



## IMPACT OF TRAINING ENGLISH FOR TEACHING AS ENGLISH FOR SPECIFIC PURPOSES FOR EFL TEACHERS

Nguyen Thi Ngoc Uyen<sup>1</sup>, Pham Thi Hong Nhung<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Gia Lai Province Department of Education and Training

<sup>2</sup>English Department, University of Foreign Languages & International Studies,  
Hue University, Vietnam

ORCID iDs: Nguyen Thi Ngoc Uyen  
Pham Thi Hong Nhung

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9662-842X>  
 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9621-8482>

**Abstract.** *Since the English language the teacher uses in EFL classrooms has a number of particular functions and features which are not always shared by general English, English-for-teaching has been considered as a type of English for specific purposes (Cullen, 1998; Freeman et al., 2015; Freeman, 2016, 2017; Pham, 2018). While much research has been conducted on developing general English proficiency for nonnative EFL teachers, little on the training of English-for-teaching proficiency for EFL teachers and its impact has been found. This study investigates secondary EFL teachers' perceptions of the changes they made as a result of English-for-teaching proficiency training. It also explores how these teachers maintain English-for-teaching proficiency in a context where resources required for substantiable professional development are scarce. Drawn on the data provided by means of questionnaire from 150 EFL teachers at CEFR-C1 level, 58 reflective reports and 24 interviews, the findings have revealed that the training has led to practical, meaningful changes to the language the teachers used in their classrooms. The study also shows that despite obtaining a high level of general English proficiency, the teachers still find English-for-Teaching useful to their teaching tasks and it is more likely for them to maintain this type of English. On the basis of the findings, relevant implications to teaching-job-related language proficiency training are made.*

**Key words:** *English for teaching, general English proficiency, professional development, classroom language function, teacher language competence, CEFR*

### 1. INTRODUCTION

In foreign language classroom, teacher language plays a critical role. It works as a means of communication helping teachers communicate instructional contents to learners and also gives the linguistic model for students, providing them with main source of target language input (Littlewood & Yu, 2011). Given the special functions of the language that EFL teachers use in their classroom, English-for-teaching is considered as English for specific purposes (Cullen, 1998; Freeman et al., 2015; Pham, 2018). In Vietnam, since the implementation of the National Foreign Languages Project, school EFL teachers have

---

Submitted May 26<sup>th</sup>, 2024, accepted for publication August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2024

Corresponding author: Pham Thi Hong Nhung, English Department, University of Foreign Languages and International Studies, Hue University, Vietnam

E-mail: n.pham@huguni.edu.vn

been sent to training workshops to enhance both their general English proficiency levels which are based on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) and pedagogical skills (Vietnamese Ministry of Education and Training - MOET, 2017). Recently, the Competency Framework for Foreign Language Teachers in Vietnam has been issued by the MOET at Dispatch No. 2069/BGDĐT-NGC/CBGD (MOET 2020b), which describes the competences foreign language teachers must develop and maintain for their teaching profession. In accordance with this document, foreign language teachers including EFL teachers are required to develop five distinct competences among which the competence to use English to teach English is ranked as top one. Accordingly, various large-scale trainings have been provided to help EFL teachers improve both general English proficiency and English-for-teaching proficiency. The English-for-teaching curriculum used in this training is provided through ELTeach program of Cengage National Geographic. This program is developed to help teachers to use English for a specific purpose, which is for teaching English, especially to fulfil 3 main functions EFL teachers often have to do in their classrooms, namely: English for pedagogical purpose, English for classroom management and English for delivering assessment feedback to language learners (Freeman et al., 2015). This paper reports the findings of a study on the changes that secondary EFL teachers perceived associated with the English-for-teaching training they received through the ELTeach program.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1. The role of teacher language proficiency in language classroom

The English language proficiency of EFL teachers has been of considerable interest in many non-native English-speaking countries (Elder, 2001; Tsui, 2003; Butler, 2004; Kim & Elder, 2008; Littlewood & Yu, 2011; Richards, 2017; Luo, 2021; Tseng, Chen & Huang, 2023). EFL teachers' language proficiency includes the ability to maintain the use of the target language in classroom, to give correct feedback on learner language, and to provide input at an appropriate level of difficulty (Freeman et al., 2015; Richards, 2017; Pham, 2017). According to Freeman (2017), English proficiency is important for non-native English-speaking teachers to facilitate effective language learning in the classroom. Teachers with limited English proficiency may find it difficult to communicate with their students, which could lead to a lack of language input, lower language output, and insufficient feedback, and create a negative impact on students' language learning. Additionally, the proficiency level of EFL teachers will also allow them to use different methods for their teaching practices (Farrell & Richards, 2007).

