

Christian Hofer, Barbara Schröttner,
Daniela Unger-Ullmann (eds.)

Akademische Lehrkompetenzen im Diskurs

Theorie und Praxis

A Discourse on Academic Teaching Competencies

Theory and Practice

WAXMANN



Christian Hofer
Barbara Schröttner
Daniela Unger-Ullmann
(eds.)

Akademische Lehrkompetenzen im Diskurs
Theorie und Praxis

A Discourse on Academic Teaching
Competencies
Theory and Practice



Waxmann 2013
Münster / New York / München / Berlin

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

Diese Publikation wurde unterstützt durch:



ISBN 978-3-8309-7578-6

© 2013 Waxmann Verlag GmbH
Postfach 8603, 48046 Münster
Waxmann Publishing Co.
P.O. Box 1318, New York, NY 10028, USA

www.waxmann.com
info@waxmann.com

Umschlaggestaltung: Anne Breitenbach, Tübingen
Umschlagbild: © Martin Bauer, Graz
Satz: Stoddart Satz- und Layoutservice, Münster
Druck: Hubert & Co., Göttingen

Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem Papier,
säurefrei gemäß ISO 9706



Printed in Germany

Alle Rechte vorbehalten. Nachdruck, auch auszugsweise, verboten.
Kein Teil dieses Werkes darf ohne schriftliche Genehmigung des
Verlages in irgendeiner Form reproduziert oder unter Verwendung
elektronischer Systeme verarbeitet, vervielfältigt oder verbreitet werden.

INHALT / CONTENT

Christian Hofer, Barbara Schröttner, Daniela Unger-Ullmann
Vorwort7

Christian Hofer, Barbara Schröttner, Daniela Unger-Ullmann
Foreword.....8

I Perspektiven für die Hochschule – Perspectives for Higher Education

Barbara Schröttner
Teaching Competency in Higher Education
Opportunities and Challenges in a Learning Economy 11

Rudolf Egger
Zwischen Skylla und Charybdis
Über die Entwicklung universitärer Lehrkompetenz in kompetitiven
Wissenschaftskarrieren..... 27

Doris Pany
Hochschullehre und akademische Schreibkultur
Entwicklungen und Perspektiven..... 38

Andrea Bernhard
Transparency and Comparability within a Multidimensional Context
Strategies for improving the Quality of Academic Programmes 51

Werner Lenz
Akademisches Lehren – Akademisches Lernen..... 63

II Perspektiven für die Universitäre Weiterbildung – Perspectives for Continued Higher Education

Christian Hofer
Vom Wesen der Hochschuldidaktik.
Das Kollegiale Beratungs- und Weiterbildungssystem
bei *treffpunkt sprachen* – Zentrum für Sprache, Plurilingualismus und Fachdidaktik..... 75

Ada Pellert
Rollenkonzepte in der akademischen Weiterbildung –
eine Aufgabe für die Personalentwicklung 95

Eva Cendon
Reflective Learning und die Rolle der Lehrenden 103

| | |
|---|-----|
| <i>Anita Mörth</i> Was bringt das Qualitätsmanagement der Lehrkompetenz? | 116 |
| <i>Andreas Fleischmann, Caroline Hein und Angelika Thielsch</i> „Gehet hin und mehret euch!“ – Das Multiplikatorenprogramm der TU München zur Unterstützung engagierter Lehrender in den Fakultäten | 126 |
| <i>Beate Dallmeier</i> Supervisor-Student Interaction: Integrating Perspectives – Experiences from a Project at the Technical University of Munich | 141 |

III Perspektiven für die Praxis – Perspectives for Practice

| | |
|--|-----|
| <i>Anja Burkert</i> Promoting Learner Autonomy at Tertiary Level: The Teacher’s Role..... | 157 |
| <i>Anna Kanape-Willingshofer</i> Initiation into Academic Teaching. The Early Careers of Academic Teachers and their Beliefs about the Development of Academic Teaching Competence | 172 |
| <i>Angelika Thielsch</i> Come and have a Look inside! – Creating Teaching Portfolios through Collaboration..... | 186 |
| <i>Kristina Neuböck</i> Kompetenzportfolios für Lehrende: ein Erfahrungsbericht aus der Arbeit mit Sprachenlehrenden..... | 195 |
| <i>Daniela Unger-Ullmann</i> Ressourcenmanagement: Dokumentation, Entwicklung und Förderung von akademischen Lehrkompetenzen in der universitären Sprachenlehre | 226 |
| <i>Eva Seidl und Birgit Simschitz</i> Prüfen als Gestaltungselement von Lehren und Lernen. Ergebnisse einer Befragung..... | 250 |
| <i>Carole Bourgadel</i> La mise en œuvre d’une classe interactive virtuelle dans l’enseignement des langues | 269 |
| <i>Faustin Mutwarasibo</i> University Students’ Experiences of Lecturer-initiated Writing Groups | 289 |
| Kurzbiografien | 302 |

Vorwort

Lernendenzentrierung und Kompetenzorientierung haben an Universitäten und hochschulischen Einrichtungen längst Einzug gehalten. Lehr- und Unterrichtsmodelle werden an die Lernbedürfnisse von Studierenden angepasst und universitäre Studienpläne orientieren sich, basierend auf Überlegungen des Bologna-Prozesses, an einer individualisierten Kompetenzentwicklung. Vermehrt haben sich sowohl hochschuldidaktische als auch erziehungs- und bildungswissenschaftliche Publikationen der letzten Jahre diesen Themen gewidmet. Forschungs- und Reflexionsbedarf sehen die HerausgeberInnen der vorliegenden Publikation jedoch in den Schlussfolgerungen und Konsequenzen, die sich für Lehrende an Hochschulen und in universitären Institutionen sowie für HochschuldidaktikerInnen und universitäre BildungsmanagerInnen ergeben. Welches Rüstzeug benötigen Lehrende, um den neuen und aktuellen Bildungskonzepten in der Praxis gerecht werden zu können? Welche Kompetenzen brauchen sie, um lernendenzentrierte und kompetenzorientierte Lehre umsetzen zu können? Geht mit dem Wandel universitärer Bildungskonzepte und Lernideale eine Änderung des Lehrendenbildes einher? Welche Anforderungen ergeben sich daraus für *lernendenzentrierte Lehrende*? Welche Ziele verfolgt eine aktuelle Hochschuldidaktik, und inwiefern grenzt sich diese von anderen Didaktiken ab? Welche Herausforderungen sind in der universitären Weiterbildung zu lokalisieren? Welche Beiträge kann hochschuldidaktische Forschung zur universitären Weiterentwicklung leisten?

In diesem Sinne richten die AutorInnen der Publikation *Akademische Lehrkompetenzen im Diskurs* den Blick auf die Entwicklung und Festigung der Kompetenzen von Lehrenden. Präsentiert, diskutiert und reflektiert werden dabei theoretisch-wissenschaftliche Konzepte zu Themen der Hochschuldidaktik, Weiterbildung, des Bildungs- und Ressourcenmanagements, der Sprachlernforschung und Sprachendidaktik sowie weiterer Kompetenzschwerpunkte, wie Selbstkompetenz, Reflexionskompetenz oder Beurteilungs- und Bewertungskompetenz von Lehrenden. Besondere Berücksichtigung finden praxisorientierte Beiträge, in denen die AutorInnen auf konkrete Projekte sowie Bildungs- und Lernkonzepte eingehen, die Lehrkompetenzen fördern und wertvolle Beiträge zur Entwicklung universitärer Lehre leisten. Die Beiträge ergeben ein breites Kompetenzspektrum und tragen dazu bei, ein Kompetenzprofil für Lehrende an der Hochschule entstehen zu lassen. Sie ermöglichen es, universitäre Lehre aufzuwerten und in einen wissenschaftlichen Rahmen zu stellen. Die AutorInnen reflektieren als erfahrene Lehrende und HochschuldidaktikerInnen ihre Praxis und bringen ihre Fachexpertise in Projekte ein. Indem Lehre in einen handlungsorientierten, aber vor allem forschungsgeleiteten Rahmen gestellt wird, zeigen die AutorInnen auf, dass Hochschul- sowie Fachdidaktik als wissenschaftliches Betätigungsfeld anzuerkennen sind. Die HerausgeberInnen danken den AutorInnen für die vielfältigen Beiträge, durch welche die Publikation *Akademische Lehrkompetenzen im Diskurs* realisiert werden konnte.

