The Classroom English Proficiency of English Teachers in Indonesia

Iswandany Kaslan[a], Utami Widiati[b], Johannes Ananto Prayogo[c], Nunung Suryati[d], [a,b,c,d]Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia, Email: [a]eonekaslan@yahoo.com, [b]utami.widiati.fs@um.ac.id

The objective of the study is to measure English teachers' level of classroom language proficiency, which comprises content and pedagogical knowledge and discourse skills, to verify the relationship between the knowledge and the skills, and to identify what the teachers need to teach effectively. The study is undertaken in two phases; in the first phase of the study, 42 respondents, who are active senior high school English teachers, sit for the Classroom English Proficiency Test. The analysis of the test scores results in the four categories of teachers; based on their proficiency levels in terms of the CK and PK knowledge and in the next phase of the study, one teacher representing each category is observed while teaching in the classroom. Each of them is also interviewed to validate the findings from the test and observation. The overall result shows that only small proportion of the teachers (17%) have sufficient knowledge. This lack of knowledge influences the teachers' performance in the classroom; as from the observations, only one out of four teachers can perform satisfactorily, using classroom English which is fluent, accurate, comprehensible and well-formed. There are other intriguing results of the study included in the article.

Key words: *Classroom English Proficiency.*

Introduction

One of the trends in ELT field is the "Changes in Views of an Effective English Educator". The effectiveness of an English teacher should not be determined by his/her being a native speaker of English, but on his/her competence, i.e. linguistic, instructional and intercultural competence (Canagarajah, 1999; Kirkpatrick, 2014; Seidlhofer, 2005; Sun, 2014). Teachers must develop an acceptable and necessary level of English language proficiency. Language proficiency or the command of the target language is one of the most visible indicators of teacher effectiveness in the classroom and professionalism (Freeman, Katz, Gomez, & Burns,

2015); it is one of the key components that make up a language teacher's professional knowledge (Renandya, Hamied, & Nurkamto, 2018); and it may not be equal to teaching ability, but it is the fundamental basic of it (Moser, Harris, & Carle, 2012).

Studies on language proficiency, however, reveal that, in many cases, the teachers have only a basic command of English, so they tend to use the local first language (L1) in the classroom (Young, Freeman, Hauck, Garcia Gomez, & Papageorgius, 2014). Meanwhile, language proficiency is the basis for the teachers' ability to perform effectively as language teachers (self-efficacy) (Chacón, 2005; Eslami & Fatahi, 2008). Without the requisite level of proficiency, they crucially lack authority and self-confidence in the classroom, and this surely affects all aspects of their classroom performance (Cullen, 2002).

As important as it is mentioned previously, however, there is an urgency to reconceptualize the English proficiency needed by English teachers. Some studies reveal that general English proficiency (defined and measured using tests like TOEFL, IELTS or CEFR-based tests) is not relevant and not sufficient to support English teachers to conduct their teaching in the classroom effectively (Thi Hong Nhung, 2017; Van Canh & Renandya, 2017). High general English proficiency does not contribute automatically to effective classroom teaching (Tsang, 2017).

Elder (2001) names it 'English Proficiency for Specific Purposes'; Freeman, et al. (2015) comes up with 'English-for-Teaching; and Richards (2017) proposes 'Teaching English through English'. The proficiency comprises of knowledge and skills; content and pedagogical knowledge, and discourse skills. Studies specifically focusing on how this knowledge and skills support teacher in their teaching in the classroom and what the relationship of between the knowledge and the skills is are still very limited. Many recent studies concern more on the so-called Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK), which is in fact the merge of content and pedagogical knowledge, as a crucial factor in building the professional knowledge of teachers; (Segall, 2004), (Gess-newsome et al., 2017) and (Kultsum, 2017) to mention some of them

The study by Kultsum (2017) concludes that content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge sew significantly needed in teaching; pedagogical content knowledge is needed to develop teachers' professional, personal and social competencies. Researching on pedagogical content knowledge, which is considered as the important component of teacher professional knowledge, in science education, Gess-Newsome, et al. (2017) found that only the general pedagogical knowledge has a significant relationship to the teacher practice; meanwhile, the academic content knowledge has impact on the students' achievement. Based on the findings, the study creates a model of teacher professional knowledge and skills including the PCK.

