEDONIAN LANGUAGE FOR PROFESSIONAL PURPOSES AT SEEU ACCORDING TO NEEDS BASED ANALYSIS 327
44. **Ольга Тихонова** - И.В. ГЁТЕ КАК КИНОПЕРСОНАЖ: К ПРОБЛЕМЕ ДИАЛОГА ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ И КИНО 337
45. **Марија Тодорова, Весна Продановска-Попоска** - ГЛАСОВНИТЕ СИСТЕМИ НА ШПАНСКИОТ И НА АНГЛИСКИОТ ЈАЗИК 345
46. **Емилија Тодоровиќ** - ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ И ПРАКТИКА:УЧЕЊЕ ПРЕКУ РАБОТА-НОВ КОНЦЕПТ ЗА ПРАКТИЧНА ОБУКА ВО ТЕХНИЧКОТО ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ 351
47. **Elena Trajanovska, Maja Gjurovikj, Biljana Ivanova** - STANDARDS-BASED EDUCATION IN ACHIEVING LANGUAGE INTEROPERABILITY 357
48. **Nina S. Ćeklić** - NARRATIVE-STYLISTIC FEATURES IN THE NOVEL LETTERS TO DANILO KIŠ BY FILIP GAJIĆ 365
49. **Ульянова Марина Алексеевна** - ГЕНДЕРНЫЕ ОСОБЕННОСТИ СЕМАНТИЧЕСКОЙ СТРУКТУРЫ СЛОВА ВЗГЛЯД 373
50. **Славица Урумова-Марковска** - ПРОСВЕТИТЕЛСКИОТ ЛИК НА СВ. КЛИМЕНТ ОХРИДСКИ ВО ПРЕДАНИЈАТА И ЛЕГЕНДИТЕ.....383
51. **С.Н. Филюшкина, Ж.А. Борискина** - АВТОР В ПУБЛИЦИСТИЧЕСКОМ ПРОИЗВЕДЕНИИ (НА МАТЕРИАЛЕ КНИГИ Г. ГРИНА "Getting to Know the General. The Story of an Involvement", 1984.) 391
52. **Наталия Хабарова** - АНГЛИЙСКИЕ ЗАИМСТВОВАНИЯ В СРЕДСТВАХ МАССОВОЙ ИНФОРМАЦИИ 397
53. **Ольга Швецова** - ЯЗЫКОВЫЕ ОСОБЕННОСТИ «ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКОЙ ПОЭМЫ» А.С. МАКАРЕНКО 407
54. **Васко Шутаров** - КУЛТУРА И КУЛТУРНА ДИПЛОМАТИЈА ВО ВРЕМЕ НА ПАНДЕМИЈА 415

UDC 006.3/.8:81'373.46

STANDARDS-BASED EDUCATION IN ACHIEVING LANGUAGE INTEROPERABILITY

Elena Trajanovska[1], Maja Gjurovikj[2], Biljana Ivanova[3]
[1]MA, Military Academy "General Mihailo Apostolski",
elena.trajanovska@ugd.edu.mk
[2]MA, STANAG 6001 testing team
Human Resources Department Ministry of Defence,
maja.gurovic@mod.gov.mk
[3]Senior lecturer, Faculty of Philology, UGD,
biljana.petkovska@ugd.edu.mk

Abstract

One of the pivotal prerequisites a country is to meet in order to participate in the collective defence system, i.e. NATO, is to develop interoperability at all levels within the military structures and capacities. One of the aspects of achieving interoperability is standardization in the realm of language proficiency, measured against the Standardized Agreement (STANAG) 6001. STANAG 6001, in addition to statements and declarations, contains the STANAG 6001 language proficiency scale according to which Standardized Language Profiles (SLPs) should be recorded and reported. This paper aims to explore the significance of standard-based education for achieving language interoperability in NATO through an analysis of the language programs implemented in the Armed Forces with recommendations and directions of improvement thereof.

Keywords: *interoperability, standardization, STANAG 6001, SLP, NATO*

Introduction

Interoperability is defined as "the ability for Allies to act together coherently, effectively and efficiently to achieve tactical, operational and strategic objectives" (http:www.nato.int/cps/nl/natohq/topics_84112.htm). This means that forces, units and/or systems from different countries are expected to operate together in terms of sharing common doctrine and procedures, as well as sharing each other's infrastructure and bases. This is achieved through establishing mutual communication in order to reduce duplication of resources, and at the same time enable the countries to pool resources.

