



За рамками общения в классе: внеклассные профессионально-коммуникативные задачи преподавателя иностранного языка в России, Китае, Индонезии, Великобритании и США

А. А. КОРЕНЕВ, А. П. ГУЛОВ, П. И. КАСАТКИН

АННОТАЦИЯ

Введение. Требования к прозрачности и подотчетности в педагогическом образовании диктуют необходимость в языковых программах и оценивании, основанных на эмпирических данных. Существующие системы языкового оценивания учителей и преподавателей часто не отражают специфические коммуникативные потребности преподавателей английского языка в использовании языка за пределами аудиторного общения. Необходимы эмпирические данные для разработки более эффективных программ языковой подготовки будущих учителей и преподавателей английского языка (а. я.), студентов лингводидактических профилей подготовки.

Цель исследования состоит в выявлении и классификации коммуникативных задач, с которыми сталкиваются преподаватели а. я. за пределами аудитории в различных национально-культурных контекстах.

Материалы и методы исследования. В анкетировании приняло участие 1288 учителей и преподавателей а. я. в России, Китае, Индонезии, Великобритании и США. Анкета содержала вопросы о профессиональном опыте учителей, профессиональных задачах, выполняемых вне класса на английском языке, и мнениях о важнейших компонентах подготовки будущих учителей и преподавателей а. я.

Результаты. Была выявлена высокая частотность чтения книг/исследований по методике преподавания языка на английском (95% в России, 93% в Китае/Великобритании, 84% в Индонезии, 78% в США) и оценивания письменных работ студентов (95% в Китае, 97% в Индонезии, 95% в Великобритании, 93% в США, 82% в России). Разработка заданий/тестов была частотным ответом в Великобритании (95%) и США (98%), в то время как консультирование студентов/предоставление обратной связи превысило 90% в Индонезии, Китае, Великобритании и США, достигнув 74% в России. Рефлексия была отмечена 91% респондентов в Китае, 80% в США и 72% в Индонезии. Написание электронных писем показало разные результаты: 89% в Китае, 88% в США и 84% в Великобритании, по сравнению с 69% в Индонезии и 68% в России. Примечательно, что оценивание письменных работ было выбрано 75% респондентов в качестве ключевого умения для будущих преподавателей, что указывает на ощущаемую потребность во включении его в содержание профессиональной подготовки будущих учителей и преподавателей а. я.

Заключение. Исследование выявляет ключевые области использования языка вне класса, включая поддержку обучения, профессиональное развитие, разработку материалов обучения и оценивания, а также административные задачи. Данные области важны для целенаправленной подготовки будущих преподавателей а. я., разработки образовательных программ и подготовки студентов лингводидактических профилей к более эффективному и естественному использованию языка в профессиональных целях за пределами класса.

КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА

профессионально-коммуникативная компетенция, профессиональная подготовка преподавателя иностранного языка, коммуникативные задачи, классный дискурс

Для цитирования: Корнев А. А., Гулов А. П., Касаткин П. И. За рамками общения в классе: внеклассные профессионально-коммуникативные задачи преподавателя иностранного языка в России, Китае, Индонезии, Великобритании и США // Перспективы науки и образования. 2025. № 4. С. 10–20. <https://doi.org/10.32744/pse.2025.4.1>

Поступила: 11.02.2024 | Одобрена: 20.04.2025 | Опубликована: 31.08.2025



Лицензия «С указанием авторства — С сохранением условий». Позволяет перерабатывать, исправлять и развивать произведения при условии указания авторства и лицензирования производных работ на аналогичных условиях.



Beyond Classroom Language: Language Teacher's Communicative Tasks Outside the Classroom in Russia, China, Indonesia, the US and the UK

A. A. KORENEV, A. P. GULOV, P. I. KASATKIN

ABSTRACT

Introduction. Demands for transparency and accountability in teacher education necessitate empirically-based language programs and assessments. Existing teacher assessments often fail to reflect the specific language use needs of English language teachers (ELTs) outside of classroom language, an increasingly crucial area due to English-medium instruction. Empirical evidence is needed to design more effective language training programmes for ELTs.

Aim. This study aims to identify and categorize the communicative tasks ELTs encounter outside the classroom across diverse international contexts.

Research Methods. A survey was administered to 1288 ELTs in Russia, China, Indonesia, the UK, and the USA, utilizing convenience and purposive sampling. The questionnaire explored teachers' professional backgrounds, outside-classroom professional tasks performed in English, and opinions on essential training components for pre-service teachers.