One particular research regarding to the teachers' proficiency in Indonesia is carried out by Renandya et al. (2017). The study concludes that Indonesian teachers' level of English proficiency is hugely varied with the majority fall in the lower intermediate, or in the B1-B2 levels of CEFR scale. B2 level on the CEFR scale is the suggested sensible standard for student teachers of English before they start teaching at schools (Renandya et al., 2018; Rudianto, 2017).

The study also offers several suggestions that Indonesia should establish the national foreign language frameworks, that will in turn materialize into a benchmark of a minimum standard of proficiency for English teachers in Indonesia. There should also be a more accurate test used to measure the special language proficiency of English teachers; other than TOEFL and IELTS which are a measure of general English proficiency. Lastly, there should be a revisit on the curriculum of the undergraduate program of English Education, which focuses mainly on the general language proficiency through skill development courses throughout the program, and dedicates only small proportion of time on the classroom English proficiency, i.e. during the school practicum time (Renandya et al., 2018; Rudianto, 2017).

The primary aim of this study is to measure English teachers' classroom English proficiency, in terms of the content and pedagogical knowledge and their discourse skills while conducting their classrooms; it is also to verify the relationship between the knowledge and the skills. The following are the research questions to be answered by the study:

1. What is the teachers' level of classroom English proficiency, in terms of content and pedagogical knowledge?
2. What is the teachers' level of classroom English proficiency, in terms of discourse skills?
3. What is the relationship between the proficiency in terms of content and pedagogical knowledge and the proficiency in terms of discourse skills?
4. What do the teachers need to be able to teach effectively in the classroom?

Literature Review
The Classroom English Proficiency

The reconceptualization of teachers' classroom English proficiency been becoming the focus of attention, and some concepts are proposed. Richards (2017) introduces the concept of 'Teaching English through English' and, Freeman et al., (2015) proposes 'English-for teaching'. These propositions have transformed the understanding of the construct, from general English proficiency to the more specific one, i.e. the English teachers' classroom English proficiency.

The term "Teaching English through English" was first coined in 1981 by Willis J.; however, it is not until recently that the concept is elaborated and developed adequately. The idea behind the concept evolves from the realization that teaching a foreign language is very special in that having the language both as the content and as the means by which the foreign language is taught should become the intended goals. Further, the proficiency needed to teach English through English draws from three domains of knowledge and skills: content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge and discourse skills. Content knowledge is the declarative knowledge (knowledge about something); and pedagogical (content) knowledge is the procedural knowledge (the ability to do something) (Pasternak & Bailey, 2004; Richards, 2017). Discourse skills in English are the ability to maintain communication in English that is fluent, accurate and comprehensible and more importantly, the extent to which the teacher can use English as a medium to teach English (Elder, 2001; Freeman et al., 2015; Pasternak and Bailey, 2004; Richards, 2017).

"English-for-Teaching" is defined as the essential English language skills a teacher needs to be able to prepare and enact the lesson in a standardized (usually national) curriculum in English in a way that is recognizable and understandable to other speakers of the language (Young et al., 2014). Derived from a language-for specific purposes approach, and similar to Teaching English through English, the construct is about using the language to accomplish particular curricular and instructional ends within the classroom context. It is about having the language knowledge that is firmly anchored in (or drives) particular uses of specific context, which are situated both interactionally and contextually in the classroom (Freeman, 2017; Freeman et al., 2015).

Classroom English Proficiency Tests

There is an urgency for English language teachers in the world to develop an acceptable language-teaching competence and language proficiency to be successful in the classroom (Burke, 2015; Coniam, Falvey, & Xiao, 2017; Kim & Elder, 2015; Nakata, 2010; Van Canh & Renandya, 2017; Zhang & Elder, 2011). In this case, applying language proficiency tests (specifically designated for English teachers) can be treated as gate-keeping mechanism and indicator to make decisions about the teachers' language-teaching competence. Hong Kong develops LPATE (Language Proficiency Assessment for Teachers of English), Cambridge ESOL developed Teaching Knowledge Test (TKT), and there are also TEFT (Test of English-for-Teaching) and TPK (Test of Professional Knowledge in ELT) as the summative tests developed by ELTeach on-line self-access training and assessment program.