Interoperability rests on four pillars: education, military exercises, technical support and standardization. Standardization is of utmost importance for the interoperability at all levels in the military and/or civilian domain. It is governed by Standardized Agreements (STANAGs) - documents that contain respective agreements that the countries should implement. Out of about 1300 STANAGs, only 6 of them refer to standardization of education and only one standard defines the language proficiency. That standard is the STANAG 6001, which in addition to statements and

declarations contains the STANAG 6001 language proficiency scale according to which Standardized Language Profiles (SLPs)[1] should be recorded and reported. The scale consists of detailed descriptions of the proficiency levels of the four skills and is broken down into six levels coded 0 through 5. The document urges countries to improve English language skills of all personnel (military and civilian) who are to cooperate with NATO forces in NATO-led operations, exercises and training, or with NATO staffs. These individuals must be able to communicate effectively in English. Notwithstanding the language requirements, the countries are encouraged to provide basic English language training to all personnel participating in NATO-led operations and exercises. To be able to achieve the above stated requirements, countries are advised to establish their own training structures, design syllabi and teaching materials, implement a testing framework to develop proficiency tests, and continuously monitor the training outcomes. The English language programme is designed within each country with the purpose of teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and in accordance with it courses are conducted. The STANAG 6001 proficiency tests are developed and administered by the STANAG 6001 testing teams responsible for measuring, recording and reporting language ability of the personnel as SLPs by using the STANAG 6001 scale. The testing team functions as a separate unit from the units in charge of teaching in order to avoid negative test washback, "that is, the practice of teaching to the test." (Monaghan, 2012:30). Having this in mind, learning English as a foreign language is set as a high priority in the Armed Forces of countries contributing in the collective defence system, i.e. NATO. In that context, one of the responsibilities refers to adopting and implementing the latest edition of STANAG 6001 (Edition 5) which states that the aim of the NATO standardization agreement (STANAG) is to respond to the following interoperability requirements: —to be used as the common standard (construct) for language curriculum and test development, and for recording and reporting Standardized Language Profiles (SLPs) (https://www.natobilc.org/files/file/6001EFed05.pdf). This policy calls for building an educational system that would rest on the idea of standards-based education, where teaching and testing are consistent and in an agreement with the standard.

Standards-based education

Within the past few decades, educational institutions worldwide have been under increasing pressure from governments to demonstrate efficiency and cost-effectiveness by more rigorous reporting of programme outcomes (Brindley, 1998). This trend led to widespread adoption of systems that use pre-specified descriptions of learning outcomes, also known as standards, benchmarks, attainment, targets, band scales, profiles and competencies. The educational system that rests upon certain standards in a subject area is known as standards-based education. Language education has not been immune. Standards have been developed on a national or system-wide basis, as in, for instance, the National Language Standards for foreign language use at work in the UK (Languages Lead Body, 1993), and the European common framework scale of language competence (North, 1995). In the US, the lead organization in developing the standards is the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACT-

[1] Standardized Language Profiles (SLPs) are separate descriptions of performance for each skill area at each STANAG 6001 level. Taken together in the order listening-speaking-reading-writing, the corresponding 4 numbers from a Standardized Language Profile (SLP). For example, SLP 3321 means Level 3 in listening, Level 3 in speaking, Level 2 in reading and Level 1 in writing.

FL). In 2011, ACTFL reported the results of a project that revealed a high percentage of foreign language teachers who use the student standards to inform their planning, classroom practices, and assessment. These results indicate that the language education gained a more comprehensive vision of what language instruction meant, setting performance objectives with the intention to raise the profile of FL instruction. The standards-based language education caused a shift in classroom emphasis away from correctness towards context-based task performance related to culture and communication in a variety of interactional settings. The most commonly recognized features of the standards-based education are:

– standards, i.e. expectations for students' performance,
– assessments of student achievement,
– teaching instruction, and
– alignment of the abovementioned key elements of the educational system.

Standards

Standards have existed for about one century but were known as goals, aims, and objectives previously (Näsström & Henriksson, 2008). In education, standards are a concept with different meanings in different settings, in different countries and at different periods in history. The most recent meaning of standards in education is that standards are descriptions of what learners are expected to know and be able to do. The meaning was derived as a result of the educational reform which started in the US.

Popham (2003) defines standards as descriptions in policy documents which contain statements what the learners are expected to know and be able to do, as well as how well they are expected to attain this knowledge and these skills. The standards describe broadly defined educational objectives—i.e., what students should have learned by the end of a course or an academic year. They are developed in such a manner that they show a specific sequence of knowledge and skills that students are expected to learn as they progress through their education.

