Višnja Rajić, Tomislav Rajić

ASSESSMENT OF INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCE OF VOCATIONAL TEACHERS IN CROATIA

ABSTRACT

Due to the changes in society and the new era of "super-diversity" (Vertovec, 2007) in European countries, intercultural competence is gaining importance both in everyday life situations and teacher training. In the academic year of 2014/2105, a research was conducted on a sample of 136 prospective secondary school teachers undergoing their pedagogical-didactical-methodological training in different universities in the Republic of Croatia. The tool that was employed in the self-assessment of intercultural competence was called Recognising intercultural competence: What shows that I am interculturally competent? *The results showed that the examinees perceive their intercultural competence quite high; attitudes (M = 4,09); skills (M = 4,12); knowledge (M = 4,02). There is no significant difference between the perceived dimensions (p = ,282). Further research is recommended to better understand the insights about the examinees' understanding of intercultural competence.*

Keywords: *intercultural competence, intercultural education, Republic Croatia, vocational teachers*

OCENA MEDKULTURNIH KOMPETENC UČITELJEV POKLICNIH ŠOL NA HRVAŠKEM – POVZETEK

Zaradi družbenih sprememb ob vstopu novo dobo »superdiverzitete« (Vertovec, 2007) medkulturne kompetence v Evropskih državah pridobivajo pomen tako v vsakodnevnih situacijah kot v izobraževanju učiteljev. Raziskava je bila izvedena v Republiki Hrvaški v študijskem letu 2014/15 na vzorcu 136 bodočih srednješolskih učiteljev, ki so bili takrat vključeni v proces pridobitve pedagoške, didaktične in metodološke izobrazbe, izvedena raziskava. Glavno orodje, ki je bilo uporabljeno pri samooceni medkulturnih kompetenc, se je imenovalo Prepoznavanje medkulturnih kompetenc: kako vem, da sem medkulturno kompetenten/tna. *Rezultati so pokazali, da vprašani svoje medkulturne kompetence ocenjujejo precej visoko; odnosi (M = 4,09); veščine (M = 4,12); znanje (M = 4,02). Med ocenjevanimi kategorijami ni bilo občutnih razlik (p = 0,282). Nadaljnje raziskave bi omogočile boljši vpogled v to, kako vprašani razumejo koncept medkulturne kompetentnosti.*

Ključne besede: *medkulturne kompetence, medkulturno izobraževanje, Republika Hrvaška, učitelji poklicnih šol*

Višnja Rajić, Ph.D., *Faculty of Teacher Education, University of Zagreb, visnja.rajic@ufzg.hr*

Tomislav Rajić, M. A., *Agency for Vocational Education and Training and Adult Education Zagreb, tomislav.rajic@asoo.hr*

INTRODUCTION

Different stakeholders mention different reasons that increase the need for lifelong education but they all tend to conclude that the ongoing crisis of education leads to inadequate results (knowledge, skills and values) that rapidly expire and do not correspond with the needs of the contemporary globalised society. Process of globalisation led to rapid and important social and economic changes as societies and cultures across the world became integrated through communication, transportation, and trade.

During the last decades of the twentieth century and the first years of the current century, globalisation forces accelerated many aspects of migration and intercultural confrontation. These forces included "…the development of a global financial sector and economic system; advances in information and communications technology and developments in trade and transportation; intensification of armed conflicts and increases in the numbers of refugees and displaced persons; changing patterns of manufacturing and resource use; threats to the environment and human welfare; and a widening gap between rich and poor nations" (Pampanini, 2010, p. 7).

Globalised society comprises a complex web of forces and factors that bring people, cultures, markets, beliefs and practices into increasingly greater proximity with one another (Sorrells, 2012). Globalisation has accelerated the speed and scale of migration. Populations have become far more mobile and willing and able to re-locate in search of better employment prospects and higher standard of living, or because of other short or longer term considerations (Cantle, 2012a).