There are two main function of those tests. First, the tests are the means of teachers' language proficiency standardization. The tests provide a basis in relevant pedagogical content knowledge for entry-level teachers ("Cambridge English TKT, Handbook for teachers," n.d.;

J. C. Richards, 2010). Besides, it is used as additional and alternative teaching certification to promote the standardization of teachers' English teaching, English learning and professional development aligned to the national policy of standards for English (Gonzalez Moncada, 183AD). Second, the tests are the means of teachers' language proficiency maintenance. Those tests are proven to increase teachers' confidence that lead to better career opportunities (Elizondo, 2015; Huang & Papakosmas, 2014; Vallazza, 2008) It is also to help teachers build professional confidence through learning and practicing language and concepts in the context of what they already known (Freeman, Katz, Le Drean, Burns, & Hauck, 2012).

Research Design
Participants and Setting

The participants of this study are 42 senior high school English teachers in Kota Jambi. They actively teach at various senior high schools (state-owned and private schools) at the moment, and they are all the members of English MGMP Kota Jambi. Almost all of them (40 out of 42) are the graduates of the undergraduate program of English Education from various universities; they also come from various background and have various length of teaching experience.

Research Procedures

This research comprises of two phases. In the first phase of the study, the participants sit for the Classroom English Proficiency Test which is to measure their knowledge about the language (content knowledge) and about how to teach it (pedagogical Knowledge). In the second phase of the study, the selected teachers' classes are observed. Their discourse skills, in terms of their classroom English, is evaluated against the criteria in the observation checklist. They are also interviewed to verify information obtained from the test and observation.

Data Collection and Analysis

The first instrument used to collect data in this study is Classroom English Proficiency Test. This test is constructed to measure the teachers' content and pedagogical knowledge. Under the Content Knowledge, topics to cover are Grammar, Lexis and Vocabulary, Pronunciation, Text and Discourse, and Language Skills. The topics covered under the Pedagogical Knowledge are Background to Language Learning and Teaching, Teaching Language and Language Skills, Managing Learning and Teaching, and Planning, Resource and Assessment ("Cambridge English TKT, Handbook for teachers," n.d.; Harmer, 2012). This test consists of 100 items, still paper-and-pencil and in various formats, and the time allocation is 90

minutes. This test was gone through expert validation process and tryout. The reliability score of this test is .97, based on ANATES Analysis.

The test scores were categorized into three groups; they are the Total Score, the Content Knowledge Score and the Pedagogical Knowledge Score. The scores are tabulated, and analyzed by using descriptive statistics. The mean, median, the standard deviation of each score are obtained. The median of each score is used to categorized each respondent if he/she belongs to Group 1 (High Content and High Pedagogical Knowledge), or Group 2 (Low Content and Low Pedagogical Knowledge), or Group 3 (Low Content Knowledge and High Pedagogical Knowledge) or Group 4 (High Content Knowledge and Low Pedagogical Knowledge).

Next, four respondents, one representing each group, are selected and their classes are observed using a classroom observation checklist. The observation focuses on the teacher's classroom English used to conduct the classroom, as the reflection of his/her discourse skills. Follow up interviews are also conducted upon each of the teacher observed. It is to verify the findings from the test and the classroom observation.

Findings and Discussion

The following tables are the result summary of the Classroom English Proficiency Test, of 42 respondents. There are three scores for every respondent; i.e. Content Knowledge Score, Pedagogical Knowledge Score and Total Score. Out of 100 total maximum score, 57 is from the Content Knowledge and 43 is from the Pedagogical Knowledge. The mean, median, lowest and highest scores, and the SD of each aspect of the test are calculated.