In standards-based education, standards are taken as priorities and serve as a unifying guide (Webb, 1997a) for education institutions, decision makers and educators in reviewing not only curricula and methodology but also aligning assessment and evaluation processes and instruments so that they are fit for the purpose. The establishment of standards is aimed to make the system more effective and coherent, thereby supporting student learning and improving achievement. In recent years, many such systems have been introduced in a variety of second and foreign language learning contexts, ranging from vocational settings to primary and secondary school education as in, for instance, the language competencies described in the Certificates of Spoken and Written English (CSWE), developed to meet the needs of the national Adult Migrant English Program (AMEP) in Australia.

According to Tognolini & Stanley (2011), there are two types of standards: curriculum standards and performance standards. Curriculum standards are described as the knowledge, skills and understanding expected to be learned by students as a result of studying a course. Curriculum standards are also known as syllabus standards, content standards, grade level standards, core standards and outcomes. Performance standards are the levels of achievement of the knowledge, skills and understanding. Performance standards are used interchangeably with the terms achievement standards, benchmark standards, proficiency standards, reporting standards, accountability/target standards and performance indicators.

In standards-based education, teaching is driven by assessments which reflect the prespecified standards. However, assessment should not be used to standardize what is to be learned but should be used to assist teachers develop curricula to meet the needs of the students. In this regard, standards leave room for teachers and curriculum developers to determine how the standards will be reached and what additional topics will be addressed. Teachers are expected to follow the standards when they create academic programmes, courses, syllabi, etc. and teach the content to which students will be held accountable. Thus, teachers set the targets and develop programmes that support and improve student learning to give students an opportunity to attain such knowledge and skills (Fuhrman, 2001). In this regard, teachers are free to provide students with the tools and knowledge they consider to be most helpful for meeting the standards based on their professional judgment and experience. One negative consequence of the influence of assessments on teaching is that the results from assessments have increasingly been used to evaluate educational systems and make high-stakes decisions (Case & Zucker, 2005). These decisions empower and support personal and professional development, like graduation and enrolment in higher education, migration to another country, a promotion to a higher-level job position. Research has shown that when the stakes are high, teachers and schools reallocate resources toward tested content only, increase time spent engaging in instructional activities that are directed toward what is tested and how it is tested, as well as putting excessive emphasis on test-taking skills (Hamilton, 2010). This behaviour may lead to score inflation, i.e. score increase that is not caused by an increase in students' learning of the skills and knowledge that the test is intended to measure. For the purpose of improving educational outcomes in a standards-based education, Hamilton (2010) proposes the following solutions:

– design high quality tests for measuring complex skills and processes in such a way to minimize predictability from one administration to another. When the test format is unpredictable regarding the item types that will be used in the test (e.g. multiple-choice questions, open-ended, short-answer questions), the instruction will not be focused on particular item formats or styles and will not be viewed as likely means to raising scores.
– employ standards-based teaching guided by a detailed, coherent curriculum aligned with rigorous standards. The curriculum should provide a scope and a sequence of essential curriculum objectives, curriculum guides (frameworks), maps, pacing guides and other curricular tools to assist teachers to plan effective instruction that focuses on essential benchmark knowledge, concepts and skills. If teachers gain confidence that all the components are well aligned, they will teach the curriculum effectively, and improvement of results will follow as measured by the assessments.

Standards-based education in the military

As previously mentioned, military language education is a standards-based education, guided by the standard STANAG 6001. Its main components are: STANAG 6001 proficiency scale (standard), STANAG 6001 proficiency test (assessment) and curricula (teaching instruction). It is expected that these three components work together, forming an efficient educational system in which learners get an opportunity to learn what is expected and achieve the desired outcomes, i.e. attain and retain

the prescribed SLPs in accordance with their job position and current or future deployment. In order to explore this hypothesis, we analysed the proficiency levels of the learners who had attended intermediate and upper-intermediate courses with the STANAG 6001 proficiency test within the Ministry of Defence and Armed Forces in North Macedonia, and the results showed that their average performance in all four skills was in the range of Level 1+ instead of the expected Level 2 and above. Learners were given a questionnaire which contained questions about the courses they had attended. In the questionnaire, they were asked to express their opinion whether the time spent on the courses was enough to acquire the contents. 58% of the participants answered that the courses were too demanding and that they did not have enough time to learn all the content, which means that the courses included a large number of objectives to be attained, resulting in insufficient time to learn, consequently reflecting on the ability to improve the language skills learned. Another interpretation of their answer may be that the contents of the courses have not been adapted to their abilities. This occurrence suggests that one of the reasons for the insufficient command of English language that the learners demonstrate on the proficiency tests is due to lack of alignment between the instructional content with the tested content.