Results. High engagement was found in reading books/research on language teaching (95% in Russia, 93% in China/UK, 84% in Indonesia, 78% in US) and assessing students' written work (95% in China, 97% in Indonesia, 95% in UK, 93% in US, 82% in Russia). Developing tasks/tests was prevalent in the UK (95%) and US (98%), while advising students/providing feedback exceeded 90% in Indonesia, China, UK, and US, reaching 74% in Russia. Reflection on teaching methods was rated by 91% in China, 80% in the US, and 72% in Indonesia. Email communication varied, with 89% in China, 88% in US, and 84% in UK compared to 69% in Indonesia and 68% in Russia. Notably, assessing writing was chosen by 75% of respondents as a key skill for future teachers, indicating a perceived need for specific training.

Implications. The study identifies key areas, including supporting learning, professional development, developing materials and administrative tasks, for targeted teacher training, informing curriculum development and promoting more effective, natural language use in ELTs' professional lives beyond the classroom.

KEYWORDS

professional communicative competence, language teacher education, communicative tasks, classroom discourse

For Citation: Korenev, A. A., Gulov, A. P., Kasatkin P. I. (2025). Beyond Classroom Language: Language Teacher's Communicative Tasks Outside the Classroom in Russia, China, Indonesia, the US and the UK. *Perspektivy nauki i obrazovania = Perspectives of Science and Education*, (4), 10–20. <https://doi.org/10.32744/pse.2025.4.1>

Received: 11 February 2025 | Approved: 20 April 2025 | Published: 31 August 2025



This is an open access article distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike International License (CC-BY-SA 4.0) that allows others to share the work with an acknowledgement of the work's authorship and initial publication in this journal

INTRODUCTION

The origins of this paper lie in the need to design empirically based language education programs and assessments for trainee ELTs. In accordance with UNESCO principles of transparency and accountability in education [1], teacher education is currently facing a new public demand for more transparency and accountability. Some researchers have raised valid concerns about the outcomes and practices of teacher education, calling it an 'institutional crisis' [2]. When it comes to further professional training and development of ELTs, existing research shows that participation in such programs is often minimal or limited to consulting online courses or watching educational videos [3]. The quality of education, in accordance with national standards, can be guaranteed through a valid and reliable system of assessment whose construct is based on the communicative tasks language teachers are likely to encounter during their professional careers [4].

There are a number of national (e.g., in Germany) or regional (e.g., in Spain and Japan) examinations to prove sufficient qualification of future language teachers in an increasing number of countries. Other governments, in turn, have designed their own assessments for teachers (e.g., the LPATE in Hong Kong) or used existing proficiency tests to assess trainee and in-service teachers' language proficiency. Among these are the Test for English Majors Grade 8 in China, the National Diploma in English in Pakistan, the State Staff Language Proficiency Exam in Turkey, IELTS in Oman, TOEFL in Mexico, and the Cambridge Placement Test in Malaysia. In Russia, the Unified State Exam is often used to assess in-service language teachers. Nevertheless, this assessment was originally designed for a completely different purpose and does not reflect the language teacher's target language use domain. In fact, if a specialized assessment for teachers were to exist, it would need to be based on a grounded description of the language teachers' target language use domain (TLU), which is also only partly available. Therefore, it is imperative to undertake further studies to describe professional communication of language teachers both inside and outside their classrooms. The urgency of this study also lies in the increasing number of academic programs that use English as a medium of instruction [26], in which teachers of other subjects [5] need to develop and demonstrate professional communicative English language skills [6].

Concerns regarding ELTs' professional communicative skills are well-documented. Butler highlights anxieties over the language proficiency of Asian EFL teachers following the introduction of English into primary school curricula, leading to an increase in teachers with limited proficiency [7]. Olivier (2002) concluded that Namibian trainee teachers required "special language skills to perform adequately in an academic situation" [8]. Llewellyn-Williams proposes strategies for maintaining in-service teachers' language skills, balancing methodological development with language skill reactivation [9]. While focused on the UK, similar issues likely affect EFL teachers globally [10]. Çetinavci and Yavuz [11: 29] note the ongoing global debate regarding the required proficiency level of language teachers. For instance, a 2015 test in Thailand revealed that 94% of secondary school English teachers failed to achieve the expected B2 level, with A2 being more prevalent [12]. Research indicates a disconnect between general proficiency tests and assessments tailored for language teachers. Elder argues that prevalent academic proficiency tests (IELTS, TOEFL, TOEIC, etc.) lack tasks reflecting the specific language use needs of teachers, such as error correction, elicitation, reformulation, and feedback [13]. Despite the extensive research and materials available in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) for areas like Business and Law, publications focusing on "English for Teachers" as an ESP area are limited.

Studies on 'classroom language' [14] detail the specific characteristics of educational and classroom discourse [15]. Analysis of this research reveals a trend: speaking is the most studied teacher language skill, while listening, reading, and writing receive less attention. This paper adopts Walsh's concept of each language lesson as a series of micro-contexts jointly constructed by teachers and students through interaction [16]. Walsh builds upon this by introducing 'classroom interactional competence,' defined as 'teachers' and learners' ability to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting learning' [16: 132].