Due to the merging of different cultures in a global economy, cultural diversity manifests itself within the global marketplace. Education has also become a great part of the globalisation process itself and faced major challenges in the last decades. The ability of knowledge production and implementation became an imperative for a contemporary competitive society (Rajić and Rajić, 2011). Also, the ability to manage the interconnectedness of the diversity that is created in this process is one of the major skills that employers seek (Deardorff and Hunter, 2006). Education is often seen as a necessity in adjusting to the ever changing world, but Fagerlind and Saha (1989) state that it is the culture and the dominant value system of a country that are the crucial criteria of a modern society.

DEVELOPING INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCE

The need for lifelong education has been the focus of different national and international organizations for the last fifty years. In the early 1970's UNESCO proposed to the member states to accept the conception of lifelong learning and lifelong education. Since then other stakeholders such as United Nations - UN, Council of Europe - CoE, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development – OECD, International Labour Organisation – ILO joined the discourse on lifelong education (Puljiz, Živčić and Šutalo, 2010).

It is around the same time that the Council of Europe issued Recommendation 786 (1976) on the education and cultural development of migrants. This could be considered as the first stage in developing ideas about intercultural competence. Although this approach was not successful it nevertheless set the basis for conceptualizing intercultural competence. The second stage can be broadly related to the 1990's and dealt with minority rights. At the time, it was a strong theoretical concept but proved to be less successful in practice. The third stage can be associated with the 21st century and is characterised by intercultural education and learning how to live together (Bedeković, 2011).

Today, most countries around the globe share concerns about social cohesion and stability. Violence, social tensions, migration, and the current global economic recession have brought the crisis in various social domains and the need to find ways to secure the stability and viability of modern multicultural nations to the forefront. Vertovec (2007) argues that this new era is super-diverse because new migrants are diverse across a wide range of variables including ethnicity, immigration status, rights and entitlements, labour market experiences, gender and age profiles, and patterns of spatial distribution.

There are about 232 million international migrants living in the world today. Since 1990, the number of international migrants in the global North increased by around 53 million (65%), while the migrant population in the global South grew by around 24 million (34%). Between 1990 and 2013, the number of international migrants worldwide rose by over 77 million or by 50 per cent. Much of this growth occurred between 2000 and 2010. (International Migration Report, 2013).

The influx of migrants combined with longer established minority populations, has resulted in an unprecedented variety of cultures, religions and identities. Europe gained the second largest number of international migrants between 1990 and 2013 (23 million or 1 million per year), followed by Asia (21 million or slightly less than 1 million per year). Of the 23 million international migrants gained by Europe during this period, 43 per cent were born in Europe, 22 per cent in Asia, 18 per cent in Africa and 14 per cent in Latin America and the Caribbean. (International…, 2013). In the era of super-diversity the need for intercultural education and intercultural dialogue in various forms has become universal. It is no surprise that Europe's activities perhaps stand out most in this regard (Cantle, 2013). Moving and living freely within the EU is the right most closely associated with citizens of EU Member states. Free movement increases social and cultural interactions within the EU and creates closer bonds between EU citizens. In 2013 an estimated 1.7 million immigrants arrived to the EU-28 from non-member countries. In addition, 1.7 million people previously residing in one EU Member State migrated to another Member State (Report from the commission…, 2013). The need to develop intercultural understanding and competence has been acknowledged by The European Union when it declared 2008 the Year of Intercultural Dialogue. Council of Europe issued the White paper on Intercultural Dialogue "Living Together as Equals in Dignity" (White paper…, 2008).

The White paper (2008) states that multiculturalism has failed and announces interculturalism as an alternative approach to the managing of cultural diversity. Cantle (2012) states that: "Multiculturalism may have had some success in the past but it has simply not adapted to the new age of globalisation and super-diversity. Interculturalism is about changing mindsets and providing intercultural education in order to give people the competence and confidence to relate to people who are different to themselves and act interculturally".

Since interculturalism is built on the basic wager of democracy (Bouchard, 2011), intercultural competence is recognised as the crucial capability required for democratic citizenship within a culturally diverse world. Intercultural competence, capacity to respond successfully to intercultural encounter, needs to be developed by every individual in order to enable them to participate in the intercultural dialogue. It is the core competence required for democratic citizenship within a culturally diverse world (White paper…, 2008).