Table 1: The Classroom English Proficiency Test Result

Test Aspects	N	Min	Max	Mean	Median	SD
Content Knowledge (57)	42	17.0	44.0	27.8	27.0	6.02
Pedagogical Knowledge (43)	42	6.00	34.0	22.4	23.0	5.80
Total Test Scores	42	31.0	78.0	50.2	49.0	10.7

For the total scores, six respondents (15%) have scores of 30s, 17 respondents (40%) have scores of 40s, 12 respondents (28%) have scores of 50s, four respondents (10%) have scores of 60s and only three respondents (7%) have the scores of 70s. For the CK scores, seven respondents (17%) have scores of 30s%, 20 respondents (48%) have scores of 40s%, nine respondents (21%) have scores of 50s%, and the same three respondents (7%) each have scores of 60s% and 70s%; and for the PK scores, two respondents (4%) have scores of 10s% and 20s%, five respondents (12%) have scores of 30s%, seven respondents (17%) have

scores of 40s%, 20 respondents (48%) have scores of 50s%, two respondents (5%) have scores of 60s% and six respondents (14%) have scores of 70s%.

With the cut score of 60%, of the total score, only 17% of the respondents can reach satisfying scores. Of the CK and the PK scores, there are respectively only 14% and 19% teacher respondents who can reach satisfying scores. Quoting the result of the study conducted by Renandya and his colleagues that Indonesian teachers' level of English proficiency is hugely varied with the majority fall in the lower intermediate, or in the B1-B2 levels of CEFR scale, the test result in this study shows that the majority of the teacher respondents have relatively low level of Classroom English Proficiency, probably lower than the suggested sensible standard of B2 level on the CEFR scale (Renandya et al., 2018; Rudianto, 2017).

The aspects in the content knowledge being tested are the knowledge about the language such as grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, text and discourse, and language skills. Meanwhile, the aspects in the pedagogical knowledge being tested include background to language learning and teaching, managing learning and teaching, and planning, resources and assessment. These are the basic knowledge about the language and how to teach it that are supposed to be taught and trained while the teachers do their undergraduate training. How the teacher candidates are trained on these areas in the program is a challenge behind another suggestion from the study result of Renandya et al., which is a revisit on the curriculum of the undergraduate program of English Education (Renandya et al., 2018; Rudianto, 2017).

The next phase of the study requires a categorization of the respondents. Applying the median split of the CK and PK scores, the data reveal that 14 out of 42 teachers (33%) are HIGH both in the CK and PK, while 11 of them (26%) are LOW both in the CK and PK. Eight teachers (19%) have LOW CK but HIGH PK, while nine teachers (22%) have HIGH CK but LOW PK. From each group, one teacher is selected to be observed while teaching in the classroom. Next, focusing on their classroom English, the following is the detail description of what happens in each of the teacher's classroom.

1. High CK High PK Representative

High CK High PK Representative is a young female teacher, with relatively short teaching experience (about four years), who represents Group 1. She is one of very few respondents who scores high in the Classroom English Proficiency Test. Her Total Score is 73, the second highest; with 43 (75%) in the Content Knowledge Section and 30 (70%) in the Pedagogical Knowledge.

The class observed consists of 25 students; it is Class XI and from Natural Science group. The class atmosphere shows that the students are relatively well motivated and eager to participate in the learning process. The class runs smoothly and effectively.

The observation shows that she is able to maintain the communication in the classroom by using English and Bahasa Indonesia. Focusing on her classroom English, she is able to use the language which is fluent, accurate, comprehensible, well-formed and formal. However, when confronting about the fact that she still uses a lot of Bahasa Indonesia in her teaching (about 50%), she reasons that she used to teach in 100% English but she had complaints from the students about it.

2. Low CK Low PK Representative

Low CK Low PK Representative is a female teacher who has more than eight years teaching experience and represents Group 2 (teachers with low proficiency in both Content and Pedagogical Knowledge). Her score is one of the lowest; 34 of Total Score, 17 for both Content and Pedagogical Knowledge (30% for the CK and 40% for the PK).

Her class, which is observed, consists of 21 students; they are senior high school students, Class X and from Natural Science group. The class atmosphere shows that the students are weak and lack of motivation, however they participate relatively well in the learning process.

The observation shows that she is able to maintain the communication in the classroom by using English and Bahasa Indonesia despite the fact that she uses a very broken classroom English. A large percentage of the language used by the teacher in the classroom is inaccurate, not well-formed, delivered in a non-fluent and incomprehensible way. The use of Bahasa Indonesia is probably the help that assists the students, in such a way, that the class can still run relatively effectively.

