

UDC 378.147:81'243

IRSTI 14.35.09

<https://doi.org/10.48371/PEDS.2026.82.3.041>

## FORMATION OF PROFESSIONAL LANGUAGE COMPETENCE IN FUTURE TEACHERS IN THE CONTEXT OF MODERN EDUCATION

Uskenbayeva B.<sup>1</sup>, \*Rasheva G.<sup>2</sup>, Ramankulova M.<sup>3</sup>, Yergeshov Y.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Kazakh State Women's Teacher training university, Almaty, Kazakhstan

<sup>\*2</sup>Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical university, Almaty, Kazakhstan

<sup>3</sup>Khoja Akhmet Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University  
Turkistan, Kazakhstan

<sup>4</sup>Military institute of Land Forces named after S. Nurmagambetov  
Almaty, Kazakhstan

**Abstract.** This manuscript explores the development of language competence in pre-service teachers, emphasizing the vital role it plays in shaping effective language educators. As language teachers are expected to model accurate, fluent, and contextually appropriate language use, their own linguistic proficiency must be both well-developed and continuously nurtured. The transition from language learner to language educator involves not only mastery of the target language but also the ability to apply pedagogical principles to language instruction. This work presents an integrative approach to teacher preparation, combining linguistic theory, applied practice, and reflective teaching methodologies.

Drawing on current research in second language acquisition (SLA), language pedagogy, and teacher education, the manuscript outlines the core competencies required of future language teachers. These include grammatical accuracy, communicative fluency, pragmatic awareness, and intercultural competence.

Additionally, it emphasizes the importance of pedagogical content knowledge — the ability to effectively teach the language to diverse learner populations.

A central focus is placed on the role of language proficiency development within teacher training programs. The manuscript proposes a framework that incorporates language enhancement courses, teaching practicums, and reflective practice to ensure that future educators not only learn the language but also learn how to teach it effectively. Case studies from teacher education programs around the world illustrate best practices in integrating language development with pedagogical training.

Moreover, the manuscript addresses common challenges faced by pre-service language teachers, such as fossilized errors, limited exposure to authentic language use, and anxiety about their own language proficiency. Strategies for overcoming these barriers are discussed, including mentorship, immersive experiences, and formative feedback.

**Keywords:** language competency, teacher education, language pedagogy, pre-service teachers, second language acquisition, communicative fluency, teacher training, language proficiency development, reflective practice, intercultural competence

### Introduction

The journey from language learner to language educator represents a complex transformation that involves not only the acquisition of language proficiency but also the development of pedagogical knowledge and teaching identity. For future language teachers, linguistic competence is not simply a tool for communication, but it is a foundational component of their professional expertise. As Richards and Farrell (2005) argue, language teachers are expected to function as models of proficient language use, meaning their ability to use and teach the target language accurately and effectively is central to their credibility and success in the classroom [1].

At first when we are researching this area we need to clarify terms competence and competency, which means that competence constitutes a normatively defined set of knowledge, abilities, skills, and modes of activity in a specific field, whereas competency characterizes an individual's integrative capacity to independently, consciously, and effectively apply the relevant competences in educational, professional, and practical activities. The role of language proficiency in teacher education has been widely discussed in recent decades. Andrews (2003) emphasizes the concept of *language awareness*, which includes both explicit knowledge about the language and the ability to reflect on its structure and usage in pedagogical contexts. Similarly, Freeman and Johnson (1998) highlight that language teacher education must go beyond simply transmitting content knowledge; it must also engage pre-service teachers in reflective practice and equip them to make informed instructional decisions based on their linguistic and pedagogical understanding [2].

While teacher education programs often focus on pedagogical strategies, curriculum design, and classroom management, the linguistic development of pre-service teachers is sometimes under-emphasized (Borg, 2006). Yet, numerous studies (e.g., Llorca, 2005; Braine, 2010) have shown that non-native English-speaking teachers (NNESTs) often experience anxiety related to their perceived language deficiencies, which can affect their confidence and performance in the classroom. This highlights the need for targeted support in developing both proficiency and self-efficacy among future educators [3].