There are various definitions of intercultural competence, but there is still no academic consensus on how intercultural competence should be defined. Deardroff (2006) generally defines intercultural competence as the ability to interact effectively and appropriately in intercultural situations supported by specific attitudes and affective features, (inter) cultural knowledge, skills and reflection. Deardorff (2012) further describes intercultural competence as an ongoing, life-long process unique to individuals' contexts and experiences, which doesn't just happen but must be intentionally addressed by educational institutions (and teacher training in particular), intercultural dialogue, intercultural mediation, project cooperation, community dialogues, arts, media, and government policies. Intercultural competence is the set of attitudes, skills, knowledge and behaviours which are required for appropriate and effective interaction and communication with people who are perceived to be from a different cultural background. The term 'appropriate' means that the interactions do not violate the cultural rules and norms which are valued by the "other", while the term 'effective' means that one is able to achieve one's objectives in the interactions (Barret, 2012). Intercultural competence can be seen as a combination of attitudes, knowledge, understanding and skills applied through action, which enables a person to:

- "Understand and respect people who are perceived to have different cultural affiliations,
- respond appropriately, effectively and respectfully when interacting and communicating with such people,
- establish positive and constructive relationships with such people,
- understand oneself and one's own multiple cultural affiliations through encounters with cultural 'difference'" (Huber and Reynolds, 2014, p. 16).

There are different trends in researching development of intercultural competence. On one hand, the research concerning adult education and development of interculturalism and internationalisation often focuses on the ability to interact in the business world and on an international market where intercultural paradigm is driven by the business and market imperatives (Mughan, 2009; Knowles, Mughan and Lloyd-Reason, 2006). But this approach has issues. Jack (2009) finds that the problem of this approach lies with the

commodification of intercultural understanding, which can lead to distorted discussion of values and relations with the Other.

On the other hand, research regarding intercultural competence development focuses on intercultural education. A great part of the research deals with intercultural competence as a communication competence or a goal of foreign language teaching (Byram, Nicholas and Stevens, 2001; Byram, 2008). Additionally, there is a tendency to research intercultural education through different dimensions (components) (Taylor, 1994; Spitzberg and Changnon, 2009).

The assessment of intercultural competence can be undertaken for a variety of purposes: to measure the effectiveness of an educational process or development intervention; to measure the learning progress of a person or persons undergoing intercultural education or development; to raise an individual's awareness of his/her own strengths and learning potentials as a form of development; to measure the intercultural competence of an individual at a given point of time in order to evaluate his or her qualification for a particular task; to compare a person's competence against a set of (occupational) standards (Stiftung and Cariplo, 2008).

METHODOLOGY

Instrument

The tool used for self-assessment of intercultural competence is was called *Recognising intercultural competence: What shows that I am interculturally competent?* The instrument was created by Pestalozzi Programme and the Intercultural Cities project of the Council of Europe/European Commission and the European Wergeland Centre (Recognising …, 2012). It consists of 56 items which represent the main components that make up intercultural competence – attitudes (20 items), skills (22 items) and knowledge (15 items). These are described in the form of I-statements describing observable behaviour that can be associated with specific aspects of the components. Examinees had to assess their own attitudes, skills and knowledge on a 5-point scale (1 - never, 2 - seldom, 3 - sometimes, 4 - often, 5 - always).

Sample

The research was conducted In the academic year 2014/15 on a sample of 136 prospective secondary school teachers that were acquiring their pedagogical-didactical-methodological competence after the completion of their basic studies and gaining of subject specific competencies. This means that the examinees have finished their studies in different fields of study, be it humanistic, social, or technical sciences, and have been employed or are striving to get employed in secondary schools (most of them at vocational schools) where they teach professional subjects. All of the examinees are currently participating in different programmes at the University of Zagreb (Zagreb N = 40 and Čakovec N = 28); University of Split N = 38 and Josip Juraj Strosmayer University of Osijek N = 30.