3. Low CK High PK Representative

Low CK High PK Representative is a female teacher who has 10 years of teaching experience and represents Group 3 (teachers with low proficiency in Content but high in Pedagogical Knowledge). Her Total Score is above the total score mean; 53 of Total Score, comprising of 26 (46%) of Content and 27 (57%) of Pedagogical Knowledge.

The class runs relatively smoothly and effectively in spite of the fact that the teachers has not been able to use accurate, well-formed, fluent classroom English. The use of Bahasa Indonesia is somewhat dominant. The class observed is Class XI, Natural Science Group, consisting of 32 students. Most of the students are quiet, but they look motivated and they participate actively in the learning process.

4. High CK Low PK Representative

High CK Low PK Representative is a male teacher with seven years of teaching experience and represents Group 4 (teachers with high proficiency in Content but low in Pedagogical Knowledge). His Total Score of the test is below the mean; 44 of Total score, comprising of 28 (49%) of Content and 16 (37%) of Pedagogical Knowledge.

The class observed consists of 14 students; it is Class XII and from Social Science group. The students are weak but quite enthusiastic, and they are instructed to work in pair answering reading comprehension questions from the book, as a practice for the coming national examination. The teacher guides them with relatively effective concise and direct instructions.

The teacher is able to manage the class effectively with his well-controlled instructions and utterances. He almost always translates his English into Bahasa Indonesia. He informed me that it was his first time to use more English in the classroom. Every time he instructs or speaks English, the students respond in Bahasa Indonesia. The teacher also additionally informs that the class mostly consists of (failed) students transferred from other schools. It is the only class left in the school after all class X and XI students transferred to other schools during the first semester of the academic year. (A typical sad story about the condition of private schools in the area).

In the interviews, all the observed teachers agree on the importance of having sufficient Content and Pedagogical Knowledge to support their teaching performance. The teacher from Group 1 shows high enthusiasm when discussing about the importance of both the CK and PK. According to her, as a young teacher, it is obligatory that she should constantly upgrade herself on the knowledge. She emphasizes that personal development is one's very significant responsibility.

The teacher from Group 4 mentions about professional knowledge which according to him comprises of content and pedagogical knowledge. He revealed that he has just finished a special PPG program. It is a program for senior high school teachers from all over Indonesia; participants are selected based on teachers' portfolio and the result of a screening test. It is a five-month program (three months of online mode, and two months of workshop); concentrating on upgrading teachers' pedagogical, professional, social and personality competences. However, despite all the effort he has always made, and in spite of the fact that he performs relatively well in the classroom, and have a moderately good classroom English, he still scores low in the Classroom English Proficiency Test.

The other two teachers, the from Group 2 and Group 3, are not novice teachers. They have had teaching experience of almost ten years; they have attended many workshops, trainings.

One of them (the teacher from Group 3) teaches at a state-owned high school as a civil servant permanent teacher. She was once selected as one of the participants of National Instructor program, representing Jambi Municipality. The teacher from Group 2 has been teaching around the town (at different schools and tutoring centers); her status at the school where she is observed (a private school) is a non-permanent teacher. She said that she has fewer and fewer classes to handle because there are fewer and fewer classes at the school.

Further, the findings obtained from the test and the observation indicate a clear relationship between the knowledge and the skills; that is, to be able to perform well in the classroom, the teachers need to possess sufficient knowledge of both content and pedagogical. Only one teacher, the one who represents the Group (1) with high level of both CK and PK, performs effectively; performing with fluent, accurate, comprehensible and well-formed classroom English.

The teacher who represents the Group (2) with low level of both CK and PK, performs absolutely poorly, with very poor classroom English. As for the other two teachers, those with high level of either CK or PK, both of them perform better the teacher of Group 2, but far less effective than the teacher from Group 1. Contrasting between the two, the teacher with high level of CK performs slightly better than that of with high level of PK.