A growing body of research supports the integration of language development and pedagogy in teacher education. Johnson (2009) advocates for a sociocultural perspective, where language learning and teaching are viewed as socially mediated practices. This perspective aligns with the idea that pre-service teachers benefit from immersive, collaborative experiences where they

can practice the language authentically while learning to teach it. Moreover, the inclusion of teaching practicums and reflective journals, as discussed by Farrell (2015), helps bridge the gap between theory and practice and fosters deeper metalinguistic and pedagogical awareness [4].

Despite these advances, challenges remain. Many programs struggle to balance linguistic development with the intensive demands of teacher training. Additionally, standardized proficiency benchmarks, such as CEFR or ACTFL levels, are not always aligned with the actual communicative and instructional demands of language teaching (Elder & O'Loughlin, 2003). This misalignment underscores the importance of context-specific and needs-driven approaches to developing language competence in pre-service teachers [5].

This manuscript aims to address these gaps by proposing an integrated framework for fostering language competence in future teachers. Through a synthesis of theoretical perspectives and practical strategies, it offers insights into how language proficiency, pedagogical knowledge, and teaching identity can be developed in tandem to prepare educators for the evolving demands of language education in diverse contexts [6].

The formation of future language teachers involves more than training in classroom management, assessment strategies, or curriculum design; it also requires the intentional development of strong linguistic competence. Language proficiency is not merely a background skill—it is the foundation upon which effective language instruction is built. However, the transition from being a language learner to becoming a language educator remains a critical and often under-examined phase in teacher education. This manuscript examines how language competence is developed in pre-service teachers and analyzes the educational frameworks that support or hinder this process [7].

Language teaching is a dual practice: it requires both knowledge of the language itself and knowledge of how to teach it. According to Freeman and Johnson (1998), the traditional view of teacher education—which isolates language learning from pedagogical training—fails to address the complex realities of the language classroom. In practice, teachers must draw on both linguistic and instructional knowledge simultaneously. This has led scholars such as Andrews (2007) to advocate for the development of *teacher language awareness* (TLA), which combines deep linguistic understanding with the ability to apply that knowledge pedagogically [8].

Despite this, many teacher education programs continue to prioritize methodology over language development, particularly for non-native pre-service teachers. Borg (2006) notes that pre-service teachers frequently enter the classroom with lingering linguistic insecurities, which can reduce their effectiveness and confidence. This is particularly problematic in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, where teachers are expected to serve as both role models and facilitators of authentic language use. Studies by Llurda (2005) and Braine (2010) confirm that non-native English-speaking teachers often report anxiety about their own language proficiency, which in turn affects their teaching practices [9].

Analytically, this points to a critical imbalance in many teacher education programs: while pedagogical theory is taught explicitly, language competence is often assumed or insufficiently addressed. A deeper analysis reveals that some programs treat language proficiency as a static prerequisite rather than a dynamic, evolving component of teacher identity. This assumption is not only inaccurate but also pedagogically limiting. As Johnson (2009) argues from a sociocultural perspective, teacher learning—like language learning—is situated, contextual, and socially mediated. Therefore, language development must be seen as an ongoing process within the teacher education experience [10].

In light of these insights, this manuscript explores how language competence can and should be cultivated throughout the teacher training process. It proposes a model that integrates language proficiency development with pedagogical training, using reflective practice, immersion, and scaffolding as key components. By analyzing current practices and offering a research-informed framework, this work aims to contribute to more balanced, effective, and supportive approaches to preparing the language teachers of tomorrow [11].

### **Materials and methods**

This study employs a **qualitative research design** to explore how language competence is developed in pre-service language teachers during their training programs. The primary aim of the methodology is to gain in-depth insights into the experiences, challenges, and developmental processes that future educators undergo as they transition from learners to teachers. Given the focus on understanding complex human behaviors and perceptions within specific educational contexts, a qualitative approach is both appropriate and effective [12].

The study adopts a *multiple case study design*, allowing for detailed examination of language development across different institutional and cultural settings. Each case represents a teacher education program that includes language proficiency development as an explicit component of its curriculum. This design enables comparison across contexts while maintaining the depth and richness of qualitative inquiry.

Participants included 24 pre-service language teachers enrolled in teacher education programs in three different countries: Spain, Indonesia, and Turkey. These participants were selected using purposeful sampling to ensure diversity in linguistic background, institutional context, and level of language proficiency. All participants were in the final year of their respective programs and had completed at least one teaching practicum [13].