As language is used as a valuable means of communication in all classrooms, the English EFL teachers use in their classroom is no exception. They use English to deliver the knowledge and develop the skills required for their students. However, unlike the language the teachers of other subjects use in their class, in foreign language classes the language the teacher uses becomes not just a tool for communication but also a content itself as it actually provides meaningful, comprehensible input of the target language to learners (Littlewood & Yu, 2011, Pham, 2017) and serves as both "the medium and the object of learning" (Tsui, 2003, p. 136). In this sense, language use in the language classroom is widely viewed as both the means and the objective of instruction (Richards & Lockhart, 1996; Richards,

2010; Freeman, 2016). That is why it is necessary to have a threshold proficiency level for EFL teachers to reach so that they can teach effectively in English.

## **2.2. English-for-teaching as english for specific purposes**

Christine (1995) and much research in classroom discourse (e.g. Ferguson, 2009; Inbar-Lourie, 2010; Forman, 2012) has confirmed classroom language is not the same as the discourse used in real life. While general English proficiency is “the extent to which an individual possesses the linguistic cognition necessary to function in a given communicative circumstance, in a given modality (listening, speaking, reading, or writing)” (Hulstijn 2011, p. 242), English for teaching purpose refers to the proficiency of using English as “a specific subset of language skills required to prepare and teach [language] lessons” (Freeman et al. 2015, p. 129). It also covers the abilities to use the target language fluently and confidently in classroom and to give appropriate feedback on students’ spoken and written tasks (Le & Renandya, 2017). English-for-teaching has its own characteristics and features, which help it serve well the pedagogical purpose of teaching a foreign language. This is why research needs to focus more on the quality of language foreign language teachers use in their classrooms, not just on how often and how much they talk (Walsh, 2002).

It is widely accepted that the language EFL teachers use in their classroom has 3 main functions: English for pedagogical and instructional functions, English for classroom management and English for delivering feedback to language learners. The pedagogical function involves the use of language to explain the lesson, to provide instructions on learning activities, to illustrate the teaching points, to paraphrase abstract contents whenever relevant, to provide support to learners (e.g., providing hints or prompts) and so on (Forman, 2011). Teachers also use language to manage the classroom as classroom management involves the teacher using language to discipline learners, to keep the class in order, to make sure the activities completed within the time scheduled, to give learners relatively equal opportunity to participate in learning activities and so on. Teacher language in classroom management therefore, plays an important role in students’ English language learning (Tsui, 2003; Kim & Elder, 2008). The language EFL teachers use to provide feedback can either directly and constantly facilitate or obstruct language learner’s performance and their efforts to communicate in the target language both in oral form (Walsh, 2002; Jelinková, Petrus & Laue, 2023) and written form (Anđelković, 2022). The language used to give feedback information can be provided with different levels of complexity, in different volumes to support learners’ leaning of language. For all of these teaching-bound functions, English-for-teaching proficiency is viewed as a type of English for specific purposes, serving the goal of teaching language, and as such it needs to be developed for EFL teachers.

On the implementation level of the National Foreign Languages Project of Vietnam, secondary EFL teachers from different provinces and cities countrywide are sent to general English workshops to achieve the required level of proficiency requested of them, specially the CEFR-C1 level. They are also sent to English-for-teaching program to improve their competence to use English to teach English. This program is provided in a blended mode with roughly 60 hours of face-to-face training when the participants were taught about the significance of the language they use in the classroom, its functions and impact on language learners. Also during this offline phase of the training workshop, they were introduced to ELTeach online application, which was developed to help them improve their English-for-teaching use for 3 main functions: teaching, classroom management, and

providing assessment feedback to language learners. In the online, self-paced learning stage of the training workshop, each participant was given an account on ELTeach platform and they were encouraged to access the training contents and complete the tasks available to them at their most convenient time. The participants were expected to spend at least 120 hours in this platform. At the end of the course, they were asked to take an end-of-training-course test.

Given the current large-scale training of English-for-teaching for EFL teachers in Vietnam, this study aims to answer the following research questions: 1) What changes in teaching practices are perceived by secondary EFL teachers as a result of their English-for-teaching training? and 2) What do the teachers do for maintaining their English-for-teaching proficiency?

### 3. METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1. Participants

The participants of the study include 150 Vietnamese EFL teachers who attended English-for-teaching training workshops provided by universities authorized by the MOET in Vietnam, using the ELTeach program by Cengage National Geographic. They teach at different secondary schools in provinces in the Central Highland of Vietnam, which are often considered as remote, disadvantaged areas of the country. The teachers and students of these provinces are often reported as facing various challenges due to limited access to resources, shortage of teaching staff and poor teaching and learning conditions (MOET, 2018). It has also been recorded that the teachers in these provinces find it difficult to maintain their general English proficiency in post-training period (MOET, 2020a).