Foreword

Learner-centred and competence-oriented approaches have long since made their way into universities and institutions of higher learning. Models of teaching and instruction have been adapted to the learning needs of students and university curricula are now geared towards the individual development of competencies on the basis of considerations made as part of the Bologna Process. More and more publications in the fields of university didactics and educational theory have been devoted to these topics in recent years. The editors of this publication, however, still see a need for research and reflection on the conclusions and consequences for teachers at universities and academic institutions as well as university educationalists and higher education managers. What tools do teachers need to do justice to new and cutting-edge educational concepts in practice? What competencies do they need to be able to implement learner-centred and competence-oriented teaching? Does the change in academic concepts of education and ideas of learning lead us to a new understanding of teachers and the role they play? What are the resulting requirements for *learner-centred teachers*? What objectives does a contemporary approach to university teaching pursue and where does it differ from other teaching methods? What challenges does academic continuing education face? What contribution can research on university didactics make to academic continuing education?

With this in mind, the authors of the publication *A Discourse on Academic Teaching Competencies* now turn their attention to the development and consolidation of teacher competencies. The authors present, discuss and reflect on theoretical and academic concepts on topics concerning university didactics, continuing education, education and resource management, research on language learning and language teaching as well as other competence focuses such as self-competence, reflexive competence or the evaluation and assessment competence of teachers. Special emphasis is placed on practice-related articles, in which the authors present specific projects and educational and learning concepts that promote teaching competencies and make a valuable contribution to the development of university teaching. The articles cover a wide range of competencies and contribute to the development of a competence profile for university teachers. They help to enhance the status of university teaching and to situate it in an academic context. As experienced teachers and university educationalists, the authors reflect on their practice and share their expertise in projects. By situating teaching in a practice-oriented and yet primarily research-led context, the authors make the case for recognizing university and subject-specific teaching methods as a scholarly field of activity. The editors would like to thank the authors for the wide variety of articles, which played a key role in the realisation of the publication.

I
Perspektiven für die Hochschule –
Perspectives for Higher Education

Teaching Competency in Higher Education Opportunities and Challenges in a Learning Economy

Abstract

In an interconnected world, opportunities and challenges for individuals and societies are ever changing, and this is intensely reflected in higher education policies and practices. This article explores these continuing changes that have been apparent over recent decades in the field of higher education and which have been greatly affecting the scope of learning and teaching. Issues of teaching and learning have undergone a process of redefinition because contemporary educational experiences require new forms of student learning and understanding, and also new forms of relaying information and knowledge by teachers. Starting from this assumption, it can be said that learning and teaching have today been strongly linked to real-world experiences which call for a wide-ranging spectrum of learning possibilities under the definition of lifelong learning. The study further emphasizes that an increasing economization of education, visible through inclusion of words related to economics such as employability, standards, effectiveness and competitiveness, is supported by European policies such as the Lisbon Strategy of 2000 which promoted the concept of lifelong learning on a far-reaching foundation and the Bologna Process which has highly influenced the structure of higher education in Europe.

Introductory Thoughts on Globalization and Higher Education

Central European higher education, which is due for a rethink of higher education policies and practices and a redefining of the social role of the university, is under increasing global pressure (Kwiek, 2001: 161f.). Because of the significance of the knowledge economy in the 21st century, higher education has become more and more important because of its place in creating new knowledge and educating individuals for participation in the new economy. Wide-ranging economic, technological and scientific developments directly affect higher education; these trends have to be taken into consideration as part of higher education policy and reality. They are reinforced by factors such as new information technology, English as a common language for scientists, the trend towards mass higher education and the demand for highly educated employees (Altbach, 2006: 123).

An increasing internationalization of the financial, product and labour markets involves new requirements for employees, new forms of division of labour across national boundaries and more intensive competition between countries. This competitive development brings with it movements like liberalization, privatization and deregulation which highly influence the educational sector and also the individual, who is thus exposed to much stronger competitive pressure. In a time of mass education in the field of higher education, educational administration, professional training of teaching staff and quality control procedures are prevalent. This accelerated standardization, at least within Europe, has culminated in the Bologna Process (Lenzen, 2010: 304). Through the Bologna Process and related initiatives, new common degree structures and other types of harmonization procedures are being implemented in European countries (Altbach, 2006: 121). Various

programs in higher education such as *Erasmus* for the international exchange of students and teaching staff and *Leonardo da Vinci* for connecting universities and businesses support this standardization (Lenzen, 2010: 304).

Even though there has traditionally been extensive hesitation among European Union member states to transfer any power over education to the European level, the ideas generated by transnational and supranational organizations such as the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the European Union have without doubt had a big impact on the setting of agendas. They have generated central reference points and benchmarks for the development of national policies and practices which have led to something that, in practice, functions as a European education policy. It can be suggested that on a national level, it is necessary to be conscious of such policy discourses and the related assumptions and implications as well as the intended or unintended consequences (Biesta, 2006: 169). Two overarching narratives are noticeable in this context, which may be on the one hand competing and mutually exclusive or, on the other hand, interrelated elements of a “delicate ecology for social sustainability” (Crick, 2008: 312). Ruth Deakin Crick (*ibid.*: 312) is of the opinion that

One is a narrative of social cohesion and justice across and within the member states, with their particular globally significant histories and aspirations. The other is the neo-liberal narrative of salvation through economic progress and the need for the EU to be a key player in the changing global economy.

Nation State, Welfare State and Economic Market Ideology

This section deals with the fact that in contemporary times, there is a weakening of the nation-state, a reconfiguration of the welfare state and the growth in a neoliberal or market ideology (Kwiek, 2001: 169). These different factors greatly influence higher education. 1) The relevance/importance of the nation-state in the contemporary world has changed because “there is no more a nation-oriented, national-consciousness-oriented, nation-building kind of idea of higher education”. The question formulated by the state in relation to higher education could be “Why should we finance higher education?” 2) The dissolution of the welfare state: A worldwide public sector reform reformulates the size and responsibilities of the public sector in general. The response of the state could be “We are (just) unable to finance higher education with its massification anymore.” 3) The economic rationality and market ideology: The neoliberal approach and ideology of the market go along with various practices such as managerialism, accountability and privatization which come from the world of business and are applied to other areas of social life as well as to higher education in the form of a corporate model with characteristics such as bureaucratization, marketization, entrepreneurialization and corporatization. The corresponding reaction of the state could be “Let us (still) finance higher education (a bit), but on a new corporate-like basis” (*ibid.*: 166f.).

In the Western world, the “corporate culture/economic rationality aspect” of globalization is probably the most strongly felt aspect of globalization, and it directly affects academics and academic institutions (Kwiek, 2001: 169). While some argue that globalization can liberate higher education (through technological innovations), there are other voices that claim that globalization strengthens worldwide inequality and this can have major

consequences for universities through the massification or the growth of the private sector in this field (Altbach, 2006: 121). Marek Kwiek's (ibid.: 170) argument is that

The unique character of higher education in general and of the university in particular in a set of traditionally public sector services is already lost, especially considering the rapid development of the private, for-profit and non-research institutions of higher education which changes radically the intellectual landscape in which public higher education is supposed to operate.

Because of an increase in demand for higher education, new higher education providers such as media companies and corporate universities, new delivery methods, both domestically and internationally, and new types of higher education programs appear. To state things in more common terms, Jane Knight (2006: 209) notes that

Generally, these new commercial providers are mainly occupied with teaching/training or providing services, and do not focus on research per se. They can complement, cooperate or compete with public and private higher education institutions, whose mandate is traditionally the trinity of teaching, research and service. Because many of the new providers are focusing on delivering education across borders, they must be included as actors in the internationalization scene.

Inequalities in Higher Education: Centers and Peripheries

While globalization leads on the one hand to equal and open access through new technologies and other manifestations of globalization throughout the world, existing inequalities are on the other hand reinforced and new barriers are erected. For Altbach (2006: 123), "The debate in higher education mirrors analyses of globalization generally". In line with this thought, it can be observed that globalized higher education is highly unequal if one looks at developing countries and smaller academic systems. While the influential universities and academic institutions in the centers have always controlled the production and dissemination of knowledge, smaller and weaker organizations and systems at the peripheries with less resources and often lower academic standards have been reliant on them. The discussion shows that the centers of academia hold the leadership in science, scholarship, research and teaching. Moreover they are leading in terms of organizational structure, the aim of universities as well as in knowledge distribution. Centers with their well-known institutions, mostly located in larger and wealthier countries, benefit from a plethora of resources such as funding and better infrastructure (libraries and laboratories), highly qualified academic staff, strong traditions and legislation that supports academic freedom. Another example of this dominance is that major international scholarly and research journals and databases, which are largely published in English, have their headquarters mostly at the major universities in the United States and the United Kingdom. In developing and smaller industrialized countries at the periphery, academic institutions and systems are strongly influenced by these centers in terms of research, communication of knowledge and teaching practices (ibid.: 123ff.).

