"Reconstruction Project"—for example, designing a community space and presenting the proposal in English.

- **The "Can-Do" Statements:** Following the CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages) standards, the focus is on what the student *can do* (e.g., "I can explain my community's needs to a visitor") rather than which grammar rules they have memorized [3].

In summary, the reconstruction of Ukraine is not merely a task of rebuilding bridges and power grids; it is the reconstruction of a nation's voice on the global stage. By aligning the EFL curriculum with the legal mandates of Law 3709-IX and the psychological needs of a resilient youth, we ensure that English becomes the key that unlocks Ukraine's future within the European community. In 2026, we are not just teaching a language; we are equipping the architects of a new Ukraine.

REFERENCES

1. Alenezi, A., & Alenezi, A. (2025). The use of artificial intelligence in English learning: Teachers' and students' perceptions. *Information Technologies and Learning Tools*, *108*(4), 37–52.
2. Borodiyenko, O., Drach, I. I., & Bazeliuk, N. V. (2025). Opportunities and risks of using AI-based applications in research: The case of Ukrainian universities. *Information Technologies and Learning Tools*, *105*(1), 125–143.
3. Carello, J., & Butler, L. D. (2015). Practicing what we teach: Trauma-informed educational practice. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, *35*(3), 262–278.
4. Zabolotna, O., & Shvaher, T. (2024). English language education in Ukraine: Navigating the challenges of the wartime and post-wartime period. *Journal of Education, Culture and Society*, *15*(1), 21

Olga BANIT

Ivan Ziaziun Institute of Pedagogical and Adult Education
National Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine /
Vadym Hetman Kyiv National Economic University

COACHING AS A TOOL FOR ENHANCING UNIVERSITY TEACHERS' ENGLISH PROFICIENCY

Coaching is a highly effective mechanism for the professional development of university teachers aiming to improve their English language proficiency, shifting the paradigm from generic instruction to hyper-personalized, context-driven growth. Unlike traditional, one-size-fits-all language courses, a coaching framework pairs educators with specialized mentors who tailor development directly to the unique, high-stakes demands of higher education, such as delivering lectures, conducting seminars, and publishing academic research in English. This collaborative

relationship fosters a safe, low-stakes environment where professors can address specific communicative anxieties, refine their pronunciation, and master discipline-specific terminology. Furthermore, because coaching relies on continuous feedback loops, reflective practice, and goal-oriented action plans, it builds sustainable linguistic confidence and self-efficacy. By directly integrating language acquisition with daily academic workflows, coaching ensures that improvements in English proficiency translate immediately into enhanced instructional quality and stronger global academic engagement.

The transformative power of language coaching for university educators lies at the intersection of cognitive, motivational, and social mechanisms that collectively drive professional growth. Cognitively, the coaching process stimulates deep reflective practice [7] and structured language acquisition by forcing educators to consciously evaluate their communicative choices during authentic academic tasks. This pushes them into their zone of proximal development [4], where the coach provides targeted scaffolding to bridge the gap between their current linguistic abilities and advanced communicative competence. Socially, the relationship functions as a collaborative partnership that models real-world academic discourse, transforming language learning from an isolated task into a shared, sociocultural experience where meaning and identity are co-constructed. This social alignment directly fuels the educator's internal motivation; by grounding the coaching in the practical, self-directed principles of adult learning theory [2], the training honors their professional autonomy. When linguistic exercises directly enhance their actual lectures or research goals, it shifts their drive from mere compliance to integrative motivation, fostering a profound sense of self-efficacy and linguistic confidence required to navigate the global academic community.

The proposed theoretical framework synthesizes the zone of proximal development, self-efficacy theory, and self-determination theory into a unified conceptual model that redefines language development for university educators. At its core, coaching serves as an essential moderator between rigid institutional demands – such as mandatory English-medium instruction – and the nuanced, individual learning needs of the teachers. By operating within the teacher’s, the coach provides dynamic, temporary scaffolding that makes overwhelming institutional expectations manageable. This tailored support directly satisfies the three core psychological needs outlined in self-determination theory: autonomy, by allowing teachers to set personalized professional goals; competence, by helping them master complex academic discourse; and relatedness, through a trusted, collaborative partnership. As these needs are met, teachers experience a shift toward intrinsic motivation, transforming language acquisition from an external institutional mandate into a deeply personal pursuit of professional excellence.

Within this conceptual model, the coaching dynamic actively strengthens advanced language competence through a continuous cycle of personalized goal-setting, facilitated reflection, and contextualized skill application. Instead of focusing on abstract grammatical rules, the coach guides the educator through Donald Schön's framework of reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action, turning daily academic challenges – such as drafting a research paper or managing an international seminar – into primary learning materials. This immediate, contextualized application of skills ensures that every linguistic victory is directly relevant to the teacher's workplace. As a result, according to Albert Bandura's self-efficacy theory [1], these repeated experiences of successful mastery of performance radically boost the teacher’s belief in their

own capabilities. This elevated self-efficacy diminishes communicative anxiety, strengthens linguistic resilience, and equips university teachers with the enduring communicative competence required to thrive in a globalized academic landscape.