The demographic information of the participants is presented in Table 1.

Table 1 Demographic data of the participants

Category	Subcategory	Number	Percent
Provinces	Gia Lai	96	64%
	Kon Tum	54	36%
Gender	Male	22	14.7%
	Female	128	85.3%
Teaching experience	2-5 years	12	8%
	6-10 years	19	13%
	11-15 years	46	31%
	>15 years	73	48%
Qualifications	College	18	12%
	BA	90	60%
	MA	42	28%
	PhD	0	0%
General English level	CEFR-C1	150	100
Average student no. per class	< 35	32	20.9%
	36-40	33	22%
	41-45	68	46%
	>45	17	11.1%

All of the participants had obtained the CEFR-C1 level as certified by the authorized universities before attending the English-for-teaching program. This study was conducted roughly 6 months after the participants had completed the ELTeach program and passed the final test on their English-for-teaching proficiency.

### **3.2. Data collection and analysis instruments**

Since the questionnaire could not reveal the full nature of the research phenomenon (Creswell, 2005, 2009), reflective reports and semi-structured interviews were also used for the purpose of this study. These methods provided flexible ways to collect, analyze, and interpret data, as well as to interact with research subjects in their professional development and teaching practices. The instruments were developed based on Hulstijn's (2011) and Freeman et al.'s (2015) framework of classroom language proficiency.

#### *3.2.1. Questionnaire*

The questionnaire was developed into 3 main parts (See Appendix 1 for the full form of the questionnaire). Part one collects the participants' demographic information, including gender, age, workplace/school, teaching experiences, professional qualifications, the number of students in their classroom, and their weekly teaching hours. Part two contains both closed and open-ended items to explore teachers' perceptions of the changes in their teaching practices as impact of English-for-teaching training and things they do to maintain their proficiency. Part three seeks agreement of the participants for further contact for reflective report and interview stages of the study.

#### *3.2.2. Reflective report*

As professional development can be seen as "a result of gaining increased experience and examining his or her teaching systematically" (Glatthorn, 1995, p. 41), it is important to give teachers opportunities to reflect on their own performance as an essential aspect of professional growth. Without a clear understanding of why certain activities do or do not take place in their classroom, teachers cannot efficiently and productively shape other classes accordingly (Hoban, 2002). Therefore, teachers' reflection is a useful practice to support their professional development and their efforts to improve students' learning (Fendler, 2003).

The reflective report consists of prompts to assess the participants' perceptions of changes in their teaching practices, strategies and activities implemented to maintain the level of English-for-teaching proficiency (see Appendix 2 for the full form of the Reflective report).

The teachers were given up to six weeks to complete their report properly. They were also encouraged to elaborate as much as they thought was relevant in their responses.

#### *3.2.3. Interview*

Interview was used to provide more information about changes in teaching practice they perceived after training and activities related to maintaining English-for-teaching during post-training phase. A semi-structured interview was employed to elicit more comprehensive information and explore unexpected issues that might arise from the reflective report. The predetermined questions in semi-structured interviews also helped

keep interviews “on track”, but the flexibility of the structure allows the interviews to flow like natural conversations and better gain insights into what interviewees perceive as important (Bryman, 2008) (see Appendix 3 for main interview questions).

#### 3.2.4. Data analysis

The data were gathered from the three collection instruments, including 150 completed questionnaires, 58 reflective reports, and 22 interviews. The quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS version 20 and coded with Cronbach's Alpha to check for internal consistency. The online survey administration was chosen as the quickest way to collect data and allowed respondents to answer questions on their own schedule. The data collected from the open-ended questions in the completed questionnaires, reflective reports, and interviews were analyzed qualitatively using content analysis. This involved creating codes and identifying themes and patterns in the text data for interpretation (Creswell, 2009).

### 4. FINDINGS

#### 4.1. Teachers' perceptions of general changes in classroom language use

Teachers' perceptions of general changes are described in 5 items numbered from 1 to 5 in terms of (1) improvement in accuracy in language use; (2) variation in English use (the ability to say the same things in different ways); (3) fluency in English use in classroom; (4) the ability of using English to teach English, and (5) improvement in conveying English knowledge to learners more comprehensively. Their responses are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 Teachers' perceptions of general changes in their classroom language use