In today's world, most of the universities and particularly universities in developing countries are primarily teaching institutions that are forced to gain new knowledge and analysis elsewhere (Altbach, 2006: 125f.). Universities and academic systems in various

smaller developing countries lack the facilities for research, providing degrees beyond a bachelor's degree or publishing journals and databases due to the expenses involved. Considering this, it is possible to conclude that "Structural dependency is endemic in much of the world's academic institutions" (ibid.: 126).

Knowledge, Knowledge Economy and Learning Society

In the 21st century which is characterized by constant change, specific educational needs emerge which raise a number of serious challenges and problems including questions for educational research and practices. The purpose of this section is to show that to pass on only static knowledge is not an adequate reaction to this tremendously rapid change. There is a need for a theory that is responsive to this constant flux and which is grounded in a theory of learning (Brown/Thomas, 2010: 321). Based on this background, the article tries to clarify how the concept of knowledge has changed from a static to a more flexible, renewable and jointly constructed one. Knowledge creation can be described as a socially shared experience which develops from participation in sociocultural activities. While knowledge is still available in educational institutions, it is also increasingly to be found in workplaces and in everyday life. That said, one might argue that no longer does any institution or group have a monopoly on knowledge. This open access to knowledge is supported by manifold media and technology based environments which create new requirements for learners (Niemi, 2008: 6f.) and teachers as well as in teaching research and practice.

Peter Jarvis (2006: 204) is of the opinion that knowledge, beliefs and values are always subjective and therefore, just like emotions, have to be learned. Hannele Niemi (2008: 7) asserts in this context that it is important to understand that "knowledge is not just a part of the reality" but it is a reality viewed from a certain angle and context. In other words the same reality can be viewed in diverse ways. Knowledge creation always starts from one's own social, cultural and historical context because these contexts form the basis for the interpretation of information and the creation of meanings. Even though knowledge is categorized from different theoretical perspectives, it is increasingly seen as a dynamic concept which depends "on the learners' epistemological propositions and socio-cultural contexts".

Not knowledge per se but (social) scientific knowledge is significant for the knowledge society because it supports the production and marketing of new commodities and services and therefore it has grown economic value. At present, scientific knowledge no longer deals with certainties but at best with approximations and policies that are often being implemented before it is possible to be certain of their outcomes. As a consequence, it is necessary to continually evaluate the outcomes of the implemented policies (Jarvis, 2006: 203f.).

In most areas of human activity, knowledge is constantly shifting and in a process of continuous flow and flux. Consequently, how we know things and how we know what we know has become more important than the factual status of information itself. This is particularly true if one notes that facts change on a continuing basis because they are facts about a changing world, and at the same time because of the technological infrastructure that support the rapid updating of information. This shift demonstrates the growing importance of the context of information. Particularly new media technologies

urge us to consider what is the authority behind the information and if the information is up-to-date and relevant to the particular problem. The importance of the implicit dimension of knowledge and the things which cannot be rendered explicitly form a large part of the basis of what it is that we know. Implicit knowledge depends “almost entirely on the social context of the information, which is also the driving force for shaping one’s sense of becoming” (Brown/Thomas, 2010: 326).

Learning itself is the practice of participating, and participation is constructed out of the social context in which learning takes place. “Communities of becoming” can be described as constructs that unify notions of interest, technological infrastructure and co-presence (joint work) into the idea of a “networked imagination”. The comparatively unbounded space of the networked world therefore releases learning from a particular trajectory (Brown/Thomas, 2010: 327). To understand the meaning of “learning to become” as well as how it might be achieved, some of the recent transitions in learning in the 21st century have to be examined. “Learning to become” develops out of a situation of rapid and continuous development, is itself in a constantly state of flux and is characterized by a sense of acting, participating and knowing. “Becoming” is then responsive to context instead of content and as the context changes, the sense of becoming changes as well (ibid.: 323f.). John Seely Brown and Douglas Thomas (ibid.: 327) point out that

(...) this sense of becoming is both afforded by and amplified by *participation in the networked imagination*. Participating in a networked imagination throws the distinction between learning to be and becoming into relief. Learning to be involves enculturation into a set of practices rather than stockpiling knowledge. Becoming involves a rich and deeply intuitive understanding of the tacit. The end result is not knowledge per se, but a new set of tools for looking at the world and engaging in inquiry, hopefully productive inquiry. Becoming, then, becomes a powerful subject position from which to manage and embrace the flux and constant change which is beginning to shape and define the world of the 21st century.

In a knowledge economy which is dominated by rapidly changing scientific knowledge, people have to be well-informed about and constantly generate new knowledge. It is for this reason that learning throughout life becomes increasingly important (Jarvis, 2006: 205). The globalization of knowledge and communication is mainly facilitated by the Internet but, just as for other aspects of globalization, there exist significant inequalities in the access to it. Information and knowledge obtainable through the Internet reproduces the realities of the knowledge system worldwide. It can be argued that “The databases and retrieval mechanisms probably make it easier to access well-archived and electronically sophisticated scientific systems of the advanced industrialized countries than the less networked academic communities of the developing countries.” (Altbach, 2006: 134) However the Internet allows scholars and scientists at universities and other institutions that lack well-equipped libraries to obtain information, and this has a democratizing effect on scientific communication. A precondition is of course that scholars and scientists, particularly in developing countries, do have access to the Internet (ibid.: 134).

The learning society has emphasized technological and scientific knowledge since they form the foundations of the capitalist market. This development has generated an open society with a more individualistic orientation in which individual rights have been emphasized and the significance of personal relationships has been downplayed. The discourse on the learning society especially includes and emphasizes those features that have

supported the dominant position of the “West” and its capitalist system while it has excluded others (Jarvis, 2006: 207). “In the learning society, ‘learning’ is a gerundive to describe the type of society in which we live”. In this perspective, learning defines the flexible, open society that responds to the changes caused by the knowledge economy and the market. To briefly summarize: since learning is seen as something good and desirable which leads to human growth and development, the discourse that the learning society is intrinsically a good thing is misleading because a concentration on the process of human learning is missed in this approach (ibid.: 205).

Lifelong Learning in a Learning Economy

The trend towards a learning economy can be predominantly noticed in the countries of the European Union but also in many other countries, although there are important differences between their lifelong learning policies and practices. Because governments and policy makers all over the world have to deal with the same challenges, the existence of similar trends at both the level of policy and practice is not surprising (Biesta, 2006: 169). An analysis of this development shows that official reports pronounce that in order to remain competitive in the global economy there is a need for a higher skilled and more flexible workforce. Official declarations claim that more and ‘better’ higher and lifelong education will bring economic prosperity to nations and individuals. The relevant question is whether this investment in education leads to economic prosperity, or do more prosperous economies generally have a better educated workforce because they are able to invest much more in education (ibid.: 176).

While there is the position that the global economy is a fact to which individuals, nations and the European Union need to adapt, another opinion is that economic globalization is not so much a ‘fact’ but something that is actively being pursued by some to serve particularly interests of certain nations, groups, classes or organizations. This yields the question if economic growth itself is an imperative or if it is possible to imagine a different future which is based on a different set of values? An additional question is if the learning economy produces prosperity for all, or if it reproduces existing economic inequalities between the so-called ‘developed’ and ‘developing’ nations or between the ‘haves’ and the ‘have nots’ within societies (Biesta, 2006: 177)?

While in the past lifelong learning was understood to be a personal good and an intrinsic aspect of democratic life, lifelong learning is increasingly associated with the formation of human capital and as an investment in economic development. These important shifts in policies for adult education and lifelong learning over the past decades around the world are not only visible at the level of policy but also in the impact on the learning opportunities of adults. This transformation is evident through the redefinition of what counts as legitimate or ‘useful’ learning, noticeable in the reduction of funding for all those forms of learning without economic value (Biesta, 2006: 169). Gert Biesta (ibid.: 172) gives a good description of what has happened with lifelong learning in many countries around the world:

Whereas in the past the field of lifelong learning was predominantly informed by a social justice agenda – the ‘social purpose’ tradition in which adult learning is seen as a lever for empowerment and emancipation (...) – the current emphasis

is on 'learning for earning' in which adult learning is seen as a lever for economic growth and global competitiveness.