In addition to pre-service teachers, 6 teacher educators and 3 practicum supervisors were interviewed to provide triangulation and professional perspectives on the development of language competence.

Data were collected over a six-month period through the following methods:

1. Semi-structured interviews with pre-service teachers (45–60 minutes each), focusing on their perceptions of their own language development, the role of language proficiency in their training, and challenges faced in both academic and practicum settings.

2. Classroom observations of language enhancement courses and teaching practicums, using an observation checklist focused on language use, instructional language, code-switching, and communicative competence.

3. Document analysis of course syllabi, language proficiency benchmarks (e.g., CEFR descriptors), practicum evaluation forms, and reflective journals written by the participants [14].

All interviews and observations were transcribed and analyzed using thematic analysis. Initial coding was conducted to identify recurring patterns related to language development, challenges, and pedagogical integration. Codes were then organized into broader themes such as “language-related anxiety,” “pedagogical application of language knowledge,” and “institutional support for language growth.”

To enhance credibility and trustworthiness, member checking was conducted by sharing preliminary findings with participants for feedback and clarification. Peer debriefing sessions with other researchers in the field were also used to refine categories and validate interpretations [15].

Ethical approval was obtained from the host institutions. Informed consent was collected from all participants, and confidentiality was ensured by using pseudonyms and securing all data in password-protected digital files. Participants were informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any time.

## Results and discussion

This section presents the findings of the study on how language competence is developed in pre-service language teachers. The data were drawn from interviews, classroom observations, and document analysis, and are organized into four key thematic areas:

1. Perceived Language Proficiency Development
2. Language-Related Challenges During Practicum
3. Institutional Support for Language Competence
4. Integration of Language and Pedagogical Knowledge

Each theme is supported by illustrative data excerpts and visualized in summary tables to facilitate analysis and cross-case comparison.

Pre-service teachers reported noticeable improvement in their overall language proficiency, particularly in speaking and classroom-specific language. Many attributed this progress to increased exposure during the practicum, peer collaboration, and task-based language learning activities embedded in their coursework.

Table 1. Self-Reported Language Skill Improvement by Domain

| Language Skill | % of Participants Reporting Improvement | Common Sources of Improvement              |
|----------------|-----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| Speaking       | 87.5%                                   | Practicum, group tasks, oral presentations |
| Listening      | 79.2%                                   | Classroom exposure, listening activities   |

|                    |       |                                          |
|--------------------|-------|------------------------------------------|
| Writing            | 66.7% | Lesson planning, reflective journals     |
| Grammar/Vocabulary | 62.5% | Language enhancement courses, self-study |

Spoken fluency was consistently rated as the area of greatest improvement. Many participants noted that lesson delivery in English or the target language helped internalize functional classroom phrases and reduce hesitation. However, improvement in grammar and vocabulary lagged behind, which participants attributed to a lack of focused feedback and explicit instruction [18]. While most participants gained confidence in their language use, nearly half reported experiencing anxiety during practicum due to fear of making mistakes or being judged by mentor teachers and students [19].

Table 2. Reported Language Challenges in Practicum

| Challenge                        | % of Participants | Sample Quote                                                      |  |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Fear of making language errors   | 45.8%             | “I worried that my students would catch my mistakes.”             |  |
| Difficulty with spontaneous talk | 37.5%             | “Answering unexpected questions in English was stressful.”        |  |
| Code-switching pressure          | 29.2%             | “Sometimes I had to switch to L1 because they didn’t understand.” |  |

These challenges suggest a need for greater preparation in handling real-time classroom discourse. While theoretical courses provided input on language pedagogy, participants felt underprepared for the linguistic demands of dynamic teaching situations [20].

Participants gave mixed reviews of the institutional efforts to support their language growth. Some praised the availability of language-focused modules and workshops, while others reported a disconnect between theoretical knowledge and practical application.

Table 3. Institutional Support Structures and Perceived Effectiveness

| Support Type                       | Offered (Y/N)   | Perceived as Effective (%) | Comments                                   |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| Language enhancement courses       | Yes (all sites) | 70.8%                      | “Helped grammar, but not fluency.”         |
| Conversation clubs / speaking labs | Yes (2/3 sites) | 58.3%                      | “Good practice, but not always available.” |
| Practicum language feedback        | No (all sites)  | N/A                        | “Almost no feedback on language use.”      |

A notable finding is the lack of language-related feedback during teaching practicums. While participants received comments on classroom management and pedagogy, linguistic aspects of their teaching were rarely addressed systematically.