Research Problems and Hypotheses

The research tried to examine the self-perceived development of intercultural competence of prospective secondary school teachers and to determine the following:
- Are there significant differences in the level of self-perceived development of different components of intercultural competence; attitudes, skills or knowledge?
- Are there significant differences between the self-perceived development of intercultural competence according to the place of study (University of Zagreb, University of Split, University of Osijek)?
- Is there a significant correlation between different components of intercultural competence?

The following hypotheses were made:
- Hypothesis 1: There are significant differences in self-perceived development of different components of intercultural competence
- Hypothesis 2: There are significant difference between the self-perceived development of different components of intercultural competence according to the place of study
- Hypothesis 3: There is significant correlation between the components of self-perceived development of intercultural components

Research Results

As evident from Table 1, prospective teachers' self-perceived development of different components of intercultural competence is quite high. The value of the arithmetic mean, based on the polarisation (direction) of the scale (especially mode as a measure of the positional central tendency), is high, which indicates that prospective teachers assess the development of different components of intercultural competence as high. There are only 3 items in the table that represent knowledge and attitudes that teachers perceive as something they only do sometimes: *I suspend judgement based on first impressions (M = 3,47); I turn to the appropriate social, cultural or political agents when I need information or support (M = 3,35); I initiate action with the appropriate group of social or political agents when a problem occurs (M = 3,21).* These results will be further discussed later on.

Table 1: Main descriptive values of the scale

	Range	Min	Max	M	Mode	SD
I show respect to the other person and regard it as an equal human being.	2	3	5	4.77	5	0.438
I give space to others so they can express themselves and I listen and react to their arguments.	2	3	5	4.50	5	0.571
I suspend judgement based on first impressions.	4	1	5	3.47	3	0.910

I am willing to put my values and norms aside temporarily.	4	1	5	3.51	3	0.894
I show patience when confronted with something that is unknown or unfamiliar.	3	2	5	4.07	4	0.674
I interact positively and without preconceived notions about what the other thinks and feels.	3	2	5	3.99	4	0.699
I show awareness of the fact that my way of thinking and acting is influenced by a set of values and norms.	3	2	5	3.91	4	0.745
I show a friendly interest in people and things I encounter (adapted from Betrand Russell).	2	3	5	4.30	4	0.681
I use arising opportunities to meet new people.	4	1	5	4.10	5	0.973
I ask others about their views and actions.	3	2	5	3.99	4	0.793
I am willing to pay attention to other people's feelings.	2	3	5	4.51	5	0.596
I show that I can share other people's feelings.	2	3	5	4.38	5	0.678
I show that I am comfortable with describing my strengths and weaknesses.	4	1	5	3.61	4	0.896
I accept the fact that I can make mistakes.	3	2	5	4.23	4	0.709
I take responsibility for my mistakes.	3	2	5	4.45	5	0.653
I ask others for help when I need it.	4	1	5	4.15	5	0.874
I adjust my behaviour when I feel it is helpful.	3	2	5	4.09	4	0.784
I show that I am not afraid to disagree with others.	3	2	5	3.90	4	0.772
I suggest alternative ways of seeing or doing things.	3	2	5	3.96	4	0.708
I show that I accept being challenged.	4	1	5	3.98	4	0.812
I listen attentively to other people.	2	3	5	4.29	4	0.634
I make sure that my message is understood the way I mean it.	2	3	5	4.36	4	0.629
I encourage people to express their needs and opinions.	3	2	5	4.13	4	0.745
I react supportively to emotions I see around me.	3	2	5	3.99	4	0.798
I look for and clarify shared needs and expectations.	3	2	5	3.95	4	0.734
I look for information in a variety of sources.	3	2	5	4.30	4	0.670
I explain my thoughts and actions but also considering outside perspectives.	3	2	5	4.18	4	0.691
I express my point of view in connection with both conflicting and complementary opinions.	3	2	5	4.01	4	0.779