Only one (out of four) teachers being observed has effective discourse skills, which in this study identified from the use of effective classroom English. The other three show very poor to less than effective use of classroom English. Not to say that they fail in conducting their classroom effectively, but they fail to be a good model. They fail in exemplifying and providing good input of the language which are supposed to be fluent, accurate, comprehensible, and well-formed to the students.

Another interesting finding from the observations is about use of Bahasa Indonesia in their teaching in the classroom. Even the best teacher observed uses fairly high proportion of Bahasa Indonesia in her classroom teaching. When confronted about it in the interview, she reasons that it is the students' request. The other three teachers also use Bahasa Indonesia fairly extensively in their teaching with more or less the same reason; which is their assumption about their students' ability.

Despite the reasoning, however, there is a big question if the teachers indeed possess the capability of conducting the classroom in 100% English; as revealed in the cases found by previous studies on language proficiency in which the teachers have only a basic command of English so then they tend to use the local first language (L1) in the classroom (Young et al., 2014).

Further, it is fairly obvious to this point that to teach effectively in the classroom, a teacher needs sufficient levels of both content and pedagogical knowledge, which will in turn realize in effective discourse skills, in terms of effective classroom English. One teacher observed has both high levels of content and pedagogical knowledge, and she shows effective classroom English in her teaching in the classroom. Another teacher has very low levels in both content and pedagogical knowledge, and her classroom English is obviously very poor or far from effective.

The other two teachers have only one high level of the knowledge, either the content or the pedagogical. The observations reveal that their classroom English is less than effective. Contrasting between the two teachers, however, the teacher from Group 4 (with HIGH content knowledge) uses more effective classroom English than that of Group 3 (with HIGH pedagogical knowledge). To come to a conclusion that content knowledge is more important than pedagogical knowledge in supporting a teachers' discourse skills is rather immature, considering the fact that methodologically they are the only teachers selected to be observed representing their groups, and the fact both of them score below the cut score of 60% in the test.

Up to this point, it is proven that there is a strong significant relationship between the knowledge and the skills. The strong mastery of the aspects in the content and pedagogical knowledge will support the teachers in their discourse skills, in their ability to produce and use of effective classroom English, which is fluent, accurate, comprehensible and well-formed. Referring to the suggestion proposed by Renandya, et al. (2018), about the revisit of the undergraduate program of English Education in Indonesia, it could not be emphasized stronger, there is an urgency to ensure that the program delivers intensive and rigorous trainings of both content and pedagogical knowledge so the teacher candidates are well equipped once their get into their teaching career.

A deeper analysis of the achievement of the respondents at each of the aspect and as per indicator under each aspect reveals that, of the CK, the mean for the Grammar aspect is 15.0 (50%). The means for Pronunciation and Language Skills aspect are respectively 3.38 (38%) and 1.69 (28%), while the means for the Lexis and Vocabulary and Text and Discourse aspects are 3.79 (63%) and 3.90 (65%). As of the PK, the means for the three aspects of Background to Language Learning and Teaching, Managing Learning and Teaching, and Planning, Resource and Assessment are respectively 10.7 (59%), 4.93 (55%) and 6.79 (42%).

In the CK section, which covers five aspects that are further translated into 19 aspects, the respondents show very poor achievements in indicators such as "What is in a sentence?", "How we use clauses", "Articles" and "Passive Construction" (from Grammar aspect); "Word Stress" and "Vowel Sound" (from Pronunciation aspect); "Reading and Writing Skills" and "Speaking Practice" (from Language Skills aspect). For other indicators they

achieve moderately and for only limited number of indicators, they show relatively strong achievement.

In the PK section of the test, which consists of three aspects and 13 indicators, the respondents show very low achievement in indicators such as "Teaching Approaches", "Classroom Management Terms" and "Stages in Presentation and the Objectives". Some strong achievement is shown in indicators like "Learner Characteristics" and "Motivation".

The concepts mentioned above are only some of which the teachers are very weak. It does not mean that they are strong in the others. The achievements in most indicators are moderate (about 50%). The concepts being tested in the Classroom English Proficiency Test are definitely those which are supposed to be within the areas and courses of undergraduate English education programs in Indonesia. Making sure that the training programs deliver accordingly all the knowledge is very crucial.