The integration of language learning and teaching strategies was inconsistent across the programs. Some participants experienced meaningful connections between theory and practice, while others felt that the two domains remained siloed [21].

Table 4. Integration Between Language Development and Teaching Methods

| Degree of Integration | % of Participants | Description                                    |
|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Strong                | 33.3%             | Courses modeled language teaching strategies   |
| Moderate              | 41.7%             | Some links between language input and practice |
| Weak/None             | 25.0%             | Language courses unrelated to teaching content |

The success of integration was often tied to instructors who explicitly modeled effective language teaching using the target language. Where integration was weak, pre-service teachers struggled to transfer linguistic knowledge into classroom practice.

These findings support the argument that language competence in future teachers must be developed holistically, through not only structured coursework but also through ongoing, reflective, and context-sensitive support throughout teacher education.

### Results and discussion

The findings of this study reveal critical insights into how pre-service language teachers develop their language competence during teacher education programs. While overall improvement was observed across all four language skill areas, particularly in speaking and listening, the development was uneven, and several pedagogical gaps were identified. This section discusses the implications of these findings, situating them within the broader discourse of language teacher education.

A significant majority of participants (87.5%) reported improvement in speaking skills, and 79.2% in listening comprehension. These findings support the view that communicative competence—particularly in oral language—can be effectively enhanced through immersive and interactive tasks, such as teaching practicums, peer collaboration, and presentations. This aligns with the work of Richards & Schmidt (2010), who argue that authentic language use in meaningful contexts contributes significantly to fluency development.

However, gains in grammar and vocabulary were more limited (62.5%), and writing skills were reported as improved by only 66.7% of participants. This imbalance reflects what Andrews (2007) calls the “fluency-accuracy trade-off,” a common occurrence in communicative language environments where real-time interaction is prioritized over linguistic precision. The limited improvement in form-focused aspects of language suggests that language enhancement modules may lack depth or alignment with the communicative demands of classroom teaching.

**Persistent Linguistic Anxiety in Practicum Settings.** Almost half of the participants (45.8%) reported experiencing anxiety about making language mistakes during their practicum. Additionally, 37.5% indicated difficulty with spontaneous speaking, particularly when responding to student questions or managing unforeseen situations. These findings echo Borg's (2006) assertion that pre-service teachers often struggle to balance their roles as language users and instructors, especially when their own competence feels unstable.

This linguistic anxiety can hinder teacher confidence and instructional clarity, potentially affecting student learning outcomes. The lack of language-specific feedback during practicum—as reported by all participants—may exacerbate this problem. Without structured support or correction, pre-service teachers may reinforce fossilized errors or avoid complex language altogether, leading to stagnation rather than continued development.

Although all programs offered language enhancement courses, only 70.8% of participants found them effective, often citing limited personalization or insufficient practical relevance. Furthermore, no participants received direct feedback on their language use during practicum—a notable weakness in all observed programs.

This highlights a critical institutional gap, as emphasized by Elder & O'Loughlin (2003), who argue that professional language competence must be assessed and supported explicitly within teacher education. The data suggest that programs are still operating under the assumption that language proficiency is a prerequisite rather than an evolving skill to be developed in parallel with pedagogical training.

Only 33.3% of participants reported a strong integration between language learning and teaching methodology courses. In contrast, 25.0% experienced weak or no connection at all. Programs that modeled effective language teaching through content delivery (e.g., instructors using the target language to teach methodology) were more successful in fostering both linguistic and pedagogical growth.

This finding supports Johnson's (2009) sociocultural perspective that learning to teach language requires situated engagement in real contexts where language and pedagogy intersect. Where this integration was missing, participants struggled to translate their theoretical understanding into practical language use in the classroom.

Overall, while pre-service teachers in this study made progress in language competence—particularly in oral skills—their development was hindered by a lack of explicit institutional support, particularly during practicum. The findings underscore the need for teacher education programs to treat language proficiency as a dynamic, central component of teacher identity and instructional effectiveness, rather than a fixed prerequisite. Only through thoughtful integration, continuous support, and reflective feedback can future language educators transition confidently and competently from learners to teachers.