I use my imagination to offer different perspectives.	3	2	5	3.85	4	0.857
I use all available information and my analytical skills to verify my interpretations.	3	2	5	4.13	4	0.686
I question the interpretations offered by others, including authority figures or authoritative sources.	3	2	5	4.00	4	0.730
I offer different ways of interpreting the ideas and actions of people.	3	2	5	3.79	4	0.734
I give clear arguments to explain my thoughts and choices.	3	2	5	4.11	4	0.737
I identify issues or problems that need to be solved.	2	3	5	4.15	4	0.543
I offer different perspectives on the problem to be solved.	3	2	5	4.01	4	0.699
I initiate attempts to solve the problem.	3	2	5	4.02	4	0.784
I support other people's attempts to solve the problem.	3	2	5	4.25	5	0.777
I actively search for a solution together with the other people concerned.	3	2	5	4.22	5	0.795
I make others feel comfortable in the group when faced with a problem.	3	2	5	4.26	5	0.762
I explore new things and situations.	3	2	5	4.10	4	0.772
I reflect on and analyse my motives, needs and goals.	3	2	5	4.30	4	0.670
I change my ways of doing things in the light of new insights.	2	3	5	4.12	4	0.710
I take into consideration both verbal and non-verbal messages.	3	2	5	4.29	4	0.688
I display awareness of the fact that words and body language may have different meanings in different contexts.	3	2	5	4.40	5	0.671
I clarify meanings to avoid misunderstandings.	3	2	5	4.18	4	0.722
I address the influence of power relations in interaction.	4	1	5	3.99	4	0.710
I show that I understand that different forms of interaction have different aims and rules.	3	2	5	4.08	4	0.710
I show awareness of the fact that other people might think, behave and feel differently.	3	2	5	4.41	5	0.661
I actively explore the reasons behind different practices and reactions.	3	2	5	3.88	4	0.835

I recognise the social and political implications of diversity.	3	2	5	4.01	4	0.821
I turn to the appropriate social, cultural or political agents when I need information or support.	4	1	5	3.35	4	1.051
I initiate action with the appropriate group of social or political agents when a problem occurs.	4	1	5	3.21	4	1.155
I recognise that spiritual and existential questions are important aspects of life.	4	1	5	4.39	5	0.752
I recognise differences in world views and belief systems when interacting.	3	2	5	4.29	5	0.749
I learn about other belief systems and world views through active exploration.	4	1	5	3.65	4	0.931
I show understanding of the fact that world views and beliefs that people hold are not static.	3	2	5	4.11	4	0.795
I recognise that world views and belief systems influence but do not determine a person's or a group's identity.	3	2	5	4.16	4	0.791

The original tool suggested which items should make each component (as seen in table 1). The first 20 items present indicators for attitudes component of intercultural competence, followed by 22 items that present indicators for skills and 15 indicators of knowledge related to intercultural competence. These components are interconnected since the knowledge we have about the world and about human interaction, as well as our attitudes towards these can only be made visible and observable through our own behaviour. Due to the importance of attitudes, these sub-components outnumber those of the skills and the knowledge described in our list of indicators (Recognising …, 2012).

Because of the structure of the tool, the proposed components were further explored as set composites during the dimension reduction process. In the original tool the statements were grouped according to their meaning and the component they were describing (attitudes, skills and knowledge). This division of statements was used for forming of the components. Table 2 shows descriptive values of each composite. Cronbach α for each composite is quite high (attitudes α = 0.822; skills α = 0.908 and knowledge α = 0.856) which makes the results reliable. Another observation that can be made regarding the table is that the M value is quite high which suggests that prospective secondary school teachers perceive that they have developed their intercultural competence and show behaviour in accordance with the proposed indicators. Prospective secondary teachers assess their intercultural skill highest (M = 4.12), and their knowledge lowest (M = 4.02).

Table 2: Descriptive values of composites: attitude, skills and knowledge related to intercultural competence

	N	Min	Max	M	SD	α
Attitudes	20	3	4	4.09	0.36019	0.822
Skills	22	3	5	4.12	0.42438	0.908
Knowledge	15	3	5	4.02	0.46946	0.856

In order to determine whether there is significant difference in self-perceived development of different components of intercultural competence further analysis Friedman test was conducted (Table 3). The test showed no significant differences between perceived development of attitudes, skills and knowledge. These results did not confirm hypothesis nr. 1. Although these results are in a way self-explanatory due to the interrelatedness of these components, significant difference was expected when it comes to the perception of acquired knowledge about intercultural competence since during their studies these individuals had no formal education about intercultural competence. Although examinees did perceive this component as the least developed and as the where they did act in accordance with the indicators, the behaviour related to the knowledge of and about intercultural competence is still assessed quite high (M = 4,02).