Practical Classroom English [17] was long the only coursebook specifically addressing teachers' English. Notably, it originated from a handout, 'Some Useful Classroom English Phrases,' given

to trainee ELTs in Finland in 1975, indicating that the concept of professional language training for these teachers emerged from the EFL context. The textbook provides a comprehensive list of classroom English phrases with exercises, organized into six units with 4-7 sections each. These sections cover common classroom situations, phrases for encouraging student involvement, classroom management from a learning environment perspective, phrases for textbook and reading activities, and management of speaking and reading activities. It also considers language needs for technology-based activities.

The ELTeach project proposed 'English-for-Teaching' as a form of ESP [18]. They argue that the ELT classroom uniquely uses the target language as both the subject and medium of instruction. Therefore, a teacher's "command of English" encompasses both language knowledge and the ability to use it appropriately in the classroom. The ELTeach approach divides teachers' professional language use into lesson preparation and enactment. These are further categorized into specific language skills needed for professional tasks (e.g., reading guidelines, preparing materials, listening to students). Finally, they analyze the national curricula underlying common teaching practices in ESL contexts.

Language teachers' professional writing skills have received less attention, often being grouped with general English for Academic Purposes (EAP) genres for English majors, encompassing tasks like providing feedback. Some research focuses on assessment design and literacy as outside-classroom professional tasks [19]. The 'Language Teachers' Target Language' project [20] made a significant attempt to describe language teachers' TLU, resulting in publications on professional listening [21] and mediation skills [22].

Considering the aforementioned research, studies on ELTs' language use within the classroom exist [23], but studies focusing on outside-classroom language use are lacking. Therefore, this study poses the following research questions:

1. What communicative tasks do ELTs encounter outside their classrooms?
2. What are the most and least frequent tasks?
3. Are there country-specific variations in these tasks?

The research design and questions are based on existing needs analysis methods in teaching language for specific purposes [24].

MATERIALS AND METHODS

To address the research questions, the survey first needed relevant language functions. The research team initially formulated over 25 functions but consolidated some into single questionnaire items to improve respondent experience. The questionnaire was piloted with 20 lecturers and professors from Moscow State University and 20 instructors and lecturers from Piatrovsky Briansk State University. The pilot group found no questions superfluous and did not consistently suggest additional functions in the "other" section, so the original questionnaire was retained. Google Forms and Survey Monkey were used to distribute the questionnaire to participants.

A combination of convenience and purposive sampling [25] was then used to reach EFL teachers. In total, 1288 teachers were surveyed across five countries: Russia (701), Indonesia (286), China (174), the UK (85), and the USA (41). In Russia, the online forms were distributed via the National Association of Teachers of English in Russia (NATE), accompanied by a letter from its president, Prof. S.G. Ter-Minasova, explaining the research purpose and anticipated use of the results. In China, Indonesia, and the US, EF Education First, a research partner, facilitated form distribution. In the UK, responses were gathered through EF and, for the pilot study, from Southampton Solent University.

The questionnaire comprised four parts, each presenting a question with multiple-choice answers. Respondents were instructed to select all options that applied to their teaching experience.

Table 1

Where have you taught English? (Q1)

	Russia (701)	China (174)	Indonesia (286)	UK (86)	USA (41)
Private language schools	149 (21%)	164 (94%)	223 (78%)	73 (84%)	38 (93%)
Pre-school	62 (9%)	25 (14%)	33 (12%)	4 (5%)	5 (12%)
Primary school	188 (27%)	39 (22%)	67 (23%)	10 (12%)	9 (22%)
Secondary school	386 (55%)	38 (22%)	82 (29%)	26 (30%)	15 (36%)
University	437 (62%)	26 (15%)	43 (15%)	40 (47%)	15 (36%)
Private tutoring	346 (49%)	77 (43%)	149 (52%)	48 (56%)	23 (56%)

The first section of the questionnaire gathered information about the respondents' professional background (see Table 1). The second question, "How long have you been teaching English?" (Q2), provided the following options: less than 2 years; less than 5 years; less than 10 years; 10 years or more (see Table 2). The final question in this section aimed to identify the CEFR levels at which the respondents had taught (Q3).

Table 2

Q2: How long have you been teaching English? Q3: Which CEFR levels have you taught?