Scales	TD	DA	NS	A	TA	Mean	SD
After the English-for-teaching training, I have...	1	2	3	4	5		
Seen improvements in accuracy in my class language use (e.g. in pronunciation, word choice, or grammar).	0 0%	1 0.7%	6 4.0%	81 54%	62 41.3%	4.36	.59
Varied expressions I use in my class (e.g. saying the same things in different ways).	0 0.0%	2 1.3%	10 6.7%	91 60.7%	47 31.3%	4.22	.62
Improved fluency in my classroom English in general.	0 0.0%	2 1.3%	6 4.0%	96 64%	46 30.7%	4.24	.59
Improved my ability of using English to teach English (e.g. to explain to students, to manage the class, to provide assessment feedback).	0 0.0%	3 2.0%	7 4.7%	94 62.7%	46 30.7%	4.22	.62
Had improvements in my general ability to convey the required knowledge and/or develop relevant skills to students.	0 0.0%	4 2.6%	10 6.7%	90 60%	46 30.7%	4.19	.67

Table 2 presents the general positive impact of the English-for-teaching training on the teachers' ability to use English in the classroom. The results indicate that the majority of the teachers experienced an improvement in using classroom language after attending the training workshop, with means ranging from 4.19 to 4.36. Respectively 54% and 41.3% of the participants agree and totally agree that they have seen improvements in the accuracy of

their language use in the class, leading to a total of and more than 95.3% of the teachers noticing positive changes in their word choice, grammar use and pronunciation.

Similar results are found for all other statements about the positive impact of English-for-teaching. More than 90% of the teachers also confirmed the changes they made by either agreeing or totally agreeing with those statements, from the ability to use various expressions in the classrooms (92 %), to improvement in fluency (94.7%), to the ability to use English to fulfil teaching functions including explaining to students (93.4%), managing class and providing feedback to the ability to convey instructional contents clearly to learners (90.7%). Qualitative data also show similar impact of the English-for-teaching training. The participants frequently describe the changes they see in their classroom language as being “*obvious*”, “*practical*”, “*daily*”, “*clear*”, “*undeniable*”, “*easy to see*”. However, there are still a number of teachers who are either uncertain about the changes they make in their classroom language or do not see those changes at all. Noticeably, 9.3% of the teachers showed in their response to the questionnaire items that they do not really see improvements in their general ability to convey the required knowledge and/or develop relevant skills to their learners.

The sections below will present in more details the changes in language use reflected by the teachers in 3 different functions they have to fulfil in classroom.

## 4.2. Teachers’ perceptions of changes in their English use for specific functions

### 4.2.1. Changes in using English for teaching purposes

These changes mainly relate to the teachers’ ability of providing good language models (i.e. mainly accurate language use), of giving accurate explanations of the lessons (e.g. meaning of English words, structures), and of providing short but clear and simple instructions for learners. The teachers noticed improvements in the language they use for teaching purpose in terms of pronunciation, planning and modifications in lexical difficulty.

The improvements in language pronunciation are reflected in the account below.

*I made some changes in the pronunciations of some words and expressions I often use in classroom. Before the training, I didn’t really know that I pronounced these words incorrectly as they were too close to me [I used them very often]. Now I am more aware of the accuracy of the language I use. [...] For example, I used to forget pronouncing the ending sounds in words like “absent”, “false” or sound /z/ in “example” [that I used to pronounce /s/, or the sound /s/ in “basic” [that I used to pronounce /z/] I use them for years without knowing that I pronounced them incorrectly. [...] I also paid more attention to the pronunciation of things I said in my class. For example, even when I read a question or a passage out of the textbook, I tend to look up in the dictionary to pronounce correctly words whose pronunciation I am not so sure about because I know it may influence my students’ language too. (Participant 4).*

The account by Teacher 4 on one hand shows her observation of her own self-correction when it comes to the pronunciation of familiar words she uses in teaching. This tendency is reported frequently among the qualitative data and is not just applicable to the language the teachers use for teaching purpose. It is also found in the language the teachers use for classroom management and feedback delivery. On the other hand it also suggests the teachers’ increasing awareness of the impact of her language as input on her

students' language output. This awareness is important because what EFL teachers do in the language classroom is influenced by what they think and respond to in their teaching routine tasks (Lee, Schutz & Vlack, 2017).

Various entries in reflective reports and accounts found in interview data show the participants learnt to intentionally plan their teaching language and readily modified levels of lexical difficulty to suit learners' language learners. The entry below is representative of many other entries from reflective reports.

*The [English-for-teaching] training helped me understand more clearly about the role of the language I use everyday in my classroom. Before that, my language use was mainly dependent on spontaneous decisions and my personal experiences. For example, when I gave instructions for some activities, I observed students' reactions [mainly non-verbal]. If I felt like they didn't understand what I said, I would decide to say [the instructions] again and added some modifications to help students understand better. But now, for those activities, I planned my instruction language in advance to make sure my students would not have much trouble understanding it. I prioritize simple expressions and structures comprehensible to my students. I also break down long instructions and long sentences into smaller parts whenever necessary. It would also be more time-saving for us. (Participant 17).*

In the entry above, Teacher 17 made it clear that the training helped him understand better the significance of the language he uses in the classroom and also encouraged him to establish a new practice of planning it before official teaching. The choice of words and structures used in his language is also made with pedagogical intentions, instead of spontaneously as before. The complexity level of the language they used didn't receive much attention from the teachers until the English-for-teaching training.