It is interesting to notice that two of the indicators rated the lowest relate to the knowledge and behaviours related to intercultural actions of each person, individual responsibility and accountability *I turn to the appropriate social, cultural or political agents when I need information or support (M = 3,35); I initiate action with the appropriate group of social or political agents when a problem occurs (M = 3,21)*. These results can lead to conclusion that individuals are not willing to take on actions and do not have the knowledge of or trust in the relevant social, cultural or political agents.

Table 3: Friedman test of composites attitudes, skills and knowledge

N	136
Chi-Square	2.534
df	2
Asymp. Sig.	0.282
a. Friedman Test	

To be able to determine whether there is a difference in the self-perceived intercultural attitudes, skills and knowledge Kruskal Wallis test was conducted (Table 4). The test showed that there were no significant differences among prospective secondary school teachers in when it comes to self-perceived intercultural attitudes, skills and knowledge according to the place of the study (Zagreb, Čakovec, Split, Osijek). These results did thus not confirm hypothesis nr. 2. It seems that prospective secondary teachers have the

same perception of their intercultural competence and that the place of their study does not influence their intercultural competence.

Table 4: Kruskal Wallis test

	χ^2	Df	p
Attitudes	1.496	3	0.683
Skills	1.629	3	0.653
Knowledge	2.159	3	0.540
a. Kruskal Wallis Test b. Grouping Variable: place of study			

The following research question attempted to determine whether there are significant correlations between perceived intercultural attitudes, skills and knowledge. Table 5. shows that there is a medium positive correlation between intercultural attitudes and skills (r = 0.723), attitudes and knowledge (r = 0.591) and skills and knowledge (r = 0.652). These results confirm hypothesis nr. 3.

Table 5: Correlation between intercultural attitudes, skills and knowledge

		Attitudes	Skills	Knowledge
Attitudes	Pearson Correlation	1	0.723**	0.591**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.000	0.000
	N		136	136
Skills	Pearson Correlation		1	0.652**
	Sig. (2-tailed)			0.000
	N			136
Knowledge	Pearson Correlation			1
	Sig. (2-tailed)			
	N			
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).				

Results presented here show high evaluation of the self-perceived intercultural competence of prospective secondary school teachers. They all rate their intercultural competence quite high and find their behaviour and the observable one to be in accordance with the proposed indicators. What seems to be the issue here is the lack of individual initiative and the knowledge of, or the readiness to, cooperate with relevant institutions. These results need to be taken into consideration since individual actions show that appropriate intercultural attitudes, skills and knowledge lead to appropriate actions.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Development of intercultural competence of teachers tends to be more relevant in general as well as in vocational education. This suggests that intercultural aspects of teacher training in general should not be something marginal or exceptional (Pajak-Wazna, 2013).

There are three dimensions of teacher competence: a) subject specific competence; b) pedagogical–didactical–methodological competence; and c) psychological competence (Spajić-Vrkaš, Kukoč & Bašić, 2001). What makes teacher competencies specific is the need to help develop the same competencies (knowledge, skills and attitudes) in their students (Vizek Vidović, 2009).

Intercultural competence is not acquired automatically but needs to be learned, practised and maintained throughout life (White paper…, 2008). It is one of the reasons that education has such an important role in acquiring intercultural competence and efforts are being made to foster such understanding throughout the education sector, starting at the youngest age (Neuner, 2012). This need has been recognised in Croatia as well and the National Curriculum Framework proposes basic guidelines for teaching intercultural competences (Mandarić Vukušić, 2014).

In most countries intercultural competence in vocational education is no longer only an objective of specific courses but is often one of the specific goals of vocational education (Handbook for methodological development of intercultural competence, 2014). Since all of the elements of intercultural competence are extremely fluid, it should be considered a process and not a product. Context is the most important element that impacts the appropriateness of specific behaviour, and the behaviour that is interculturally competent in one situation might not be appropriate in another.