	Russia (701)	China (174)	Indonesia(286)	UK (86)	USA (41)
Q2	How long have you been teaching English?				
Less than 2	15 (2%)	40 (23%)	57 (20%)	9 (10%)	6 (15%)
Less than 5	67 (10%)	56 (32%)	82 (28.6%)	19 (22%)	16 (39%)
Less than 10	108 (15%)	54 (31%)	84 (29.3%)	24 (28%)	9 (22%)
10 years or more	511 (73%)	24 (14%)	63 (22%)	34 (40%)	10 (24%)
Q3	Which CEFR levels have you taught?				
A1-A2 (Elementary)	544 (78%)	258 (90%)	167 (96%)	79 (92%)	33 (80%)
B1-B2 (Intermediate)	646 (92%)	253 (88%)	156 (90%)	86 (100%)	39 (95%)
C1-C2 (Advanced)	420 (60%)	155 (54%)	104 (60%)	71 (83%)	30 (73%)

The second part of the survey explored the administrative tasks that language teachers have performed in English (Q4). Respondents were also asked to specify any other functions they had performed outside the classroom within their organization that were not covered in the survey (Q6). Finally, the teachers were asked to select the functions that, in their opinion, language teachers should be trained to complete in English (Q7). We intentionally left out the genres of academic writing, because despite the pressure to publish internationally in all the countries under consideration [26], these functions are usually considered within English for Academic Purposes, not English for specific occupational purposes of language teaching.

Although the study has achieved its aims, some limitations warrant mention. First, the online questionnaires reached only a specific segment of the teacher population (e.g., those who are ICT-literate and willing to participate in surveys). Furthermore, respondents from China, Indonesia, the UK, and the US were approached through EF Education First, implying their affiliation with a particular corporate culture. The sample sizes also varied across countries and were not proportional to the total teacher population, making it difficult to generalize the percentage of teachers in each country who have encountered the selected functions. Nevertheless, the fact that a substantial number of survey participants reported these tasks suggests their relevance to real job duties. Finally, the collected data requires further analysis to differentiate tasks based on context (e.g., private or public institutions), age, and student level.

RESULTS

The survey, with over 1200 respondents from five countries, enabled us to create frequency-based hierarchies of teachers' professional tasks performed outside the classroom.

The majority of Russian respondents work at the secondary school and university levels, with 73% having over 10 years of teaching experience. Nearly half also engage in private tutoring. Table 3 shows that Russian teachers primarily use English for reading books/research on language teaching (95%), developing their own tasks/tests (92%), and assessing students' written work (82%). Peer induction for new teachers (36%) and communicating with parents (15%) are the least common tasks.

Most Chinese respondents work for private language schools (94%), with 63% having between two and ten years of experience. Figure 1 indicates that assessing students' written work, advising students, and providing feedback before/after class (95%) are the most frequent. The vast majority also engage in reading books/research (93%), communicating with management (92%), and reflecting on teaching methods (91%). Writing letters of reference (51%) and developing/translating curricula (49%) are the least popular.

The Indonesian sample includes both early-career teachers and those with over 10 years of experience. Similar to China, assessing written work (97%), advising students/providing feedback (90%), and reading books/research (84%) are the most common. Writing letters of reference (43%) and developing/translating curricula (43%) are again the least frequent.

In both the UK and the US, over half the respondents have two to ten years of experience (50% and 51%, respectively) and mainly work for private language schools at the secondary school and university levels. The most common function is developing their own tasks/tests (95% and 98%, respectively), followed by assessing students' written work (95% and 93%) and advising students/providing feedback (92% and 95%). Communicating with parents and developing/translating curricula are the least popular.

Table 3

Q4-5: Have you ever performed any of these tasks IN ENGLISH?

	Russia (701)	Indonesia (286)	China (174)	UK (86)	US (41)	Overall (1288)
Reading books/research on language teaching	665 (95%)	241 (84%)	161 (93%)	80 (93%)	32 (78%)	1179 (92%)
Assessing students' written work	574 (82%)	276 (97%)	166 (95%)	82 (95%)	38 (93%)	1136 (88%)
Developing your own tasks/tests	643 (92%)	220 (77%)	153 (88%)	82 (95%)	40 (98%)	1138 (88%)
Advising students/providing feedback before/after class/ outside the classroom	519 (74%)	256 (90%)	165 (95%)	79 (92%)	39 (95%)	1058 (82%)
Reading instructions/manuals/administrative documents	531 (76%)	221 (77%)	142 (82%)	70 (81%)	33 (80%)	997 (77%)
Participating in/delivering at conferences and/or training sessions	511 (73%)	199 (70%)	151 (87%)	61 (71%)	29 (71%)	951 (74%)
Writing emails to students/teaching staff/administration	480 (68%)	198 (69%)	154 (89%)	72 (84%)	36 (88%)	940 (73%)
Reflecting in speaking or writing on your teaching meth- ods and courses/units that you have taught	429 (61%)	205 (72%)	158 (91%)	78 (91%)	33 (80%)	903 (70%)
Communicating with management/administration	351 (55%)	216(76%)	160 (92%)	73 (85%)	32 (78%)	832 (65%)