Conclusion

This result of the test shows that most of the teachers do not have sufficient knowledge, content and pedagogical, as two components of the classroom English proficiency. This insufficiency further reflects inadequate level of discourse skills in three out of four teachers selected to represent the groups, when they stand in front of the classroom as they conduct the teaching process. They are not capable of producing and using fluent, accurate, comprehensible and well-formed classroom English.

Deeper analysis into the two knowledge reveals that the achievement for the PK is slightly better than the CK. However, this condition is not enough to support them to perform effectively in the classroom. The dominant use of Bahasa Indonesia as the complementary medium of instruction is suspected to be the reason why the classes can still run relatively smoothly. Another possible reason is that the students are so used to their teachers' English, and can never expect to have better standard.

Three out of four teachers being observed do not play well one of their most important roles, that is to be a good model of an English learner. As it is often discussed, one big advantage or strong point of having non-native speaker English teachers is the fact that they have gone through the passage that their students are experiencing right now (Sun, 2014). The fact that they do not present themselves as a good model raises the question why. The issue of how they are trained or prepared previously is very relevant in this case.

Considering the thousands of English teachers graduated by English education programs from all over Indonesia nowadays, there is an urgency for the national foreign language

framework in Indonesia which will lead to a benchmark of a minimum standard of proficiency of English teachers in Indonesia. In conjunction with the framework, there is also a need to revisit on the curriculum of the undergraduate program of English Education to make sure that the graduates are meeting the standard required (Renandya et al., 2018; Rudianto, 2017).

The undergraduate program of English Education in higher education institutions in Indonesia is in fact the ultimate training program for the pre-service English teachers in Indonesia. One of the most important roles of the program is to equipped the trainees with sufficient knowledge of both content and pedagogical and to allocate more time on the practicum in which they can put their knowledge into practice. It is in this program and not in the master or doctoral programs that they will learn the language and about it, how to teach it, and how to use it in the classroom as the medium of instruction; which they will further keep developing throughout their lives and career as ELT professionals.

It is also strongly suggested that the teachers are benchmarked by using more specialized proficiency tests. The Classroom English Proficiency Test used in this study is one example of such specialized test, constructed specifically to measure the teachers' knowledge and/or proficiency based on what they have from day to day in the classroom with their students.

This study also opens passages for further research in the field of teachers' classroom English proficiency. There are many other possible contributing variables such as teaching experience, sex, types of schools, students' background, professional development programs which might also be significant contributors of teachers' classroom English Proficiency.

REFERENCES

Burke, B. M. (2015). Language proficiency testing for teachers. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, 23, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal1468

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). Interrogating the "native speaker fallacy": Non-linguistic roots, non-pedagogical results. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 77–92). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Chacón, C. T. (2005). Teachers' perceived efficacy among English as a foreign language teachers in middle schools in Venezuela. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *21*(3), 257–272. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2005.01.001

Coniam, D., Falvey, P., & Xiao, Y. (2017). An investigation of the impact on Hong Kong's English language teaching profession of the language proficiency assessment for teachers of English (LPATE). *RELC Journal*, *48*(1), 115–133. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688216687455

Cullen, R. (2002). The use of lesson trancripts for developing teachers' classroom language. In G. Trappes-Lomax, H. and Ferguson (Ed.), *Language in Language Teacher Education* (pp. 219–238). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Elder, C. (2001). Assessing the language proficiency of teachers: are there any border controls? *Language Testing*, *18*(2), 149–170. https://doi.org/10.1177/026553220101800203

Elizondo, R. V. (2015). Measuring the effectiveness of Teaching Knowledge Test (TKT) in Mexico. Retrieved from www.colmee.mx/public/conferences/1/presentaciones/ponenciasdia3/49Midiendo.pdf

Eslami, Z. R., & Fatahi, A. (2008). Teachers' sense of self-efficacy, English proficiency, and instructional strategies: A study of nonnative EFL teachers in Iran. *Tesl-Ej*, *11*(4), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1136/jmg.2004.027961

Freeman, D. (2017). The case for teachers' classroom english proficiency. *RELC Journal*, *48*(1), 31–52. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217691073

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. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccu074