The results of this study show that the future vocational teachers perceive their intercultural competence quite high and believe that they, for the most part, behave in accordance with proposed indicators. When developing intercultural competence we have to consider that teaching which tries to influence how a learner will behave during the teaching and learning process undermines the dignity of the learner and may be accused of indoctrination (Jarvis, 2004). Eisner (1969), according to Jarvis (2004) states that expressive objectives should be evocative rather than prescriptive. This is why the indicators of intercultural competence should be seen as such, especially when knowing that they are the outcomes of adult education.

The results of this study show that prospective vocational school teachers are lacking the active component of intercultural competence and assess their ability and willingness to initiate action and turn to the appropriate social, cultural or political agents when in need of information or support with low mark. This is quite concerning since the active component of intercultural competence is very important for its successful realisation.

Developing intercultural competence through education is a powerful tool for achieving intercultural understanding, appreciation and respect (Huber and Reynolds, 2014). This is why it is important to better understand development of intercultural competence.

This study tried to assess intercultural competence of future vocational teachers in the Republic of Croatia but encountered certain limitations and should therefore be interpreted with caution. It is necessary to consider that the responses that the examinees gave are likely to be the result of acquiescence and social desirability. Further research on the development of intercultural competence of vocational teachers in a form of qualitative research is highly recommended. Preferably this would be conducted in the form of interviews and observations, which would enable to better understand the insights about examinees' understanding of intercultural competence.

REFERENCES

Barrett, M. (2012). Intercultural competence. *EWC Statement Series*, 2, 23–27.

Bedeković, V. (2011). Interkulturalna kompetencija cjeloživotnog obrazovanja nastavnika. *Pedagogijska istraživanja,* 8(1), 139–151.

Bouchard, G. (2011). What is interculturalism? *Mcgill Law Journal~Revue De Droit De Mcgill,* 56(2), 335–468.

Byram, M. (2008). *From foreign language education to education for intercultural citizenship.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Byram, M., Nichols, A. and Stevens, D. (eds.) (2001). *Developing intercultural competence in practice.* Exeter: Cromwell Press.

Cantle, T. (2012a). *Interculturalism: For the Era of Cohesion and Diversity*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cantle, T. (2012b). *About Interculturalism.* Retrieved from http://tedcantle.co.uk/publications/about-interculturalism/.

Cantle, T. (2013). Interculturalism and multiculturalism: similarities and differences. In M. Barrett (ed.), *Interculturalism and multiculturalism: similarities and differences* (pp. 69–93). Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Council of Europe (1976). *Recommendation 786: Education and cultural development of migrants.* Retrieved from

http://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTML-en.asp?fileid=14820&lang=en.

Deardorff, D. K. (2006). The identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization at institutions of higher education in the United States. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10(3), 241–266.

Deardorff, D. K. (2012). Intercultural Competence in the 21st Century: Perspectives, Issues, Application. In B. Breninger, T. Kaltenbacher (eds.), *Creating Cultural Synergies: Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Interculturality and Interreligiosity*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Deardorff, D. K. and Hunter, W. (2006). Educating global-ready graduates. *International Educator,* 15(3), 72–83.

Fagerlind, I. and Saha, L. J. (1989). *Education & National Development.* Oxford, New York: Pergamon Press.

Handbook for methodological Development of Intercultural Competence (2014). Retrieved from http://incom-vet.eu/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/HANDBOOK-OF-METHODOLOGY-FOR-DEVELOPMENT-OF-INTERCULTURAL-COMPETENCE-2nd-draft_2014-08-25.pdf.

Huber, J. and Reynolds, C. (2014). *Developing intercultural competence through education.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

International Migration Report 2013. (2013). Retrieved from http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/ population/publications/migration/migration-report-2013.shtml.

Jack, G. (2009). A Critical Perspective on Teaching Intercultural Competence in a Management Department. In A. Feng, M. Byram and M. Fleming (eds.), *Becoming Interculturally Competent Through Education and Training* (pp. 32–52). Bristol: Multilingual matters.