The aim set by the European Council, to 'become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion', decided on in the Lisbon Strategy of 2000, links lifelong learning to economic interests which is expressed in terms such as employability, one of the new keywords. Employability first calls for a good basic education and, second, for greater flexibility in the job market which has to be accompanied by lifelong learning strategies. In this characterization learning becomes something 'good and desirable' which implies, as mentioned previously, that the learning society is basically something good (Görsdorf 2010: 142). Niemi (2008: 13) states that in the political discourse of the European Commission, learning is looked on as being at the very core of economic development. Learning and competence building are seen as central for investment in human capital. It is notable that there is a strong optimistic trust in the power of knowledge and learning. However, the emphasis on the economy and competitiveness should not be the only foundations for learning. Instead, learning and the attainment of competence and skills should also support personal empowerment and the improvement of society.

Over the past two decades there has been an increased individualization of lifelong learning which has also changed the very language of discussing it. Not long ago it was talked about as adult education, but while 'education' can be understood as a relational concept that refers to the interaction between an educator and a student, 'learning' refers to a process that can be done alone and without assistance. The use of the phrases 'the adult learner' or even 'the learner' indicates a specific way of configuring and conceptualizing the field. Nonetheless the individualization of lifelong learning is not only a conceptual issue because the nature of the learning activities of adults has changed as well. Many adults are spending more and more of their time and money on diverse forms of learning, both inside and outside of traditional educational institutions. The volume and level of participation in formal adult learning are therefore growing and there is a rapidly growing market for non-formal forms of learning (Biesta, 2006: 175). Zygmunt Bauman (in *ibid.*: 177) states that "lifelong learners are responsible for their own learning but seem to have little influence on the content, purpose and 'point' of their learning. They have, (...), de jure autonomy, but what they seem lacking is de facto autonomy".

While on the micro level the responsibility for learning is shifted to the individual, on the macro level the responsibility is moved away from the state towards the private sector. From being a collective good, learning increasingly becomes an individual good. It is for this reason that the state as provider and promoter of lifelong learning is fading and becoming more and more the regulator and auditor of the learning market. Through the shift towards a learning economy lifelong learning has changed from being a right to an individual's duty and responsibility. This development also has a negative impact on the individual's motivation for engaging in lifelong learning activities because today the lifelong learner is caught up in a struggle over what counts as 'real' or 'worthwhile' learning. This struggle is not simply conceptual since it directly impacts the resources that are made available for lifelong learning (Biesta 2006: 175ff.). Biesta (*ibid.*: 175f.) states that:

Whereas in the past lifelong learning was an individual's right which corresponded to the state's duty to provide resources and opportunities for lifelong learning, it seems that lifelong learning has increasingly become a duty for which individuals need to take responsibility, while it has become the right of the state to demand of all its citizens that they continuously engage in learning so as to keep up with the demands of the global economy.

The rise of the learning economy thus brings into question the potential democratic function of lifelong learning (Biesta, 2006: 170). By making lifelong learning a private good, which is considered valuable to individuals and other players in the economic sector in relation to its economic function, it becomes more and more difficult to make a claim for collective resources which support the other two dimensions of lifelong learning: the personal and the democratic. In view of the recent rise of the learning economy the key question is about the relationship between lifelong learning and democracy: does democracy need lifelong learning and if yes, what kind of lifelong learning does it need? Because of the current specification of lifelong learning in economic terms, there is without a doubt a need to generate a more balanced approach to lifelong learning and to reclaim the democratic dimension of lifelong learning (ibid.: 177f.). It can be concluded that to analyze the intended and unintended consequences of specific ways of thinking about lifelong learning and to detect what is included and what is accidentally or deliberately left out in the discussion is a crucial task (ibid.: 170).

Experiencing Learning: From Limited Surface Learning to Deep Learning

Experience lies at the intersection of objective reality and the self and therefore forms one's individual construct of reality. This construction of reality is caused by the process of turning data and information into knowledge, beliefs, values and emotions (Jarvis, 2006: 207). Moreover, learning experiences shape learners' own learning identities which has strong implications for their quality of life. To be able to create new knowledge and competencies learners require tools to shape, codetermine and control their lives and to be able to manage their own learning (Niemi, 2008: 10, 13).

There are different types of learning such as *reproduction-oriented modes* (quantitative increase of knowledge, acquiring and memorizing facts, etc.) or *transformative modes* (abstract meaning, interpretation of reality, personal development, etc.). Critics of higher education claim that too much emphasis is still placed on "limited surface learning" which results from a reproduction-oriented mode of education. This kind of teaching is called 'teaching as telling' because students aren't required to reflect on either purpose or strategy. Instead they memorize facts and procedures as a matter of routine without any need for connecting the different aspects of the content or developing new ideas. Critics of these traditional forms of teaching in higher education institutions worldwide ask for so-called "deep learning" which can be described as a transformative experience with longer term retention and the capacity to transfer the knowledge, skills and attitudes gained in the educational setting to other contexts. In deep learning settings, students have "to focus on what is of significance in the course material, relate theoretical ideas to everyday experience, evaluate the evidence of competing arguments, and construct their own coherent, fact-based understanding of the subject" (Forest, 2006: 352). This trans-

formative mode of learning concentrates on the growth in “students’ intellectual complexity, critical thinking, reasoning, and capacity for learning” (Arnold, 2002 in *ibid.*: 352). High quality learning entails the “active construction of meaning” and the “possibility of conceptual change” on the part of the learners (Ramsden, 1992 in *ibid.*: 353). Teacher’s responsibility is then to engage the learners in appropriate learning activities (*ibid.*: 353).

Motivation, Prior Knowledge and Meta-Cognitive Competencies

Learning is a very complex process which depends on and is characterized by various factors. Three important factors are a person’s *motivation*, *prior knowledge* and *meta-cognitive competencies* which determine the approach a person selects in learning (Thielsch, 2011: 57). In the following, these three factors are introduced in more detail.

Motivation: There is no learning without motivation because learning requires the involvement or activity of the individual in the form of (re)constructing what is already known. While an internal interest in the subject or the wish to pass a course or an examination can motivate one’s learning, a loss of motivation occurs if a person cannot identify value in an activity, lacks confidence or has no expectancy of the desired outcome. While the intrinsic motivation is meaning-oriented and results from an interest in what is being learned and the feelings of pleasure resulting from it, the extrinsic motivation is outcome-oriented and depends on external rewards such as grades or praise. In order to be motivated, individuals always need to know for what purpose they are learning (Thielsch, 2011: 58). Students who are stimulated to set goals and are permitted to control their own achievement of those goals are therefore more attentive to and have more energy for their learning (Forest, 2006: 355).

Prior Knowledge: If learning is to take place, students as well as teachers need to work with prior knowledge because each person constructs knowledge based on what he or she already knows. Through learning, new links between novel information and experiences which may add to, modify or reorganize the individual’s existing knowledge base are constructed. As a consequence each individual constructs or makes his or her own meaning of knowledge (Thielsch, 2011: 58). The prior knowledge of learners is extremely important for comprehension and knowledge acquisition and also for the construction of personal meaning. Prior knowledge can then be defined as the platform upon which a teacher can assist students to gain a more complex understanding of the content (Forest, 2006: 353). Because there is an enormous heterogeneity in student groups, for example different learning styles and diverse cultural backgrounds, a teacher has to deal with multiple unique prior knowledges. These prior knowledges have to be acknowledged and explored so as to be able to teach according to them. However, the differences in learning are not only influenced by previous education; they are also triggered by heredity as well as prior experiences. Social and cultural attitudes within families and peer groups are formed early and have a lasting influence on the learning style of a person (Thielsch, 2011: 59).

Meta-Cognitive Competencies: To be able to reflect on and understand one’s own learning – referred to as meta-cognitive knowledge – is one of the key competencies of learners because it makes it possible to consciously influence and direct one’s learning. The

meta-cognitive knowledge about one's own learning implies the following three aspects: "thinking about the learning itself", "planning how to do it" and "monitoring the learning process". Those who are aware of their personal learning and who are able to put this understanding into practical use are likely to achieve better learning performance. Successful learning not only depends then on the learning action itself but on the reflexion on it (Thielsch, 2011: 59).

Experiencing Academic Teaching

Globalization processes, market dynamics, multinational initiatives, internationalization and new information technologies, as described earlier in more detail, have brought numerous changes for higher education worldwide. These changes have a significant impact on what is taught; however, there are not yet dramatic changes in how teaching and learning is organized in higher education (Forest, 2006: 370). While learning is central to the role and mission of the university, little attention is still given to the development of teaching competence among the members of the academic profession. A closer look reveals that most faculty receives little or no preparation in teaching skills because the focus is on the development of disciplinary expertise and research capabilities, assuming that proficiency in an academic discipline adequately prepares one for teaching. However the increase of specialization within academic disciplines and fields of scientific inquiry and the simultaneous need for specialized competence among teachers and researchers has certainly led to a change in the way to approach learning and teaching (ibid.: 348f.). More precisely, while the core of teaching is still the interaction of teachers and students, teachers' professional roles have expanded. For Niemi (2008: 10) teaching calls for wide-ranging competencies such as:

- awareness of the knowledge construction of their subject matter
- understanding of multidisciplinary research on learning to be able to create learning spaces for diverse learners
- detailed understanding of human growth and development
- knowledge of the methods and strategies in learning processes
- familiarity with the curricula and learning environments in educational institutions
- openness to learning in non-formal educational settings such as in open learning and labour market contexts
- the know-how to apply information and communication technology in the knowledge creation processes
- the ability to provide tools so that learners are able to be in a dialogical relationship with knowledge, learning environments and other people.