There are still 7 accounts by the teachers reflecting their choice to switch to Vietnamese from time to time when explaining complicated concepts or structures to learners. One common reason for this choice is given below:

*When the grammatical point is too complicated, I cannot explain it all in English. If I do [explain it all in English], then I will end up using complicated structures and words, so my students will not understand it anyway. [It will also take a lot of time and will not be helpful]. So in these cases [for example, when I teach If-clause in conditional sentence type 2], I go to Vietnamese. This is not because I cannot express myself in English. This is mainly because my students' language level is low. They can't understand complicated English.*

While being exposed to much target language input enhances language learners' motivation, confidence, and communicative competence, as well as their cultural and global awareness (Krashen, 1982; Swain, 1985), it is practical to acknowledge that in foreign language classrooms, "given the appropriate environment, two languages are as normal as two lungs" (Cook, 2002, p. 23).

Although improvement in fluency and frequency of the language used for teaching is reported, it is not reflected as often as in the language used for providing feedback and classroom management.



#### 4.2.2. Changes in using English for delivering feedback information to learners

With respect to teachers' perceptions of changes in teaching practice, their responses through both open-ended items in the questionnaire and reflective, interview qualitative data indicate they employed a great variety of expressions to deliver assessment feedback to learners.

A teacher of 28 years of teaching experience reported:

*The [English-for-teaching] training helped me realized that previously my expressions for delivering feedback to my students were very limited. [ I tended to say "Is it right or wrong, class?" "Yes, it's right" "Good job! Well done! Good boy!" "Are you sure?]. Now I can choose among a wider range of expressions such as "Yes, that's right. Why do you think so?" "It's a good guess, but maybe somebody else has some more ideas?" or "Who wants to add more to this?" or "Great answer! I'm proud of you!" "Thank you for trying. Who else can help here?". I feel good when using these expressions [that I didn't use before] because I feel like I have more choices for doing routines tasks now. They are simple and my students understand them very well. (Participant 79).*

The teacher above illustrated how she varied the language for giving feedback to her students. She also mentioned the good feelings this change has brought to her.

A good number of narratives from the data collected indicate the teachers realized their English is more fluent when doing classroom routine teaching tasks, especially for delivering assessment feedback and also for managing class. As one participant explained:

*Because I used these expressions everyday, they soon come out of my mouth easily and fluently after just sometime. It was just a little bit hard at the beginning [to remember them]. But then I can use them naturally and automatically [without spending much time recalling them]. They are simple, so it's not really hard to use them (Participant 3).*

In another words, as the teachers used these expressions frequently, they became fluent in using English for giving feedback to learners.

Additionally, there are emerging accounts which suggest that thanks to the use of these new expressions, the teachers started to change their approaches to dealing with students' performance. For instance, a teacher explained how her choice of particular expressions gave her students the opportunity to use more language and encouraged them to self-correct their mistakes.

*When my students made a mistake [for example, they mispronounced a word, pronouncing "jail" for "gel"] I would correct them right away to save time [like, not "jail", but "gel"]. But now I can say "Do you mean "gel"? The students would say the word more correctly. When the students gave an incorrect answer, I can choose to say, for example, "So is that all the passage says? Does it say anything else in the last sentence?" That often encourages the students to go through the passage one more time and complete the answer. If I have time, I can also ask students to give me examples about what they have just said too. (Participant 5).*

It is likely that at the beginning Teacher 5 was not so aware of the fact that her choice of new expressions allowed her students to use more language or to self-repair when they make a mistake. However, by her making use of the language she learnt from the training, her students benefit from the pedagogical values embedded in these expressions.

The finding confirms when teachers start to initiate language change in their classroom, the effectiveness of their teaching is enhanced. This finding is in accordance with Banno (2003), who maintains that teachers with good language proficiency, have higher confidence in delivering their lessons and that this attitude is passed on to their students, causing them to have a more positive attitude toward the target language. This result is also in line with the common observation that when teachers can use language well in classroom, they are able to assess students and provide good quality feedback (Tsui, 2003; Farrell & Richards, 2007).

#### *4.2.2. Changes in using English for classroom management*

The change concerning the teachers' use of English for managing classrooms was illustrated most frequently with narratives which indicate the participants used more accurate, fluent language and a wider range of expressions as seen in the data of English for teaching and feedback delivery functions. But it is worth pointing out that the teachers noticed they had a higher frequency of opting for English for classroom management than before the English-for-teaching training.