Writing letters of reference/support for your students	437 (62%)	123 (43%)	102 (59%)	55 (64%)	22 (54%)	739 (57%)
Developing/translating into English curricula/syllabi/manuals/course descriptions	376 (54%)	122 (43%)	86 (49%)	45 (52%)	20 (49%)	649 (50%)
Peer-induction for new teachers	250 (36%)	172 (60%)	140 (80%)	48 (56%)	29 (71%)	639 (50%)
Communicating with parents in English	104 (15%)	210 (73%)	138 (79%)	40 (47%)	22 (66%)	514 (40%)

Finally, the answers to the last question revealed greater variation in teachers' opinions on what trainee language teachers should be taught. Overall, "assessing written work" was the most popular response, ranking first in China, the UK, and the US, second in Indonesia, and third in Russia. Participating in training and conferences was considered most important in Russia and Indonesia but was not among the top three in other countries. Depending on the country, the second most popular responses were writing comments on written work (the UK and the US), developing tasks and tests (Russia), and advising students outside the classroom (China). The third most popular functions varied even more: developing syllabi and materials (ESL-context), writing progress reports and comments (Indonesia and China), and reading books and research on language teaching and testing (Russia).

Table 4

Which tasks should pre-service language teachers be trained to complete in English?

N=1822	RUS (701)		IND (286)		CHI (174)		UK (86)		US (41)		Tot.	Tot. (%)
Assessing written work	545	78%	185	65%	134	77%	72	84%	35	85%	971	75%
Participating/delivering at conferences and/or training sessions	573	82%	195	68%	99	57%	55	64%	17	41%	939	73%
Writing comments to written work (essays, reports etc.)	533	76%	177	62%	118	68%	70	81%	35	85%	933	72%
Developing/formulating tasks and tests	563	80%	161	56%	98	56%	63	73%	26	63%	911	71%
Advising students, providing feedback before/after class/outside the classroom	509	73%	175	61%	130	75%	63	73%	31	76%	908	70%
Reading books/research on language teaching	548	78%	147	51%	110	63%	54	63%	31	76%	890	69%
Writing progress reports/comments	471	67%	181	63%	123	71%	63	73%	28	68%	866	67%
Developing curricula/syllabi/manuals	426	61%	157	55%	90	52%	63	73%	32	78%	768	60%
Writing letters of reference/support	456	65%	114	40%	76	44%	47	55%	21	51%	714	55%
Writing emails to students/teaching staff/administration	415	59%	97	34%	93	53%	45	52%	20	49%	670	52%
Reading instructions/manuals/administrative documents	399	57%	100	35%	74	43%	44	51%	21	51%	638	50%
Peer-induction for new teachers	315	45%	147	51%	105	60%	44	51%	24	59%	635	49%
Communicating with management/administration	296	42%	137	48%	120	69%	47	55%	24	59%	624	48%
Communicating with parents	231	33%	188	66%	127	73%	43	50%	23	56%	612	48%

DISCUSSION

Across all countries, "assessing written work" was a common task, ranking highest in China (95%), Indonesia (97%), and the UK (95%), and third in the US (93%) and Russia (82%). The relatively lower percentage in Russia might be due to a larger proportion of preschool teachers in the

Russian sample. Nevertheless, the prevalence of this task underscores its importance in teachers' outside-classroom communication. "Advising students/providing feedback before/after class/outside the classroom" ranked as the third most common communicative task, exceeding 90% positive responses in Indonesia, China, the UK, and the US, and reaching 74% in Russia. The lower score in Russia may be linked to the newer adoption of target language feedback in many Russian contexts, compounded by the high proportion of experienced teachers surveyed (73% with over 10 years of experience). Previous research consistently emphasizes the importance of feedback in teacher workload and its impact on student learning [27]. A large body of research focuses on effective feedback strategies [28]. Nonetheless, the empirical evidence towards the leading role of this function emphasizes the need for training in pre-service teacher and development of their linguistic and critical thinking skills for effective feedback.

"Reading books/research on language teaching" was another highly ranked task, with 95% of Russian teachers selecting it, along with 93% in China and the UK, 84% in Indonesia, and 78% in the US. A strong connection between teacher professional development and engagement with research literature is well-established [29]. The need for teachers to be lifelong learners is a recurring theme [30]. This research quantifies the prevalence across different countries and links it directly to the concept of "English for professional development," connecting language proficiency to access to research.