Jarvis, P. (2004). *Adult education and lifelong learning*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Knowles, D., Mughan, T. and Lloyd-Reason, L. (2006) Decision-maker characteristics and performance of internationalised SMEs. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development,* 13(4), 620–641.

Living Together: Combining Diversity and Freedom in 21st Century Europe. Report of the Group of Eminent Persons of the Council of Europe. (2011). Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Mandarić Vukušić, A. (2014). Contents of the intercultural competence in the national curriculum framework. *Školski vjesnik,* 63(1-2), 133–148.

Mughan, T. (2009). Exporting the Multiple Market Experience and the SME Intercultural Paradigm. In A. Feng, M. Byram and M. Fleming (eds.), *Becoming Interculturally Competent Through Education and Training* (pp. 32–52). Bristol: Multilingual matters.

Neuner, G. (2012). The dimensions of intercultural education. In J. Huber (ed.), *Intercultural competence for all: Preparation for living in a heterogeneous world.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Pajak-Wazna, E. (2013). Teachers' intercultural competence and teacher education: A case of Poland. *European Scientific Journal,* 1(2), 318–322. Retrieved from http://eujournal.org/index.php/esj/article/view/1343.

Pampanini, G. (2010). Introduction. In G. Pampanini, F. Adly and D. Brook Napier (eds.), *Interculturalism, Society and Education* (pp. 7–11). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Puljiz, I., Živčić, M. and Šutalo, I. (eds.). (2010). *Međunarodne organizacije o obrazovanju odraslih.* Zagreb: Agencija za strukovno obrazovanje i obrazovanje odraslih.

Rajić, V. and Rajić, T. (2011). Utjecaj globalizacije na obrazovanje odraslih. In M. Matijević, T. Žiljak (eds.), *Andragoška profesija i kompetencije stručnjaka u obrazovanju odraslih* (pp. 264–276). Zagreb: Agencija za strukovno obrazovanje i obrazovanje odraslih, Hrvatsko andragoško društvo.

Recognising intercultural competence: What shows that I am interculturally competent? Pestalozzi Programme and the Intercultural Cities project of the Council of Europe/European Commission and the European Wergeland Centre (2012). Retrieved from http://www.coe.int/en/web/pestalozzi/intercultural-matters.

Report from the commission to the European parliament, the Council, the European economic and social committee and the committee of the regions EU Citizenship, Report 2013; EU citizens: your rights, your future. (2013). Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/justice/citizen/files/com_2013_269_en.pdf.

Sorrells, K. (2012). *Intercultural Communication Globalization and Social Justice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Spajić-Vrkaš, V., Kukoč, M. and Bašić, S. (2001) *Obrazovanje za ljudska prava i demokraciju: Interdisciplinarni rječnik*. Zagreb: Hrvatsko povjerenstvo za UNESCO i Projekt za mir i ljudska prava za hrvatske osnovne škole.

Spitzberg, B. H. and Changon, G. (2009). Conceptualising intercultural competence. In B. H. Spitzberg and G. Changon (eds.), *The Sage handbook of intercultural competence* (pp. 2–52). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Stiftung, B. and Cariplo, F. (2008). *Intercultural Competence–The key competence in the 21 st century.* Retrieved from http://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/fileadmin/files/BSt/Presse/imported/downloads/xcms_bst_dms_30238_30239_2.pdf.

Taylor, E. W. (1994). A learning model for becoming interculturally competent. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations,* 18, 389–408.

Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 30(6), 1024–1054. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01419870701599465.

Vizek-Vidović, V. (2009). Kompetencije i kompetencijski profili u učiteljskoj i nastavničkoj profesiji. In V. Vizek-Vidović (ed.), *Izrada kurikuluma usmjerenoga na kompetencije u obrazovanju učitelja i nastavnika: Priručnik za visokoškolske nastavnike* (pp. 33–39). Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu i Učiteljski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.

White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue: Living Together as Equals in Dignity. Launched by the Council of Europe Ministers of Foreign Affairs at their 118th Ministerial Session. (2008). Strasbourg: Council of Europe.