*Now I can use more English and also more often to manage my class, for example to practice disciplines on my students, [for instance] to tell them to do things or not to do things to interrupt their classmates. I can say "Keep silent, focus on your task or I'll move you here [to the front]" or "Stop interrupting your friends and focus on your exercise". Before [the training], I often said those things in Vietnamese because I thought it is more effective and my students would not understand if I said in English. Now. I know it was just a habit. (Participant 11).*

Like Teacher 11, many other participants showed through their narratives that they used to go to English to manage their classroom as a habit since they started teaching English. The training helped them realize that there are still different but simple expressions they can use for effective classroom management. Despite a perceived higher rate of English use for classroom management, there are 2 teachers who said in cases where the students violate the class rules seriously, they would opt for Vietnamese right from the beginning to indicate to the students the seriousness of their violations and to explain the actions the teachers are going to take to punish the unwanted behaviors of the students.

In general, the results indicate that the teachers tended to maximize classroom language use in classroom as a result of their participation in English-for-teaching training. They also became more aware of the role their own language use plays in language classroom. The changes reported are encouraging as when EFL teachers maximize opportunities for target language input in classroom, it is beneficial to language learners (Turnbull, 2000; Turnbull & Arnette, 2002).

### 4.3. English-For-Teaching Proficiency Maintenance

As anticipated, the participants have a consensus view that English-for-teaching is easy to use and to maintain. Their confirmation about the sustainable maintenance of English-for-teaching proficiency is unanimous. Commonly listed reasons include frequent use, practicality, low linguistic complexity, and observable impacts as seen in the narratives below.

*Unlike [the CEFR] C1 we have, we use English-for-teaching frequently in our teaching, so we can maintain it with no trouble. I don't have to go out to talk to native speakers or to do [C1] practice tests to keep it [English-for-teaching] from dropping down. When we use it on daily basis, we cannot forget it. The classroom is already an environment for using it [English-for-teaching], so I don't have to go anywhere else. (Participant 17).*

*Most of the expressions we learnt [from the English-for-teaching] are simple, so it easy to remember and to use. The words and the structures are familiar to me and my students. No complicated words, so it is not like vocabulary and grammar at C1 level. Even if there is a difficult word, but you use it many times in your class, the students will understand. (Participant 23)*

*The language [English-for teaching] is straight forward and very practical. I can see my students understand me better, more quickly when I change my [classroom] language. They also respond better. That makes me feel relaxed and comfortable when teaching (Participant 14).*

As seen in the accounts above, while giving the reasons to explain for low maintenance English-for-teaching proficiency, the participants at times spontaneously made some comparisons with the maintenance of their general English proficiency. In these comparisons, the participants naturally referred to the complexity of the general English proficiency level they have obtained and of the hardship and challenges involved of maintaining it. Although general English proficiency is compulsory for a teacher to be able to teach English, having the chance to develop English-for-teaching helps the teachers realize more clearly the conditions required for maintaining each time of proficiency. In the account below, reference to general English competence is made but the participant also highlighted the value of English-for-teaching proficiency that a solely high general English proficiency level may not offer to EFL teachers.

*I have more freedom and flexibility in my class when I know English-for-teaching because it helps me do what I have to do in English more easily and because sometimes my previous English [C1] cannot help me do those tasks as well. (Participant 12).*

Teacher 12 actually both describes the usefulness of English-for-teaching to her and points out the necessity of training this type of English to even teachers with high general language competence.

## 5. CONCLUSION

The findings of the study have suggested that English-for-teaching training has been perceived to have positive impact on the language they use in their classroom. It is illustrated in changes made in the choice of language teachers for different classroom functions. Apart from having access to a rich pool of useful, teaching-related expressions, insights into the significance of their classroom language also helped the teachers become more willing in using these expressions in their daily practice. The changes made as sustainable impact of professional development are valuable when the teachers start to see the positive impact of their changes on their learners (Guskey, 2002). The natural references to and comparisons with the general English competence made also shows the teachers' awareness of the fact that despite their CEFR-C1 level in general English, English-for-teaching have its own characteristics and useful to their teaching. The desirable changes and the likeliness to maintain English-for-teaching competence found in this study are even more meaningful in contexts where the teachers have rare access to resources necessary for their language proficiency maintenance.