Reflection itself was recognized as significant for teacher development, with 91% of Chinese teachers, 80% of US respondents, 72% of Indonesian respondents, and nearly two-thirds of Russian teachers naming it as part of professional communication. It proves that reflective practice is a cornerstone of many teacher education programs and is considered essential for continuous improvement [31]. Anecdotal evidence suggests that a lack of experience in reflecting on teaching in English can contribute to feelings of uncertainty among non-native teachers during training [32]. Participation in conferences and training was also cited by over two-thirds of respondents across all countries. It was particularly popular in China (87%), which also had the highest score for reflecting on teaching, suggesting a relationship between the two.

Another task performed in English by over three-quarters of respondents across all contexts was developing tasks and tests. This ranked highest in the UK (95%) and the US (93%) and second in Russia (92%). It was also highly ranked in China (88%) and Indonesia (77%). While many Indonesian and Chinese respondents were teachers in private language schools offering extensive teaching materials, the continuing need to develop their own tasks and tests underscores the importance of addressing this skill methodologically (which has been previously discussed [33]) and linguistically (which may be an important finding of this study given the popularity of this task in Russia) in teacher training.

Writing emails to students, colleagues, and/or administrators in English was reported by over two-thirds of respondents in all contexts, but its popularity varied significantly, reaching high levels in China (89%), the US (88%), and the UK (84%), compared to Indonesia (69%) and Russia (68%), a difference exceeding 20%. The high prevalence of email usage aligns with research showing the increasing importance of digital communication in education [34]. One important finding is that the popularity of this task could correlate with the degree of internationalization of the education system (Russia also scored lowest on peer induction, communication with parents, and communication with management in English). It also stresses that professional correspondence units in teacher training programs could standardize communication between teachers and students (at least linguistically), while individual teacher-student relationships would continue to influence the degree of formality.

Reading instructions, manuals, and administrative documents in English was another administrative task. While its high ranking in China (82%), the US (80%), and Indonesia (77%) can be attributed to the prevalence of English documentation in the international education company where many respondents worked, the same explanation applies to the UK (81%). The fact that it also ranked highly in the Russian survey (76%) is noteworthy. Therefore, teacher training programs should incorporate administrative guides, instructions, and manuals to foster familiarity and enhance corresponding reading skills using authentic resources.

Another important finding is that while teachers' actual language use exhibits considerable similarities across contexts, with top functions scoring above 80% overall, there is significantly more divergence in opinions regarding what future language teachers should be taught. The top

response, assessing writing, was chosen by 75% of all respondents, notably less than the top function in questions 4-5, reading books/research, at 92%. Further, the top three responses included eight different functions across countries. We hypothesize that the perceived importance of learning goals for future language teachers is influenced by 1) the frequency with which teachers perform a function and 2) the perceived difficulty in performing it. Assessing writing, therefore, ranks highly in all contexts. In contrast, reading books and research literature, which was the most popular function in questions 4-5, ranks only sixth overall and was identified as a top-three teacher development area only in Russia. On the other hand, participation in training and commenting on students' writing and progress rank relatively high, perhaps reflecting institutional requirements and perceived training gaps. It is also interesting that developing tasks and tests, the most frequent function in the UK and the US, was only the fourth most popular response overall, primarily due to teachers in Russia and the UK. This might reflect that teachers in the US, China, and Indonesia, who were using company materials, design their own tasks and tests less frequently. Conversely, teachers in countries with a larger proportion of university lecturers chose this as an important area, possibly because they encounter this task more often and find it more challenging.

The diverse responsibilities of teachers, encompassing peer induction [35], letter writing, and parent communication [36], demonstrate significant variations across international contexts, reflecting differing levels of internationalization and cultural norms. While teachers engage in a broad range of activities, including extracurricular events, international partnerships, and online tool design, the consistent presence of key communicative tasks across countries suggests the possibility of developing generalized teacher training solutions, categorized into supporting learning, professional development, materials development, and administrative tasks (Figure 1), similar to the international handbook that was designed in 2004 [37]. Further research is needed to delve into the nuances of these tasks and their implementation across varying contexts.



Figure 1 Teachers' outside-classroom communicative tasks

CONCLUSION

In summary, this cross-national survey of over 1200 teachers across five countries identified frequency-based hierarchies of teachers' professional tasks performed outside the classroom. Key findings reveal that assessing student work, creating materials, reviewing documents, and online communication are common communicative tasks across contexts, while variations exist in tasks such as peer induction and parent communication. Notably, there was a greater divergence in opinions regarding what future language teachers should be taught compared to the tasks they currently perform. These insights have direct implications for informing teacher training programs, promoting more effective language use, and highlighting the importance of out-of-classroom language skills. Further research is needed to explore the nuances of these tasks, genre-specific needs, and address the gap between current practices and perceptions of necessary training. This research directly influenced the design of the "English for Teachers of English" course [38], incorporating units on task design, feedback, extracurricular activities, and workplace communication, alongside previously researched areas of classroom English.