Further research and implications

These findings need to be researched further and the factors that affect the instructional content are to be investigated: the content taught in relation to cognitive demand, time allocated to each content, and the instructional activities in which students are engaged and time allotted. Further research should provide greater insight into language teaching and testing in the context of the military educational system in the Ministry of Defence and the Armed Forces and help to trigger changes that could eventually lead to the improvement in the alignment between the content that is taught and tested, as a fundamental condition for a functional standards-based educational system. The alignment can contribute to an effective educational system as a result of effective classroom instruction that reflects the standard, provides greater focus to both teachers and learners by directing their efforts towards the achievement of expected outcomes.

Conclusion

Practice has shown that the military personnel is constantly challenged to meet high language standards in order to fulfil certain positions in a multinational environment, to be promoted to a higher level into the command structure where they would need to perform more complex command duties, even be sent to the battlefield where language is the first means to prevent casualties in the units under their command. Thus, nothing can compensate for the lack of well-established language training and testing programs. This analysis served to explore the significance of standards-based education in achieving language interoperability, with an emphasis on the implementation of the descriptors of STANAG 6001 proficiency scale. Educators need to identify areas of the standards that are not being taught, or taught with only limited time or emphasis, or which expectations for learning expressed in standards or assessments are not included in the curriculum. Standards-based education means bringing different parts of the educational system together in a systematic and efficient way, and further research needs to be focused on examining the quality of the military standards-based education and what might be improved in the efforts

towards achieving the desired goals in language interoperability within the collective defence system, i.e. NATO.

References

1. Brindley, G. (1998). Outcomes-based assessment and reporting in language programs: a review of the issues. Language Testing. Retrieved January 15, 2017 from http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/026553229801500103
2. Case, B. & Zucker, S. (2005). Methodologies for Alignment of Standards and Assessments. Pearson Assessment. Retrieved from https://images.pearsonassessments.com/images/tmrs/tmrs_rg/AlignmentMethodolog ies.pdf?WT.mc_id=TMRS_Methodologies_for_Alignment
3. Fuhrman, S. (Ed.). (2001). From the Capitol to the classroom: Standards-based reform in the States, One hundredth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
4. Hamilton, L. S. (2010). Testing what has been taught: helpful, high-quality assessments start with a strong curriculum. American Educator, 34(4), 47–52. Retrieved November 29, 2016, from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ909943.pdf
5. Languages Lead Body (1993). Introduction to the national language standards. London, UK: Languages Lead Body
6. Martone, A., Sireci, S.G. (2009). Evaluating Alignment between Curriculum, Assessment, and Instruction. Review of Educational Research. Retrieved February 6, 2017 from http://nsee.pbworks.com/f/Evaluating+Alignment+Between+Curriculum,+Assessme nt,+and+Instruction.pdf
7. Monaghan, R. (2012). Language and Interoperability in NATO: The Bureau for International Language Co-ordination (BILC). Canadian Military Journal. Retrieved February 6, 2017 from http://free-journal.umm.ac.id/files/file/Language%20and%20 Interoperabililty%20in%20NATO%20The%20 Bureau%20for%20International%20 Language%20Co-ordination%20(BILC).pdf
8. NATO. (2017). Interoperability: Connecting NATO Forces. [online] Available at: https://www.nato.int/cps/nl/natohq/topics_84112.htm [Accessed 6 November, 2017].
9. Natobilc. (2017). STANAG 6001: Edition 5. [online] Available at: https://www.natobilc.org/files/file/6001EFed05.pdf [Accessed 6 November, 2020].
10. Näsström, G. & Henriksson, W. (2008). Alignment of Standards and Assessment: A theoretical and empirical study of methods for alignment. Department of Educational Measurement, Umeå University
11. North, B. (1995): The development of a common framework scale of descriptors of language proficiency based on a theory of measurement. System 23, 445–65.
12. Popham, W. J. (2003). Test better, teach better: The instructional role of assessment. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
13. Tognolini, J. & Stanley. G (2011). A standards perspective on the relationship between formative and summative assessment, in Powell-Davies, P. (ed) New Directions: Assessment and Evaluation. A collection of papers (25-32). British

Council
14. Webb, N. L. (1997a, April). Criteria for alignment of expectations and assessments in mathematics and science education. Research monograph No. 6. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/ fulltext/ED414305.pdf