All over the world, the commitment to teaching and learning has been a trademark of the academic profession. The intrinsic motivation for teaching is powerful because it supports individuals in understanding the complex world which leads to new discoveries and the advancement of social and scientific knowledge. It could be said that teaching effectively is the core function of higher education because it enhances and nurtures the learning processes of students (Forest, 2006: 347). Effective teaching includes preparation, attitudes toward instruction and classroom behavior and interactions. The philosophy of teaching, whether knowledge is seen as transmitted or constructed, is of high importance and a

teacher's choice of teaching method has a considerable impact on the learning experience (ibid.: 358). A teacher's sense of self plays a significant role in his or her teaching effectiveness. A university teacher has to establish a clear personal commitment to and understanding of his or her role in a student's academic and personal development. While individual strengths facilitate learning, fears and misperceptions are barriers to good teaching. Moreover, an adequate preparation of the teacher for classroom teaching plays an important role in the effectiveness of learning processes (ibid.: 349). James J.F. Forest (ibid.: 358) holds the view that

Teaching is perhaps the most difficult and complex responsibility for members of the academic profession. From textbook selection to classroom management and organization, to giving and grading exams, teaching requires a considerable commitment of time, energy and skill. Thus, it comes as no surprise that a good deal of research on college and university teaching is dedicated to helping the teacher achieve these multiple tasks more effectively.

Driven by market forces and a decline in public support for higher education, institutions of higher learning cannot survive without at least some demonstrated effectiveness in teaching (Forest, 2006: 349). To be able to evaluate the effectiveness of teaching in higher education institutions, one has to take into account the fact that the goals of higher education vary within each particular regional, national and institutional context. These variations often relate to political, social and cultural forces, and thus there are huge differences between countries and institutions in terms of what is taught. However teaching itself, "the instructional methods, learning environment and assessment tools used", is quite similar worldwide. In particular Western conceptions of good teaching have a high degree of cross-cultural validity. Centers for improving teaching can be found at many academic institutions in some form or another, particularly in Australia, Canada, the United States and Western Europe. In addition, various websites and publications offer theoretical exploration and practical guidance on a variety of issues which support the development and improvement of teaching in higher education (ibid.: 350ff.).

For Weimar (2002, 2003 in ibid.: 363) five key dimensions are important for higher education institutions to be able to reexamine their assumptions of student learning: 1) Decision making processes about learning practices have to be shared between teachers and students. Students have to be involved in the selection of class assignments; this brings with it more responsibility and motivation for their learning. 2) Teachers support students in constructing meaning independently, for example through a learner-centered teaching approach. 3) Teachers have to abandon control in their classrooms and relatedly decrease their students' dependence on them. 4) Replacing the traditional emphasis on disciplinary content. To master increasingly sophisticated content, students need "a repertoire of strategies, approaches, and techniques" and a solid foundation of knowledge in their particular subject area. 5) To encourage learning and the development of student's assessment skills, different evaluation activities should be implemented.

At the end of this section it is further possible to assert that because of the increasing use of information technology by universities, today teaching modes are changing. Both teacher and students use new online technology to enhance their teaching and learning processes and to foster their communication. The rapid rise of distance learning programs further changes teaching practices in the modern information age. In many parts of the

world, students are even more technologically competent than their teachers. Nevertheless, it must be kept in mind that even though technology is often understood as a tool to enhance traditional forms of teaching and learning, the use of this tool has not yet considerably transformed our understanding of learning and teaching (Forest, 2006: 361f.).

Responsibility in Learner-Centered Teaching Approaches

For Elisabeth Görsdorf (2010: 146) the relationship between learner and teacher is changing because of the possibility of inheriting a more active role of learners in the learning process, the opportunity to construct new knowledge by working in teams and the chance to apply previous experiences and knowledge in learning situations. Angelika Thielsch (2011: 56) similarly suggests that in higher education, teachers deal with (young) adults who commonly have a social and cultural reservoir of meaningful experience, an intrinsic motivation, a life-centered and problem-centered orientation to learning and a learning style which is marked by self-directed aspects. For Thielsch, the learning strategy of self-directed learning allows the learners to decide themselves on crucial aspects of learning such as on what, when and how learning should take place, what they want to achieve and to set the goals for every learning process (ibid.: 60). Learners need to develop these abilities which can be supported by learning environments that seek to involve the students and support their ability to individually direct their learning as much as possible. Even if learners who enter universities often don't have the competencies for self-directed learning, this type of learning is characteristic of adult learning (ibid.: 65).

A learner-centered teacher in higher education puts the individual in the center of the course design (Thielsch, 2011: 121) – this can be described as a “shift from teaching to learning” (ibid.: 60). Learner-centered teaching approaches reorganize learning environments in higher education through activating the learners and hence adjusting to the core of the self-directed learning cycle – the responsibility of the learner. The learners' responsibility increases through a sharing of power between teacher and students. To make this process successful, the learners have to understand and accept the responsibilities that belong to them (ibid.: 62). Through dividing the responsibilities between students and teachers, new roles emerge for both of them in a learner-centered environment. A teachers' responsibility in learner-centered teaching is to help “their students to build a knowledge base, to engage with the subject and to make the content important for them”. The role of learner-centered teachers further includes the consideration of individual differences in learning among the students. Teachers have to use different methods to accommodate these individual differences and they have to encourage students to actively interact within learning activities (ibid.: 64). Moreover, both teachers and learners bear the responsibility for the outcome of the educational experience. A continuous reflection on both parts is therefore an important factor so that effective learning and teaching can take place (Forest, 2006: 371).

Teaching and learning can be defined as an interactive process which involves, as mentioned above, shared responsibilities and manifold roles (Forest, 2006: 370f.). While Forest (ibid.: 363) maintains that teachers and students are partners in reaching desired learning outcomes, Görsdorf (2010: 146) claims that teachers increasingly inherit the role of moderators, mediators, trainers or facilitators. Moreover Weimer (2002: xviii in Thielsch, 2011: 64f.) states that learner-centered teachers are facilitators, guides and de-

signers of learning experiences. Consequently, learner-centered teachers are no longer the main actors in the learning setting because of the reallocation of activity and of power. It can be concluded that the loss of some of the teachers' power does not inevitably indicate the loss of authority as a teacher because the authority comes mainly from expert knowledge and experience and students generally accept and learn from that knowledge.

Recommendations for Academic Teaching Competencies

In this final part of the article, the focus of attention is on recommendations for university teaching by Thomas A. Angelo and James J.F. Forest (2002 in Forest, 2006: 358-361) which can be outlined as follows: 1) *Lecturing effectively*: Lecturing is still the most common teaching method. Effective lecturing entails clarity and thoughtful organization of the material. Personal attributes of the lecturer such as enthusiasm, energy and charisma are of high importance. Effective lecturing requires a certain sense of self-awareness and a sense of humor. Moreover, personal attributes related to behavior such as eye contact, using emotion-enhancing words or moving in the classroom are other crucial characteristics of an effective lecturer. Many of the personal features related to verbal aptitude also matter considerably. 2) *Employing effective group assignments*: Effective group assignments are a tool for developing students' higher-level cognitive skills. These assignments require an understanding of the course concepts, a level of difficulty that encourages collaborative over individual effort, appropriate questions, a grading system which takes into account individual preparation and team development, activities that groups do well (e.g. identifying problems, formulating strategies), the chance to apply the course concepts to realistic problems and a tangible output that can be effectively evaluated. 3) *Encouraging classroom discussion*: Effective discussions are dependent on the abilities of the teacher to control issues and to guide students through interpersonal interactions, especially those occurring in multicultural classrooms. 4) *Collaborating with colleagues*: Teacher collaboration, team teaching and interdisciplinary education are increasing. The advantage of collaboration is that students are able to gain knowledge through working together effectively and respecting diversity of opinion and perspective. 5) *Assigning problem-solving exercises*: Problem-solving activities promote critical thinking, creativity and the intrinsic motivation for creative problem solving. 6) *Seeking feedback from students*: Respect for and interest in student thoughts and views about the course direction or discussion is vital for engaging students in the learning process. "One Minute Papers" is a quick and effective way to collect written feedback about a course or a specific class session. Anonymous, open-ended teaching evaluations at various points throughout the course can also help to address the interest and concerns expressed by the students. 7) *Organizing the classroom experience*: To support students in constructing their understanding of the material and how ideas and concepts presented relate to one another can be done through clarifying concepts, summarizing the main points and leaving time for questions. 8) *Encouraging inquiry*: Asking questions, asking for clarification and asking for connections to other relevant materials promote creative and critical thinking and cooperative learning. To gain more responsibility for the learning process, teachers should support and encourage students understanding of how to ask questions. 9) *Using experiential learning exercises*: Field trips offer students the chance to become involved in the learning process and to become aware of the complexity and imperfection of real events. Through the active participation

of students, these experiences promote active learning which plays a central role in promoting student motivation for learning. 10) *Establishing learning contracts*: Learning contracts are an effective strategy for structuring teaching and learning. They are tools for clarifying what the teacher and the student can expect from a course (methods, time-frame, tools, evaluation procedures, etc.). Learning contracts give students some control over the learning process and this can be a motivating factor for effective learning.