REFERENCES

1. UNESCO Governance in education: transparency and accountability. 2006. Available at: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000148766>. (accessed February 15, 2025)
2. Ilaltdinova E. Yu., Frolova S. V., Sergeeva T. N. Institutional identity of pedagogical education: problems and development trends. *Perspektivy nauki i obrazovania = Perspectives of Science and Education*, 2021, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 70-87. DOI: 10.32744/pse.2021.2.5.
3. Sadeghi K., Richards J. C. Professional development among English language teachers: challenges and recommendations for practice. *Heliyon*, 2021, vol. 7, no. 9, e08053. DOI: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e08053.
4. McNamara T.F. Measuring second language performance. London, UK and New York, US: Addison Wesley Longman, 1996.
5. Macaro E. Exploring the role of language in English medium instruction. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 2020, vol. 23, pp. 263-276. DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2019.1620678.
6. Wang C. The Relationship between Teachers' Classroom English Proficiency and Their Teaching Self-Efficacy in an English Medium Instruction Context. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2021, vol. 12, 611743. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.611743.
7. Dewaele J.-M., Leung P. P. Y. The effect of proficiency on non-native English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers' self-efficacy and practice in the EFL classroom. *IAFOR Journal of Education*, 2022, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 11-32. DOI: 10.22492/ije.10.1.01.
8. Butler Y. G. What level of English proficiency do elementary school teachers need to attain to teach EFL? Case studies from Korea, Taiwan, and Japan. *Tesol Quarterly*, 2004, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 245-278.
9. Olivier C. E. The oral proficiency of ESL teacher trainees in different discourse domains. *NERA Journal*, 2008. Available at: <https://repository.unam.edu.na/bitstreams/60eb3abc-aa66-44a0-a51b-1c61d0f92211/download> (accessed February 15, 2025).
10. Llewellyn-Williams J. In Search of Lost Language: A longitudinal study into trainee teacher motivation and the reactivation of lapsed language skills. *Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 2012, Vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 61-73.
11. Dewaele J.-M., Mercer S., Talbot K.R., von Blanckenburg M. Are EFL pre-service teachers' judgment of teaching competence swayed by the belief that the EFL teacher is a L1 or LX user of English? *European Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2020, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 1-24. DOI: 10.1515/eujal-2019-0030.
12. Çetinaç U. R., Yavuz A. Language Proficiency Level of English Language Teacher Trainees in Turkey. *The International Journal of Research in Teacher Education*, 2010, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 26-54.
13. Franz J., Teo A. 'A2 is Normal' – Thai secondary school English teachers' encounters with the CEFR. *RELJ Journal*, 2018, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 322-338. DOI: 10.1177/0033688217738816.
14. Elder C. Assessing the language proficiency of teachers: are there any border controls? *Language testing*, 2001, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 149-70.
15. Barnes D. Supporting exploratory talk for learning. In K.M. Pierce and C.J. Gilles (Eds.), *Cycles of meaning: Exploring the potential of talk in learning* (pp. 1-12). Portsmouth, UK: Heinemann, 1993.
16. Walsh S. *Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in Action*. New York, US: Routledge, 2011.
17. Hughes G., Moate J., & Raatikainen T. *Practical Classroom English*. Oxford University Press, 2007. 172 p.
18. Freeman D., Katz A., Gomez P. G., Burns A. English-for-Teaching: rethinking teacher proficiency in the classroom. *ELT Journal*, 2015, DOI:10.1093/elt/ccu074.
19. Rahimi S. A., Razmjoo S. A., Sahragard R., Ahmadi A. R. Development and validation of language assessment literacy scale for high school EFL teachers: A mixed methods approach. *Teaching English Language*, 2021, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 229-126. DOI:10.22132/TEL.2021.142934.
20. Korenev A., Westbrook C., Merry Y., Ershova T. Language teachers' target language project: Language for specific purposes of language teaching. *Language Teaching*, 2016, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 146-148. DOI: 10.1017/S0261444815000373.
21. Korenev A. Language teacher's professional-communicative competence: Listening skills. *Scientific Journal "Modern Linguistic and Methodical-and-didactic Researches"*, 2017, vol. 3, no. 18, pp. 69-76.
22. Perevertkina M., Korenev A., Zolotareva M. Developing classroom mediation awareness and skills in pre-service language teacher education. *CEFR Journal – Research and Practice*, 2020, no. 2, pp. 25-39.
23. Young J. W., Freeman D., Hauck M. C., Gomez P. G., and Papageorgiou S. (2014). A Design Framework for the ELTeach Program Assessments. ETS Research Report No. RR-14-36, Educational Testing Service. DOI: 10.1002/ets2.12036.