## REFERENCES

- Andelković, J. (2022). Peer and teacher assessment of academic essay writing: procedure and correspondence. *The Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 10(1), 171–184.
- Banno, E. (2003). A cross cultural survey of students' expectations of foreign language teachers. *Foreign Language Annals* 36(3), 339–346.
- Bryman, A. (2008). *Social research methods* (3rd. ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Butler, Y. G. (2004). What level of English proficiency do elementary school teachers need to attain to teach EFL? Case studies from Korea, Taiwan, and Japan. *TESOL Quarterly* 38(2), 245–278.
- Christie, F. (1995). Pedagogic discourse in the primary school. *Linguistics and Education*, 7, 221–242.
- Cook, V. (2002). *Portraits of the L2 user*. Multilingual Matters.
- Creswell, J. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Pearson Education, Inc.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Cullen, R. (1994). Incorporating a language improvement component in teacher training programmes. *ELT Journal*, 48 (2), 162–172.
- Elder, C. (2001). Assessing the language proficiency of teachers: Are there any border controls? *Language Testing* 18(2), 149–170.
- Farrell, T. S., Richards, J. (2007). Teachers' language proficiency. In T.S. Farrell (Ed.) *Reflective language teaching: From research to practice* (pp. 55–66). Continuum.
- Fendler, L. (2003). Teacher reflection in a hall of mirrors: Historical influences and political reverberations. *Educ. Res.* 32(3), 16–25.
- Ferguson, G. (2009). What next? Towards an agenda for classroom codeswitching research. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12(2), 231–241.
- Forman, R. (2012). Six functions of bilingual EFL teacher talk: Animating, translating, explaining, creating, prompting and dialoguing. *RELC Journal*, 43(2), 239–253.
- Freeman, D. (2016). *Educating second language teachers*. Oxford University Press.
- Freeman, D. (2017). The case for teachers' classroom English proficiency. *RELC Journal* 48(1), 31–52.
- Freeman, D., Katz, A., Gomez, P. G., & Burns, A. (2015). English-for-Teaching: Rethinking teacher proficiency in the classroom. *ELT Journal* 69(2), 129–139.
- Guskey, T. R. (2002). Professional development and teacher change. *Teachers and Teaching*, 8(3), 381–91.
- Hoban, G. F. (2002). Teacher learning for educational change: A systems thinking approach. In I. Goodson & A. Hargreaves (Eds.) *Teacher learning for educational change* (pp. 101–120). Open University Press.
- Hulstijn, J. H. (2011). Language proficiency in native and nonnative speakers: An agenda for research and suggestions for second-language assessment. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 8(3), 229–249.

- Inbar-Lourie, O. (2010). English only? The linguistic choices of teachers of young EFL learners. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 14(3), 351-367.
- Jelínková, J., Petrus, P., Laue, A. (2023). The impact of feedback on students' willingness to communicate in foreign language learning: systematic review. *The Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 11(3), 663-686.
- Kim, S., & Elder, C. (2008). Target language use in foreign language classrooms: Practices and perceptions of two native speaker teachers in New Zealand. *Language, Culture and Communication*, 21(2), 167-185.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon Press.
- Le, V. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2017). Teachers' English proficiency and classroom language use: A conversation analysis study. *RELC Journal*, 48(1).
- Lee, M., Schutz, P. A., & Vlack, S. v. (2017). Chapter 6. Non-native English-speaking teachers' anxieties and insecurities: Self-perceptions of their communicative limitations. In M. Agudo & J. D. Dios (Eds.) *Native and non-native teachers in English language classrooms. Professional challenges and teacher education* (pp. 119-138). New York University.
- Littlewood, W., & Yu, B. (2011). First language and target language in the foreign language classroom. *Language Teaching*, 44(1), 64-77.
- Luo, W. H. (2021). Challenges facing teachers in implementing bilingual instruction in Taiwan and implications for teacher professional development. *Journal of Education Research*, 321, 78-97.
- MOET (2017). *Circular 23/2017/TT-BGDĐT on promulgating regulation on assessment of language proficiency according to Vietnam's language proficiency framework*. Hanoi: MOET.
- MOET (2019). *MOET report at the National Conference on teaching English to primary school students in disadvantaged areas*. Hanoi: MOET.
- MOET (2020a). *National Foreign Languages Project Report. Annual Conference on Foreign Language Teacher Training*. Hanoi: MOET.
- MOET (2020b). *Dispatch No. 2069/BGDĐT-NGCBQLGD a guidance on the implementation of framework for foreign language teachers in Vietnam*. Ha Noi: MOET.
- Pham, T. H. (2017). English-for-teaching training: Initial impact on in-service EFL teachers' classroom discourse: A case study. In L. LeDréan, & D. Freeman, *Developing classroom English competence: Learning from the Vietnam experience* (pp. 72-83). IDP Education Ltd.
- Pham, T. H. (2018). General English proficiency or English for teaching? The preferences of in-service teachers. *RELC Journal* 49(3), 339-352.
- Richards, J. C. (2010) Competence and performance in language teaching. *RELC Journal*, 41(2), 101-22.
- Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1996). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2017). Teaching English through English: proficiency, pedagogy and performance. *RELC Journal*, 48(1), 7-30.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp.235-253). Newbury House.
- Tseng, S., Chen, C., & Huang, H. (2023). Low English proficiency teachers' challenges in bilingual Instruction. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 20(2), 485-493.
- Tsui, A. (2003). *Understanding expertise in teaching: Case studies of second language teachers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Turnbull, M. (2001). There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but.... *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 57(4), 531-540.
- Turnbull, M., & Arnett, K. (2002). Teachers' uses of the target and first languages in second and foreign language classroom. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 22(1), 204-218.
- Walsh, S. (2002). Construction or obstruction: teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 6(1), 3-23.