Concluding Thoughts

The market economy and trade liberalization, the knowledge society, information and communication technologies as well as changes in governance structures are integral elements of globalization which have an enormous influence on the education sector; they are both catalysts for globalization and consequences of globalization (Knight, 2006: 209). In the 21st century with its complexities, possibilities and constant changes the educational landscape can shift tremendously and therefore prevalent paradigms for learning, knowing and education need to transform. If education practices, institutions and informal learning environments want to take advantage of these changes, approaches to education and learning need to be as comprehensive and complex as its challenges and opportunities (Brown/Thomas, 2010: 335). From this perspective, interdisciplinary approaches which can be understood as “learning across different academic disciplines, collaborating and looking at the same questions or problems from different perspectives” and transdisciplinary approaches which imply “the collaboration of academic disciplines with non-university professionals for application in practice” should be applied to learning and teaching practices in higher education (Görsdorf 2010: 147).

Within Europe and all around the world interconnectedness increases which calls for new forms of living, working (Görsdorf 2010: 143) and in consequence for new ways of learning and teaching. For Lee Shulman (2002 in Forest, 2006: 350f.) the goals of higher education should be that students are engaged and motivated; acquire knowledge and develop understanding; present their knowledge and understanding through performance and action; critically reflect on the world and their own place within it; handle the constraints and complexities of the world; formulate their own judgments and strategies for action and promote a lifelong commitment to critical examination and self-development. Thielsch (2011: 55) similarly emphasizes that the field of higher education should provide individuals with the ability to think for themselves, to draw meaning out of complex issues, to learn how to continue learning throughout their lives and to acquire competencies that enable them to act in today’s multifaceted world. And Lenzen (2010: 304f.) points to the fact that in globalized times, individuals are challenged to acquire certain qualifications and behaviors to be able to participate in the (global) society. For Lenzen, these qualifications can be dealing with ambiguities, thinking about the future, coping with the plethora of information around them, not blindly trusting in opinions expressed in public spaces, keeping options open in the face of growing uncertainties, making sustainable personal decisions with regard to social relationships and in relation to training and occupation, acting rationally despite uncertainties, performing and judging from a firm knowledge base and avoiding linear thinking.

Without question, there is a broad spectrum of teaching and learning goals; from moral and ethical behavior to civic engagement and from discipline-based factual knowl-

edge to critical thinking. The concept of critical thinking which can be described “as the ability to evaluate different points of view and look at evidence” is a key element to the success of learners in higher education. The model of “reflective judgment” by Kitchen-er and King (1984 in Forest, 2006: 351) illustrates that a student’s learning environment must challenge absolutistic assumptions and sustain the validity of alternative perspectives. For Peter Jarvis (2006: 207), individuals are more than ever exposed to various secondary experiences of the world and therefore

globalisation has not only generated new conditions in which ideals change as they are applied to existing conditions, it has broken down the social situation in which we have been able to limit our thinking to our own society and exclude all those situations that do not fit into our mind-set. (ibid.: 208)

And Kwiek argues that “In periods of huge transformations the conceptions of one’s role, place and tasks in culture and society get questioned” and thus, the academic world which has been for a long time very inward-orientated has to develop deep awareness of transformations which occur in the outside world (Kwiek, 2001: 171). It is clear from this discussion that university teachers are required to include a greater global dimension in their course assignments as well as in class discussions (Forest, 2006: 370).

For much of the 20th century, learning was mostly concerned with the attainment of skills and the transmission of stable information, i.e. as can be defined as “learning about” (Brown/Thomas, 2010: 321). This traditional model of learning follows the idea that knowledge can be studied and accumulated (ibid.: 326). Near the end of the 20th century learning shifted towards “learning to be”. In this approach to learning, learning has been put into a situated context which is concerned with systems, identity and the transmission of knowledge. “Learning to be” needs engagement and provides a sense of enculturation in practices which enables participation, to learn how to learn and to shape practices within communities (ibid.: 321ff.). The acceptance in the networked world promotes notions of “learning to be” because of its ability to put the things we learn into action (ibid.: 326). While traditional models of learning have moved from models of direct knowledge transfer to broader notions of skills, neither of them is able to explain and account for the fundamental epistemic shifts and new agreements of the 21st century (ibid.: 335). In other words, in a relatively stable world, the two concepts of “learning about” and “learning to be” worked, however a world of constant flux requires a theory of “learning to become” (ibid.: 321).

Bibliography

- Altbach, Philip G. (2006): Globalization and the University: Realities in an Unequal World. In: Forest, James J.F./ Altbach, Philip G. (eds.): International Handbook of Higher Education. Dordrecht: Springer. pp. 121-139.
- Biesta, Gert (2006): What’s the Point of Lifelong Learning if Lifelong Learning Has No Point? On the Democratic Deficit of Policies for Lifelong Learning. In: European Educational Research Journal. Volume 5. Numbers 3 & 4. pp. 169-180. http://www.wwords.co.uk/pdf/freetoview.asp?j=eerj&vol=5&issue=3&year=2006&article=2_Biesta_EERJ_5_3-4_web [16.04.2012].
- Brown, John Seely/ Thomas, Douglas (2010): Learning in/for a World of Constant Flux: Homo Sapiens, Homo Faber & Homo Ludens revisited. In: Weber, Luc E./ Duderstadt, James J.

- (eds.): University Research for Innovation. Glion Colloquium Series No. 6. London, Paris, Geneva: Economica. pp. 321-336.
- Crick, Ruth Deakin (2008): Key Competencies for Education in a European Context: narratives of accountability or care. In: European Educational Research Journal. Volume 7. Number 3. pp. 311-318. <http://www.wvwords.co.uk/rss/abstract.asp?j=eerj&aid=3349> [14-04-2012].
- Forest, James J.F. (2006): Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. In: Forest, James J.F./ Altbach, Philip G. (eds.): International Handbook of Higher Education. Dordrecht: Springer. pp. 347-375.
- Görsdorf, Elisabeth M. (2010): The Case for Europe: Europe-Related Learning in the Context of a Summer University. In: Schröttner, Barbara/ Hofer, Christian (Hrsg.) (2010): Kompetenzen – Interdisziplinäre Rahmen/ Competences – Interdisciplinary Frameworks. Graz: Leykam Universitätsverlag. pp. 141-157.
- Jarvis, Peter (2006): Beyond the learning society: globalisation and the moral imperative for reflective social change. In: International Journal of Lifelong Education. <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02601370600697011> [22.05.2012].
- Knight, Jane (2006): Internationalization: Concepts, Complexities and Challenges. In: Forest, James J.F./ Altbach, Philip G. (eds.): International Handbook of Higher Education. Dordrecht: Springer. pp. 207-227.
- Kwiek, Marek (2001): Central European Higher Education and Global Pressures: The Three Aspects of Globalization. In: Drozdowicz, Zbigniew (ed.): Transformations, Adaptations and Integrations in Europe. Global and Local Problems. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Fundacji Humaniora. pp. 161-173.
- Lenzen, Dieter (2010): BILDUNG and Innovation – a contradictio in adjecto for today's university education in a globalized world? In: Weber, Luc E./ Duderstadt, James J. (eds.): University Research for Innovation. Glion Colloquium Series No. 6. London, Paris, Geneva: Economica. pp. 303-314.
- Niemi, Hannele (2008): Why from Teaching to Learning? In: European Educational Research Journal. Volume 8. Number 1. pp. 1-17. <http://www.wvwords.co.uk/rss/abstract.asp?j=eerj&aid=3489> [14.04.2012].
- Thielsch, Angelika (2010): "Nice to Meet You!" – About the Combination of Teaching Literature and Acquiring Intercultural Competence in the Context of Higher Education: Theoretical Assumptions and Models of Course Design. In: Schröttner, Barbara/ Hofer, Christian (Hrsg.) (2010): Kompetenzen – Interdisziplinäre Rahmen/ Competences – Interdisciplinary Frameworks. Graz: Leykam Universitätsverlag. pp. 113-125.
- Thielsch, Angelika (2011): Learning and Self-Direction. Ways to Foster Self-Directed Learning in Higher Education. In: Schröttner, Barbara/ Hofer, Christian (Hrsg.): Looking at Learning. Higher Education. Language. Place./ Blicke auf das Lernen. Hochschule. Sprache. Ort. Münster, New York, Munich, Berlin: Waxmann Verlag. pp. 55-70.