24. Kaskani A. Needs analysis questionnaire. US-China Education Review B, 2021, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 52-60. DOI: 10.17265/2161-6248/2021.02.002.
25. Dörnyei, Z., & Dewaele, J.-M. Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge, 2022.
26. Raitskaya L., Tikhonova E. Pressure to Publish Internationally: Scholarly Writing Coming to the Fore — Journal of Language and Education, 2020, vol. 6, no. 21, pp. 4-7. DOI: 10.17323/jle.2020.10631.
27. Hattie J., Timperley H. The Power of Feedback. Review of Educational Research, 2007, vol. 77, no. 1, pp. 81-112.
28. Brookhart S. M. How to give effective feedback to your students. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2017, 112 pp.
29. Borko H. Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. Educational Researcher, 2004, vol. 33, no. 8, pp. 3-15.
30. Avalos B. Teacher professional development in Teaching and Teacher Education over ten years. Teaching and Teacher Education, 2011, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 10-20. DOI: 10.1016/j.tate.2010.08.007.
31. Schön D. A. The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. New York: Basic Books, 1983, 374 pp.
32. Dewaele J.-M., Bak T., & Ortega L. Why the mythical "native speaker" has mud on its face. In N. Slavkov, S. Melo Pfeifer & N. Kerschhofer (Eds.), Changing Face of the "Native Speaker": Perspectives from Multilingualism and Globalization (pp. 23-43). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter, 2021.
33. Brown H. D., & Abeywickrama P. Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices (3rd ed.). Pearson Education, 2019, 504 pp.
34. Rice R. E., Leonard P. M. Toward a social communication perspective on technology and organizations. In L. L. Putnam & M. J. Pacanowsky (Eds.), Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach. Sage Publications, 2003. pp. 85-116
35. Villarreal D., & Boud D. Enhancing teacher learning through peer support: A review of research. Professional Development in Education, 2018, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 1-18. DOI: 10.1080/19415257.2017.1354384.
36. Epstein J. L. School, family, and community partnerships: Your guide to connecting educators and families (4th ed.). Corwin, 2018, 512 pp.
37. Day C., Sachs, J. Professionalism, Performativity and Empowerment: Discourses in the Politics, Policies and Purposes of Continuing Professional Development. In C. Day, & J. Sachs (Eds.), International Handbook on the Continuing Professional Development of Teachers. Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2004. Pp. 3-32
38. Korenev A., Gushchina Y., Ershova T. English for Teachers of English. Student's book with online support. RELOD, 2024.

Авторы

Корнев Алексей Александрович

(Москва, Россия)

Кандидат педагогических наук, доцент
Московский государственный институт международных
отношений (университет) МИД России

Доцент

Московский государственный университет
имени М. В. Ломоносова

Email: studywithkorenev@gmail.com

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-1695-4135

Гулов Артем Петрович

(Москва, Россия)

Доктор педагогических наук, доцент
Московский государственный институт международных
отношений (университет) МИД России

E-mail: gulov@tea4er.org

ORCID: 0000-0001-7192-5316

Касаткин Петр Игоревич

(Москва, Россия)

Доктор философских наук, профессор,
начальник управления научной политики
Московский государственный институт международных
отношений (университет) МИД России

E-mail: pkas@mail.ru

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-1361-6747

Scopus Author ID: 55968692200

Authors

Alexey A. Korenev

(Moscow, Russia)

Cand. Sci. (Educ.), Associate Professor
MGIMO University

Associate Professor

Faculty of Foreign Languages and Area Studies
Lomonosov Moscow State University

Email: studywithkorenev@gmail.com

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-1695-4135

Artem P. Gulov

(Moscow, Russia)

Cand. Sci. (Educ.), Associate Professor
MGIMO University

E-mail: gulov@tea4er.org

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-7192-5316

Petr I. Kasatkin

(Moscow, Russia)

Dr. Sci. (Philosophy), Professor,
Head of the Research Policy Department
MGIMO University

Email: pkas@mail.ru

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-1361-6747

Scopus Author ID: 55968692200

Вклад авторов

Корнев А. А.: концептуализация, проведение исследования,
администрирование данных, создание черновика рукописи,
администрирование проекта

Гулов А. П.: верификация данных, формальный анализ,
редактирование рукописи, визуализация

Касаткин П. И.: методология, ресурсы, руководство
исследованием

Authors contribution

Alexey A. Korenev: Conceptualization, Investigation, Data Curation,
Writing - Original Draft, Project administration

Artem P. Gulov: Validation, Formal analysis, Writing - Review &
Editing, Visualization

Petr I. Kasatkin: Methodology, Resources, Supervision

© Корнев А. А., Гулов А. П., Касаткин П. И., 2025

Авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов

© Alexey A. Korenev, Artem P. Gulov, Petr I. Kasatkin, 2025

The authors declared no conflicts of interest