This theoretical integration of the zone of proximal development, self-efficacy, and intrinsic motivation finds a highly practical, actionable expression in the GROW coaching model's structural phases. This framework – encompassing Goals, Reality, Options, and Will – provides a structured yet highly adaptable four-stage matrix for coaching university teachers through English language development [6]. In the first phase, Goals, the coach and educator establish clear, near-term linguistic objectives tailored to the teacher's academic responsibilities. Rather than aiming for vague fluency, the goals are highly specific and functional, such as managing a Q&A session at an upcoming international symposium or delivering a 90-minute lecture in English smoothly. This is immediately followed by the Reality phase, where the coach facilitates an honest, objective assessment of the teacher's current linguistic state. Through self-reflection and baseline observation, they identify exact friction points – such as a tendency to revert to the native language when asked unexpected questions, or a reliance on overly formal vocabulary that hinders student engagement.

Once the present reality is mapped against the desired future state, the partnership moves into the Options phase. Here, the coach acts as a facilitator rather than a lecturer, prompting the university teacher to brainstorm creative, actionable strategies to bridge their language gap. For an educator struggling with lecture delivery, options might include recording and self-critiquing a mock lecture segment, creating a bilingual glossary of discipline-specific idioms, or practicing signposting phrases to better guide students through complex topics. By encouraging the teacher to generate these alternatives themselves, the model respects the autonomy central to adult learning theory, ensuring the chosen strategies align with the teacher's personal instructional style.

The final stage, Will (or Way Forward), converts these options into a concrete, accountable action plan. In this phase, the coach and teacher define precisely what will be done, when, and how success will be measured, ensuring the teacher possesses the intrinsic motivation and institutional support to follow through. For instance, the teacher might commit to integrating three new interactive English phrasing techniques into their very next seminar, followed by a post-class reflection session with the coach. By transforming abstract language learning into a series of structured, high-ownership professional milestones, the GROW model effectively scaffolds a university teacher's journey from linguistic anxiety to authentic academic communicative [5].

In conclusion, establishing coaching programs within university professional development systems provides a theoretically robust framework that shifts language acquisition from a rigid institutional mandate into a deeply personalized process of professional growth. By embedding language development within structured frameworks like the GROW model, universities can move away from alienating, one-size-fits-all training modules that view English proficiency as a box to be checked. Instead, coaching honors the professional autonomy of university teachers, transforming language acquisition into a self-directed, reflective practice that aligns directly with their authentic academic needs, research disciplines, and teaching contexts. Ultimately, this paradigm shift not only alleviates the communicative anxiety associated with English-medium instruction but also fosters the internal motivation and self-efficacy required for sustained linguistic mastery [3]. By systematically investing in localized coaching initiatives, higher

education institutions bridge the gap between institutional internationalization strategies and educators' individual learning needs, cultivating a more confident, globally connected faculty.

To validate the efficacy of this proposed conceptual model, further empirical research is strongly recommended to test its practical outcomes across diverse academic settings. Future longitudinal studies should investigate the direct impact of personalized language coaching on teachers' actual classroom delivery, measuring changes in student engagement and instructional clarity in English-medium courses. Additionally, mixed-methods research utilizing both quantitative self-efficacy scales and qualitative reflective journals would help isolate which specific coaching mechanisms – such as peer facilitation or contextualized goal-setting – contribute most significantly to reducing communicative anxiety and increasing intrinsic motivation. Finally, comparative studies contrasting structured coaching models against traditional, lecture-based language training are essential to provide university administrators with the empirical, data-driven evidence needed to justify systemic investment in institutional coaching programs.

REFERENCES

1. Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, *84*(2), 191–215. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191
2. El-Amin, A. (2020). Andragogy in practice in higher education. *Journal of Research in Higher Education*, *4*(2), 54–69. https://doi.org/10.24193/JRHE.2020.2.4
3. Li, B., & Chan, S. (2007). Coaching as a means for enhancing English-language teachers' professional development: A case study. *Journal of In-Service Education*, *33*(3), 341–358. https://doi.org/10.1080/13674580701486952
4. McLeod, S. (2024). Vygotsky's theory of cognitive development. *Simply Psychology.* https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15680745
5. Rahman, M. A. (2023). Professional development in an institution through GROW Model. *Assyfa Learning Journal*, *1*(2). https://doi.org/10.61650/alj.v1i2.187
6. Sadewo, Y., Purnasari, P. D., & Saputro, T. V. D. (2026). Implementing the GROW coaching model in developing competencies of educators: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Social Learning (IJSL)*, *6*(2), 357–380. https://doi.org/10.47134/ijsl.v6i2.552
7. Schön, D. A. (1983). The Reflective Practitioner. How Professionals Think in Action. USA: Basic Books. https://raggeduniversity.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/1_x_Donald-A.-Schon-The-Reflective-Practitioner_-How-Professionals-Think-In-Action-Basic-Books-1984_redactedaa_compressed3.pdf