Zwischen Skylla und Charybdis Über die Entwicklung universitärer Lehrkompetenz in kompetitiven Wissenschaftskarrieren

Abstract

In diesem Aufsatz werden die institutionellen Bedingungen und die biographischen Entwicklungen von Lehrkompetenz im universitären Bereich beschrieben. Dabei werden Aussagen über die Hintergrundkonstruktionen, Handlungskontexte und Erwartungsmuster in Bezug auf die hier vorgenommenen Prozesse der „Passung“ von individuellen Vorstellungen und Dispositionen innerhalb der institutionellen Anforderungen erschlossen. Weiters geht es um den Nachvollzug dieser Prozesse der Anpassung und Überschreitung, der Disziplinierung und Emanzipation innerhalb der vielschichtigen Verläufe in der Herausbildung von akademischen Lehrstilen. Wie diese im Einzelnen aussehen, wird anhand der Analyse von biographischen Aneignungsprozessen dargestellt.

Wie jede andere Institution antwortet die Universität auf gesellschaftliche Handlungsprobleme und bietet diesbezüglich spezifische Modelle und Konzepte für unterschiedliche gesellschaftliche Interessenslagen und Zukunftsszenarien. Das Leitsystem der Wissenschaft zur kulturellen Reproduktion ist dabei der Entwurf und die Methodisierung von Möglichkeiten der Analyse und Aneignung von Welt. In diesem Sinne sind Universitäten weiterhin eine entscheidende Triebfeder der modernen Wissensgesellschaft. Innerhalb dieser Institution wiederum sind es vor allem die Neugierde und die Freude am Entdecken von Zusammenhängen sowie das Vernetzen von Wissen und Menschen, die hierbei den Motor der sozialen und wissenschaftlichen Modernisierung vorantreiben. Menschen, die hier arbeiten, sind in diesem Vorhaben der Suche sehr oft intrinsisch motiviert, indem sie ein persönliches Interesse zum Verständnis dieser Welt antreibt. Diese Wissbegierde ist dabei stets gebunden an ein aufklärerisches Motiv der Selbstermächtigung des entdeckenden Verstandes, aber auch an die Kritik der formalen Normen und Begrenzungen. Dieses Bestreben wird durch die Initiative Einzelner vorangetrieben, kann aber erst durch die kollegiale Praxis der *community of scientists* abgesichert und wertvoll gemacht werden. Dieses Vorgehen der Bezogenheit von Einzelleistung und Gemeinschaft, von vorläufig begründetem Wissen und Zweifel, von Denken und Handeln, aber auch von Wissenschaft und Gesellschaft muss erlernt werden, bedarf der systematischen Ausbildung innerhalb eines akademischen Habitus. Neben dieser wissenschaftsimmanenten Perspektive ist die zweite große Ebene der Universität, die Lehre, besonders wichtig, da hierin zum einen die Weitergabe des hervorgebrachten Wissens, zum anderen die Pflege und Entwicklung der für den Fortgang der Welt und der Wissenschaft so wertvollen Neugierde gesellschaftlich und kommunikativ begründet sind. Treten diese Elemente der Bezogenheit von Lehrenden und Lernenden, von Wissen und der Kritik desselben in den Hintergrund, weichen sie einer einzig pragmatischen oder strategischen Ausrichtung, die als karriererelevant eingestuft wird, so fehlt ein essentieller Baustein universitären Bemühens um die Verständlichkeit der Welt. Genauso schädlich wie das „Zurechtbasteln“ von Publi-

kationen und Forschungsarbeiten einzig zu „Zielen“ „individueller Werbekampagnen“, ist die Abwertung der Lehre zugunsten der Forschungsqualifikation. Das Spannungsfeld, in dem sich die Universität als Bildungs- und Wissenschaftsinstitution befindet, findet aber nicht nur in der Gegenwart statt. Die offensichtlichen Umgestaltungen sind unübersehbar, aber sie treffen nicht das Wesen oder den Kern von Universität. Eine temporäre Bezogenheit auf momentane Veränderungen oder Befindlichkeiten verliert deshalb allzu schnell die großen Zusammenhänge aus den Augen, übersieht viele wichtige Bezüge universitärer Arbeit in Hinblick auf die Gesellschaft und deren Subsysteme, der Politik, der Wirtschaft, der „Idee vom guten Leben“ usw. Gerade in Zeiten globalisierter Vorgänge sind es ja zu meist nicht nur die neuen, sondern auch die alten Probleme, mit denen sich Bildung und Wissenschaft auseinandersetzen müssen. Es sind die Fragen nach den mündigen BürgerInnen, den Zielen und Werten unserer Gesellschaft, der Anreicherung unserer Welt mit Wissen und Fertigkeiten und den sich daraus ergebenden Konsequenzen. Gerade an dieser Stelle sollte nicht übersehen werden, dass Universitäten (ob sie es wollen oder nicht) sich an derart dauerhaften Fragen abarbeiten müssen, denn die Bezugnahme auf mündige ForscherInnen, Lehrende und Studierende verlangt, weit über die Anlassfälle der aktuellen Aufregtheiten und Wirtschaftsdaten hinaus zu denken. Universitäten dürfen diese Art von Fragen nicht vergessen, sonst unterfordern sie ihre MitarbeiterInnen, missbrauchen ihre Studierenden und verschwenden ihre Ressourcen. Einzig ein Durchlauferhitzer für studentischen und technologischen Output zu sein, wäre ein großer Verlust. Eine Universität, die sich als reine „Wissensfabrik“ unter ökonomisierten Wettbewerbsbedingungen versteht, entledigt sich ihres gesellschaftlich wertvollen Auftrags, bewusst an der Gestaltung von Zukunft mitzuwirken.

Es ist jedoch offensichtlich, dass eine aktiv wahrgenommene gesellschaftspolitische Perspektive sehr voraussetzungsvoll ist. Dies gilt sowohl für die Forschung als auch für die Lehre. Die für die Lehre untersuchten Wirkverhältnisse zeigen dabei recht unterschiedliche Deutungsmuster, wie Tätigkeiten des inspirierenden und forschenden Lehrens angestrebt (aber nicht logisch erzwungen) werden können. Es gibt kaum WissenschaftlerInnen, die im Gespräch nicht beteuern, dass es für alle wesentlichen Tätigkeiten an der Universität zu wenig Zeit und auch zu wenig Freiraum gäbe. Ein großer Teil hält dies gleichzeitig für ein eisernes Gesetz der wirtschaftsdominierten und medialen Moderne, dem sich die Universität nicht entziehen kann. Trotzdem halten beinahe alle ihren Arbeitsplatz für etwas Privilegiertes, für einen außergewöhnlichen Ort der systematischen Bezugnahme von eigener Entwicklung und allgemeinem Fortschritt. Die Universitätsentwicklung wird in diesem Sinne als in Veränderung wahrgenommen, die durchaus viele Chancen beinhaltet: die verstärkten Momente weiblicher Präsenz im universitären Alltag und deren innovative Versuche, neue Work-Life-Balance-Modelle zu entwickeln; die mannigfaltigen technologischen Möglichkeiten und deren soziale Bindungen in neuen Kooperationsformen; die im Wachsen begriffenen trans-, inter- und intradisziplinären Projekte mit ihren erst zu findenden Beobachtungssprachen und -aufgaben, die es erlauben, auf neue Weise in die Tiefe zu gehen, alternative Geschichten über diese Welt zu erzählen und Hintergründe zu beleuchten. So sehr die Befragten vom hohen Ethos der Wissenschaft überzeugt sind, so unterschiedlich sind oft ihre Wege, diese Aspekte in die Lehre übertragen zu können. In den in diesem Aufsatz geschilderten berufsbiographischen Zugängen zum universitären Lehrberuf zeigte sich immer wieder, wie die einzelnen subjektiven Erfahrungen und deren Deutungen stets auf institutionelle und gesellschaftliche Verhältnisse bezogen bleiben. Dabei wirken sich eben die Fokussierung der universitären Berufsbezüge auf kompe-