### Conclusion

The development of language competency in pre-service language teachers is a foundational yet often under-prioritized element of teacher education. This study has shown that while many pre-service teachers experience growth in fluency—particularly in speaking and listening skills—gaps remain in grammatical accuracy, written expression, and the confident use of language in real-time classroom settings. These gaps are compounded by a lack of structured, formative feedback and limited integration between language development and pedagogical training.

The findings demonstrate that pre-service teachers continue to struggle with linguistic anxiety, especially during teaching practicums, where the stakes of performance and language accuracy are high. Nearly half of the participants reported fear of making language mistakes, highlighting the emotional burden of language use in professional teaching contexts. This stress is amplified by the absence of systematic language-related feedback, which leaves many teachers-in-training without guidance on how to improve their classroom language.

Additionally, institutional support for language development, while present in the form of enhancement courses or conversation clubs, is often insufficiently aligned with the communicative and instructional realities of the language classroom. Only one-third of participants reported a strong integration between language learning and teaching methodology. This disconnect suggests that many programs still treat language and pedagogy as separate domains rather than interdependent components of teacher competence.

This study underscores the importance of reconceptualizing language competence as a core element of teacher identity and professional practice, not as a prerequisite to be assessed once and then assumed stable. Teacher education programs must adopt a more holistic and sustained approach to language development—one that spans coursework, practicum, and reflective practice.

In moving forward, programs should seek to embed language development across all aspects of teacher training, not only to improve linguistic performance, but also to empower future educators to enter the classroom with clarity, confidence, and competence.

### REFERENCES

- [1] Andrews S. *Teacher Language Awareness*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [2] Braine G. *Nonnative Speaker English Teachers: Research, Pedagogy, and Professional Growth*. – Routledge, 2010.
- [3] Borg S. *Teacher Cognition and Language Education: Research and Practice*. – Bloomsbury, 2006.
- [4] Braun V., Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology // *Qualitative Research in Psychology*. – 2006. – Vol. 3, No. 2. – P. 77–101.
- [5] Canagarajah A. S. *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism in English Teaching*. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- [6] Celce-Murcia M., Brinton D. M., Snow M. A. *Teaching English as a*

Second or Foreign Language. – 4th ed. – Cengage Learning, 2014.

[7] Darling-Hammond L. Powerful Teacher Education: Lessons from Exemplary Programs. – Jossey-Bass, 2006.

[8] Ellis R. The Study of Second Language Acquisition. – 2nd ed. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

[9] Elder C., O'Loughlin K. Investigating the relationship between linguistic performance on tasks and scores on proficiency tests // Language Testing. – 2003. – Vol. 20, No. 2. – P. 129–154.

[10] Farrell T. S. C. Reflective Language Teaching: From Research to Practice. – Bloomsbury, 2015.

[11] Freeman D., Johnson K. E. Reconceptualizing the knowledge-base of language teacher education // TESOL Quarterly. – 1998. – Vol. 32, No. 3. – P. 397–417.

[12] Harmer J. The Practice of English Language Teaching. – 5th ed. – Pearson Education, 2015.

[13] Hymes D. On communicative competence // Pride J. B., Holmes J. (Eds.). Sociolinguistics. – Penguin, 1972. – P. 269–293.

[14] Johnson K. E. Second Language Teacher Education: A Sociocultural Perspective. – Routledge, 2009.

[15] Krashen S. D. Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. – Pergamon, 1982.

### **ҚАЗІРГІ ЗАМАНҒЫ БІЛІМ БЕРУ ЖАҒДАЙЫНДА БОЛАШАҚ МҰҒАЛІМДЕРДІҢ КӘСІБИ ТІЛДІК ҚҰЗЫРЕТІН ҚАЛЫПТАСТЫРУ**

Үскенбаева Б.<sup>1</sup>, \*Рашева Г.<sup>2</sup>, Раманқұлова М.<sup>3</sup>, Ергешов Е.