Freeman, D., Katz, A., Le Drean, L., Burns, A., & Hauck, M. (2012). Global pilot report 2012. Retrieved from www.elteach.com

Gess-newsome, J., Taylor, J. A., Carlson, J., Gardner, A. L., Wilson, C. D., Stuhlsatz, M. A. M., … Stuhlsatz, M. A. M. (2017). Teacher pedagogical content knowledge , practice , and student achievement. *International Journal of Science Education*, *0*(0), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2016.1265158

Gonzalez Moncada, A. (183AD). On alternative and additional certifications in English Language Teaching: The Case of Colombian EFL Teachers' Professional Development. *Ikala, Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura, 2009, 14, 22, May-Aug, 183-209*.

Huang, L., & Papakosmas, A. (2014). The impact of TKT on Chinese teacher's teaching beliefs, knowledge and practice. In *Cambridge English: Research Notes, Issue 57*.

Kim, H., & Elder, C. (2015). Interrogating the construct of aviation English: Feedback from test takers in Korea. *Language Testing*, *32*(2), 129–149. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532214544394

Kirkpatrick, A. (2014). World Englishes. In *The Routledge Companion to English Studies Routledge* (pp. 33–45). https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315852515.ch3

Kultsum, U. (2017). The Concept of Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK): Recognizing the English Teachers ' Competences in Indonesia, *134*(Icirad), 55–59.

Mindy Pasternak and Kathleen M. Bailey. (2004). Preparing Nonnative and Native EnglishSpeaking Teacherc: lssues of Professionalism and Proffciency. In *Learning and Teaching from Experience: Perspectives on Nonnative English-Speaking Professionals*.

Moser, J., Harris, J., & Carle, J. (2012). Improving teacher talk through a task-based approach. *ELT Journal*, *66*(1), 81–88. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccr016

Nakata, Y. (2010). Improving the Classroom Language Proficiency of Non-native Teachers of English: What and How? *RELC Journal*, *41*(1), 76–90. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688210362617

Renandya, W. A., Hamied, F. A., & Nurkamto, J. (2018). English Language Proficiency in Indonesia : Issues and Prospects. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, *15*(3), 618–629.

Richards, J. C. (2010). Competence and Performance in Language Teaching. *RELC Journal*, *41*(2), 101–122. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688210372953

Richards, J. C. (2017). Teaching English through English: Proficiency, Pedagogy and Performance. *RELC Journal*, *48*(1), 7–30. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217690059

Rudianto, C. (2017). An institutional curriculum for a pre-service English teacher-education

program. In J. Richards (Ed.), *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching* (2nd ed., pp. 31–34). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Segall, A. (2004). Revisiting pedagogical content knowledge : the pedagogy of content / the content of pedagogy, *20*, 489–504. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2004.04.006

Seidlhofer, B. (2005). English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal*, *59*(4), 339–341. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci064

Sun, Y. (2014). Plenary Paper Major Trends in the Global ELT Field : A Non-Native English-Speaking Professional's Perspective. *Language Education in Asia*, *5*(1), 7–19.

Thi Hong Nhung, P. (2017). General English Proficiency or English for Teaching? The Preferences of In-service Teachers. *RELC Journal*, *(in press)*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217691446

Tsang, A. (2017). EFL/ESL Teachers' General Language Proficiency and Learners' Engagement. *RELC Journal*, *48*(1), 99–113. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217690060

Vallazza, G. (2008). Impact of TKT on language teachers and shools in Uruguay. In *In Cambridge ESOL: Research Notes, Issue 34. 188-196.*

Van Canh, L., & Renandya, W. A. (2017). Teachers' English Proficiency and Classroom Language Use: A Conversation Analysis Study. *RELC Journal*, *48*(1), 67–81. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217690935

Young, J., Freeman, D., Hauck, M., Garcia Gomez, P., & Papageorgius, S. (2014). A Design Framework for ELTeach Program Assessment (ELT Research Report No RR- 13-46). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service. https://doi.org/1002/ets2.12036

Zhang, Y., & Elder, C. (2011). Judgments of oral proficiency by non-native and native english speaking teacher raters: Competing or complementary constructs? *Language Testing*, *28*(1), 31–50. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532209360671