titive Forschungs- und Drittmittelbezüge in der Forschung, der Primat der Fachkulturen und die Unterentwickeltheit (bzw. kaum offensiv vertretene Rolle) der Hochschuldidaktik behindernd auf einen Zuwachs der Bedeutungsgehalte der Lehre aus. Der Ausbau von institutionell abgesicherten Lehrentwicklungen und des individuellen Lehrhandelns finden ihre Begrenzung meist innerhalb konkreter Machtverhältnisse, Berufskarrieren und sozialer Normen. Diesbezüglich scheint es heute unabweislich, dass für den Umfang und das Profil der hochschuldidaktischen Aktivitäten von Universitäten vor allem jene Formen der „institutional policy“ ausschlaggebend sind, die die Leistungen nach den messbaren Parametern und den daraus abgeleiteten institutionellen Vorgaben ausrichten. In diesem Sinne spielen die Elemente der Forschungsevaluation und der dazu vorgelagert erhobenen Ziel- und Leistungsgrößen die entscheidende Rolle. Anhand dieser Einflüsse wird die organisationale Identität („das Profil“) der Universitäten, der Fakultäten und Institute ausgerichtet. Eine aktive Universitätsentwicklungspolitik geht innerhalb dieser weitgehend regulierten Strukturen vor sich. Die dabei eingeschlagenen Wege der institutionellen Differenzierung bestimmen jene Rankings und Bezugspunkte in der Scientific Community, die vermehrt darüber bestimmen, wie eine Hochschule mit finanziellem, kulturellem und sozialem Kapital ausgestattet wird. So dynamisch die davon betroffenen Institutionen ihre internen und externen Bezüge im Wissenschaftssystem herstellen können, so passiv und strukturkonservativ kommen die dabei erzeugten Effekte in der Lehre an. Dies scheint unter den Bedingungen der derzeitigen Massenuniversitäten ein fundamental immanentes Dilemma zu sein, das sich in den Studiengängen, aber verschärft noch im Bereich der Aus- und Weiterbildung des wissenschaftlichen Lehrnachwuchspersonals zeigt. Und zwar in der immer wieder auftauchenden inhärenten Spannung zwischen der Forschungs- und der Lehrleistung, zwischen dem eigenen Hervorbringen von Erkenntnis und der Entwicklung eines Vermittlungs- und Beziehungssystems zur Kommunikation des Wissens in der Lehre. Alle universitär Lehrenden finden sich (zumindest solange sie keine tragfähigen Routinen dafür entwickelt haben) in diesem Spannungsfeld wieder. Für neu eintretende Personen birgt sie besonders viele Wagnisse, denn sie müssen an den gewohnten Bahnen des eigenen unmittelbaren Umfelds festhalten, um sich nicht in ein wissenschaftliches Abseits zu begeben, und sollten gleichzeitig Raum für Erkundungen eigener Fragestellungen und Erklärungsversuche in der Lehre bekommen. Sie müssen diesbezüglich zwischen der Skylla der ungeschützten Lehrerkundungspfade und der Charybdis der festgefühten und nachdrücklich verteidigten Strukturen in der Organisation von Hochschulen hindurch. Gerade hier ist die Bereitschaft der Universitätsleitungen von entscheidender Bedeutung, eine offensive Hochschuldidaktikpolitik zu betreiben und die (Weiter-) Bildungsaktivitäten in Bezug auf die Lehre auszubauen. Dazu bedarf es vor allem förderlicher und unterstützender Rahmenbedingungen, um der systematischen Entwicklung von Lehrkompetenz, als einer zentralen Aufgabe der Universität, Aufmerksamkeit zu verschaffen. Wie dies geschehen kann, wurde in einem österreichweiten Projekt analysiert. Im Zentrum des Interesses standen dabei Lehrende des tertiären Bereiches aus fünf österreichischen Universitäten, wobei in der Analyse den narrativen Konstruktionsprozessen von biographischen Lehrdispositionen nachgegangen wurde. Dabei standen sowohl kompetenz- und identitätstheoretische Bewältigungsmechanismen als auch Fragen nach den unterschiedlichen Formen von (berufs-)biographischen Orientierungs-, Entscheidungs- und Handlungsprozessen in Bezug auf die Entwicklung von Lehrkompetenz im Mittelpunkt der Fragestellung (vgl. dazu und zu den folgenden Ausführungen Egger 2012). In der Mehrzahl der hier analysierten Interviews wird die Situation einer zielgerechten Ent-

faltung von Lehrkompetenz allerdings als etwas weitgehend Randständiges beschrieben. Die in allen Institutionen vermehrten Debatten über lebenslanges Lernen werden diesbezüglich kaum auf die Lehre in der Universität übertragen. Existieren zwar durchaus vielfältige Angebote für unterschiedliche Zielgruppen in der Universität, so ist es aus dieser Sicht bisher noch nicht gelungen, die hochschuldidaktische Weiterbildung tatsächlich als dritten, gleichwertigen Pfeiler neben Forschung und Erstausbildung zu verankern. Die Gründe und Ursachen dafür sind schon ausführlich beschrieben worden und liegen sicherlich auch in der erheblichen Überlastung der Lehre insgesamt aufgrund der sich kontinuierlich ausdehnenden Nachfrage und einer rückläufigen Personalentwicklung. Ist dieser Überlastungs- und Nachfragedruck zwar zwischen Studienfächern unterschiedlich, so ist das Gesamtsystem Universität derzeit generell von diesen Entwicklungen und den Reaktionen der Lehrenden darauf betroffen. Daneben verstärken die Rahmenbedingungen der hochschuldidaktischen Weiterbildung weiterhin eine eher abwehrende Haltung. Werden von den Universitäten zwar hochschuldidaktische Ausbildungen für neueintretende WissenschaftlerInnen gestartet, so bleiben diese Aktivitäten vielfach nutzlos, da KollegInnen davon betroffen sind, die mit kurzfristigen Verträgen bald wieder aus dieser Institution ausscheiden müssen. So sinnvoll die einzelnen Maßnahmen auch sind, so sehr werden sie von dienstrechtlichen Hemmnissen konterkariert. Die Schwierigkeit ist es weiterhin, alle Lehrenden tatsächlich lebenslang mit hochschuldidaktischen Entwicklungs- und Aktivitätspotentialen im Sinne einer „institutional policy“ zu erreichen.

Dass sich die Universitäten bis heute mit der Hochschuldidaktik so schwer tun, hat (über die Kapazitäts- und Auslastungsgründe hinaus) sicherlich auch Motive, die geschichtlich in der Tradition und dem forschungsorientierten Wissenschafts- und Bildungsverständnis dieser Institution liegen. Hierbei spielen, wie schon mehrfach erwähnt, wissenschaftsinterne Normen der Fachdisziplinen die zentrale Rolle in den Organisations- und Handlungseinheiten, was sich im akademischen Karriere- und Reputationssystem ausdrückt. Weiters liegt dies auch

an der ausgeprägten Einheitlichkeit bzw. der geringen Differenzierung des Hochschulsystems und der akademischen Ausbildung – zum Beispiel nach unterschiedlichen Ausbildungszielen, berufspraktischen Anforderungen oder den Voraussetzungen und besonderen Bedürfnissen der Teilnehmer/innen. (Herm/Koepernik/Leuterer/Richter/Wolter 2003, S. 26)

Dieses Argument weist darauf hin, dass für die Lehrenden an der Universität alle Studierenden zu einer Gruppe gehören und dass die Lehre insgesamt das Forschungshandeln der universitär Arbeitenden als wichtigsten Bezugspunkt ansieht. Hierin liegt auch die Ursache der Konflikte zwischen Praxisanforderung und der Wissenschaftsorientierung. Da die institutionellen Aufgabenzuschreibungen der Universität hierin begründet werden, ist eine Umgestaltung der universitären Berufsrolle in Hinblick auf eine Aufwertung der Lehre schwierig. Im Gegenteil, sie ist, im Sinne des bereits erwähnten Wissenschaftsprimats für Karrieren, rundweg schädlich. Hier wird offensichtlich, dass die Frage der Verankerung und der Zukunft der Hochschuldidaktik auch mit der grundsätzlichen Entwicklung der Organisation und dem Steuerungssystem der Hochschulen verbunden ist. Universitäten sind in diesem Sinne auch als gesellschaftliche Dienstleistungseinrichtung zu sehen,