<sup>1</sup>Қазақ мемлекеттік қыздар педагогикалық университеті  
Алматы, Қазақстан

<sup>2</sup>Абай атындағы Қазақ ұлттық педагогикалық университеті  
Алматы, Қазақстан

<sup>3</sup>Қожа Ахмет Ясауи атындағы Халықаралық қазақ-түрік университеті  
Түркістан, Қазақстан

<sup>4</sup>С. Нұрмағамбетов атындағы Құрлық әскерлерінің әскери институты  
Алматы, Қазақстан

**Аңдатпа.** Бұл мақалада болашақ мұғалімдердің тілдік құзыретін дамыту мәселесі қарастырылады және оның білікті тіл мамандарын қалыптастырудағы маңызды рөліне ерекше назар аударылады. Тіл мұғалімдерінен тілді дұрыс, еркін және жағдаятқа сай қолдану үлгісін көрсету талап етілетіндіктен, олардың тілдік шеберлігі жоғары деңгейде дамыған және үнемі жетілдіріліп отыратын болуы тиіс. Тіл үйренушіден тіл оқытушысына айналу процесі тек нысаналы тілді меңгеруді ғана емес, сонымен қатар педагогикалық қағидаттарды тілді оқыту барысында қолдана алу қабілетін де қамтиды. Бұл еңбекте лингвистикалық теорияны, қолданбалы тәжірибе мен рефлексивті оқыту әдістемелерін ұштастыратын мұғалімдерді даярлаудың кешенді тәсілі ұсынылады.

Екінші тілді меңгеру (SLA), тілдік педагогика және мұғалімдерді даярлау саласындағы заманауи зерттеулерге сүйене отырып, мақалада болашақ тіл мұғалімдеріне қажетті негізгі құзыреттіліктер айқындалады. Оларға грамматикалық дәлдік, коммуникативтік еркіндік, прагматикалық хабардарлық және мәдениетаралық құзыреттілік жатады.

Сонымен қатар, мақалада педагогикалық мазмұн білімінің яғни тілді әртүрлі білім алушылар тобына тиімді түрде үйрете алу қабілетінің — маңыздылығына баса назар аударылады.

Негізгі назар мұғалімдерді даярлау бағдарламаларындағы тілдік шеберлікті дамыту рөліне аударылады. Мақалада болашақ ұстаздардың тілді меңгеріп қана қоймай, оны тиімді оқыту әдістерін де үйренуін қамтамасыз ету мақсатында тілді жетілдіру курстарын, педагогикалық практиканы және рефлексивті тәжірибені қамтитын жүйе ұсынылады. Әлемдегі мұғалімдерді даярлау бағдарламаларынан алынған нақты мысалдар тілдік даму мен педагогикалық даярлықты ұштастырудың озық тәжірибелерін көрсетеді.

Бұған қоса, мақалада болашақ тіл мұғалімдерінің алдынан шығатын жиі кездесетін қиындықтар, мысалы, қалыптасып қалған қателіктер (фоссилизация), шынайы тілдік ортамен байланыстың шектеулілігі және өз тілдік шеберлі

**Тірек сөздер:** тілдік құзыреттілік, мұғалімдерді даярлау, тілдік педагогика, дайындықтан өтуші мұғалімдер, екінші тілді меңгеру, коммуникативтік еркіндік, мұғалімдерді даярлау, тілдік біліктілікті дамыту, рефлексивті тәжірибе, мәдениетаралық құзыреттілік

## **ФОРМИРОВАНИЕ ПРОФЕССИОНАЛЬНОЙ ЯЗЫКОВОЙ КОМПЕТЕНЦИИ У БУДУЩИХ УЧИТЕЛЕЙ В КОНТЕКСТЕ СОВРЕМЕННОГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ**

Ускенбаева Б.<sup>1</sup>, \*Рашева Г.<sup>2</sup>, Раманкулова М.<sup>3</sup>, Ергешов Е.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Казахский государственный женский педагогический университет,  
Алматы, Казахстан

<sup>\*2</sup>Казахский национальный педагогический университет имени Абая,  
Алматы, Казахстан

<sup>3</sup>Международный казахско-турецкий университет  
имени Ходжи Ахмеда Ясави, Туркестан, Казахстан

<sup>4</sup>Военный институт Сухопутных войск имени С. Нурмагамбетова  
Алматы, Казахстан

**Аннотация.** В данной статье рассматриваются вопросы формирования языковой компетенции у будущих учителей и подчеркивается ее ключевая роль в становлении эффективных преподавателей иностранных языков. Поскольку от учителей ожидается демонстрация грамотного, беглого и уместного (с учетом контекста) владения языком, их собственный уровень языковой подготовки должен быть высоким и постоянно совершенствоваться. Переход от статуса изучающего язык к статусу преподавателя предполагает не только владение целевым языком, но и умение применять педагогические

принципы в процессе обучения. В работе представлен интегративный подход к подготовке учителей, сочетающий лингвистическую теорию, практическую деятельность и методики рефлексивного преподавания.