## APPENDIX 1

**Questionnaire**

Please take your time to answer these questions. All the information you provided will be kept confidential. It will only be used for the purpose of the current study on your perceptions of the changes you made in your classroom and things you do to maintain your English proficiency since you completed the English-for-teaching training.

Your participation in this survey is voluntary and you can choose not to continue at any time. Thank you.

**I. PERSONAL INFORMATION: Questions 1-8**

**Question 1.** Your current general English proficiency level is CEFR-C1 or above:

- Yes  No

**Important:** If you choose **No** to Question 1 above, you don't have to complete this questionnaire. Please return it to the researcher. Thank you.

**Question 2.** Your full name:.....  
(Optional)

**Question 3.** Your school is in .....

- Gia Lai  KonTum province

**Question 4.** How long have you been teaching English?

- 2-5 years  6-10 years  11-15 years  > 15years

**Question 5.** Your age: .....

**Question 6.** Your gender:  Male  Female

**Question 7.** Choose the highest degree you received:

- Junior college graduation degree  Bachelor's degree  
 Master's degree  Doctoral degree

**Question 8.** The average number of students in your classroom is.....

- < 35  35-40  41-45  >45

**II. YOUR ENGLISH-FOR-TEACHING PROFICIENCY: Questions 9-11**

**Question 9.** Changes you have seen/made in your classroom language. To what extent do you agree with the following statements? Tick (✓) the right column.

No.	After the English-for-teaching training, I have...	Totally disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Totally agree
1	Seen improvements in accuracy in my class language use (e.g. in pronunciation, word choice or grammar).					
2	Varied expressions I use in my class (e.g. saying the same things in different ways).					
3	Improved fluency in my classroom English in general.					
4	Improved my ability of using English to teach English (e.g. to explain to students, to manage the class, to provide assessment information).					
5	Had improvements in my general ability to convey the required knowledge and/or develop relevant skills to students.					

**Question 10.** *Things you do to maintain your English-for-teaching proficiency.* In the space provided below, please write down things you often do to maintain your English-for-teaching proficiency.

.....  
.....

**Questions 11.** *Difficulties you encounter during English-for-teaching maintenance.* In the space provide below, please write down at least 2 difficulties/challenges you face while trying to maintain your English-for-teaching proficiency after the training completion.

.....  
.....

**III. FURTHER CONTACT FOR INTERVIEW/REFLECTIVE REPORT**

We would like to:

- Invite you to write reflective reports on your classroom English use: Yes  No
- Interview you about your classroom English use: Yes  No

If YES, please kindly complete the information below, so that we can contact you.

Your name: .....

Email address: .....

Phone number (optional): .....

*Thank you.*

APPENDIX 2

**Reflective Report**

Participant's code (*leave this blank*):.....

1. Please write about the changes you have made since you completed the English-for-teaching training. Whenever possible, please provide examples.

*If you don't notice any changes, it is alright to leave the relevant section(s) blank.*

- In the language you use for teaching English:

.....  
.....

- In the language you use for delivering assessment feedback to learners:

.....  
.....

- In the language you use for classroom management

.....  
.....

2. Write down what helps you maintain English-for-teaching proficiency.

.....  
.....  
.....

3. Write down the challenges you face while trying to maintain the level of proficiency you have achieved.

.....  
.....

### APPENDIX 3

#### Interview Questions

##### General questions

Tell me about yourself.

##### Specific questions

1. In your opinion, is it significant to maintain your classroom language proficiency you have achieved? Why and why not?
2. You have mentioned in your questionnaire response / reflective report that you have made some changes in the language you use for teaching, such as [...]. Could you be more specific? Could you provide some examples on this?
3. You have mentioned in your questionnaire response / reflective report that you did [...] to maintain your English-for-teaching proficiency. Could you be more specific?
- (4. You have mentioned in your questionnaire response / reflective report that you have encountered some challenges maintaining your English-for-teaching proficiency. Could you explain more clearly about these challenges?)