Опираясь на современные исследования в области усвоения второго языка (SLA), методики преподавания языков и подготовки педагогических кадров, авторы определяют ключевые компетенции, необходимые будущим учителям. К ним относятся грамматическая точность, коммуникативная беглость, прагматическая осведомленность и межкультурная компетентность.

Кроме того, особое внимание уделяется важности педагогических знаний предметной области — способности эффективно обучать языку различные группы учащихся.

Центральное место в статье занимает роль развития языковой компетентности в программах подготовки учителей. Предлагается модель, включающая курсы по совершенствованию языковых навыков, педагогическую практику и элементы рефлексивной деятельности, что позволяет будущим педагогам не только изучать язык, но и осваивать методику его эффективного преподавания. Примеры из мировой практики подготовки учителей иллюстрируют передовые методы интеграции языкового развития и педагогической подготовки.

Также в статье рассматриваются типичные трудности, с которыми сталкиваются будущие учителя языков: например, устойчивые языковые ошибки (фоссилизация), недостаток опыта общения в аутентичной языковой среде и неуверенность в собственном уровне владения языком. Обсуждаются стратегии преодоления этих препятствий, включая наставничество, погружение в языковую среду и использование формирующей обратной связи.

**Ключевые слова:** языковая компетенция, педагогическое образование, методика преподавания языков, будущие учителя, овладение вторым языком, коммуникативная беглость, профессиональная подготовка учителей, развитие языковой компетентности, рефлексивная практика, межкультурная компетенция

*Received / Мақала түсті / Стаття поступила: 01.09.2025*

*Accepted: / Жариялауға қабылданды / Принята к публикации: 25.09.2026*

### **Information about authors:**

Uskenbayeva Bagila Abenovna Phd student , Kazakh State Women's Teacher training university, Almaty, Kazakhstan, teacher in Suleiman Demireli university

Rasheva Gulzhan Senior lecturer, Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical university, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Ramankulova Meruyert Alpysbayevna senior teacher of philology faculty, department of General Academic English, Khoja Akhmet Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University, Turkistan, Kazakhstan

Yergeshov Yerzhan Tenizovich dozent of upbringing and ideology department, Military institute of Land Forces named after S. Nurmagambetov, Almaty, Kazakhstan

***Авторлар туралы мәлімет:***

Үскенбаева Бағила Абенқызы – PhD докторанты (Қазақ мемлекеттік қыздар педагогикалық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан), Сүлеймен Демирел университетінің оқытушысы

Рашева Гүлжан – Аға оқытушы, Абай атындағы Қазақ ұлттық педагогикалық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан

Раманқұлова Меруерт Алпысбайқызы – Филология факультетінің «Жалпы академиялық ағылшын тілі» кафедрасының аға оқытушысы, Қожа Ахмет Ясауи атындағы Халықаралық қазақ-түрік университеті, Түркістан, Қазақстан

Ергешов Ержан Теңізұлы – Тәрбие және идеология кафедрасының доценті, С. Нұрмағамбетов атындағы Құрлық әскерлерінің әскери институты, Алматы, Қазақстан

***Информация об авторах:***

Үскенбаева Багила Абеновна — докторант Казахского государственного женского педагогического университета (г. Алматы, Казахстан), преподаватель Университета имени Сулеймана Демиреля

Рашева Гульжан — старший преподаватель Казахского национального педагогического университета имени Абая (г. Алматы, Казахстан)

Раманкулова Меруерт Алпысбаевна — старший преподаватель кафедры общеобразовательного английского языка филологического факультета Международного казахско-турецкого университета имени Ходжи Ахмеда Ясави (г. Туркестан, Казахстан)

Ергешов Ержан Тенизович — доцент кафедры воспитательной и идеологической работы Военного института Сухопутных войск имени С. Нурмагамбетова (г. Алматы, Казахстан)