CEFR for Languages and Its Effective Implementation in Secondary Schools in Malaysia

Norshaidatul Md Nawawi[*]**, Natasha Zuhaimi, Khairunisa Sabu,**
Nur Siti Rozaialaina Mahamud, Nur Afiqah Moh Nasir
Faculty of Education, University Putra Malaysia, Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia.
*Corresponding author: shaidatulnawawi@gmail.com

Abstract

The implementation and development of the Common European Framework of References (CEFR) have received recognition and enthusiasm in language learning globally. The purpose of the present study, therefore, is to investigate the effectiveness of the implementation of CEFR reference of language in other countries generally as well as in the Malaysian secondary schools specifically. The evaluation of Malaysian teachers' perceptions toward the implementation of CEFR is substantially important to carry out the significant problems of implementing the framework. A systematic literature review was done to several research studies in Asian and especially Malaysia to achieve the fundamental research objectives. Despite the several challenges faced by English Second Language (ESL) teachers in implementing the framework. Therefore, it was found that CEFR has potentially improved in the language learning context.

Keywords: Common European Framework of References (CEFR), Effectiveness, Teachers' Perceptions

INTRODUCTION

The Malaysian education system has gone through a series of reformulation and reformation due to the development of the country and economic growth according to Darmi et al. (2017) in the country. The transition from teacher-centred learning or theoretical learning approach to student-centred learning or practical learning approach has provided opportunity for the policymakers to transform the Malaysian Education Blueprint (2013-2025) and introduce 11 new shifts "to deliver the step-change in outcomes envisioned by all Malaysians" (MOE, 2015). The second and seventh shifts, however, highlighted the importance of the English language to usher or integrate in digital literacy into the classroom. The current needs of today's young generation have resulted in the use of technology as "essential tools" in the methods used by teachers in their instructional delivery. The implementation in the 21st century learning in each classroom has been the contributing factor as well as ensuring that the youths are well prepared to contribute to the development of the economy, become socially advance and innovative while exerting the ability to speak fluently in both national languages, Bahasa Malaysia and English (Krishnan & Melor, 2019).

The English language in some parts of Malaysia is still regarded as a foreign language as it is not used in daily conversation, it is quite difficult to achieve a myriad of fluent speakers. English Second Language (ESL) teachers have faced countless difficulties in teaching the English language and it became more intense when the government decided to make English subject as a compulsory subject to pass in Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia (SPM) (Shazali & Hashim, 2018). The government has enforced such a decision because the Malaysian graduates are still lacking in the English language proficiency related to the employability and marketability skills (Darmi et al., 2017). Therefore, it has become the responsibility of the Ministry of Education to make sure that every graduate produced is adequately

prepared for the world of work.

Intending to achieve the goal, as exemplified above, the Ministry of Education has come out with various programs and plans in ten years of roadmap starting from 2015 to 2025. The emergence of English Language Education Reform has introduced a specific objective which is "to bring about substantial improvement in our students' proficiency in the English language" (MOE, 2015). In line with the integration of Common European Framework of Language (CEFR) into the syllabus, starting from primary one and form one at secondary school in 2017, they are expected to be abreast with the new curriculum to establish a standard structure for English language teaching and assessment in Malaysia. The research by Abdul Hakim et al. (2018) pointed out that the implementation of CEFR breathes new life into the Malaysian ESL education system, moving it from an exam-oriented to a more action-oriented approach.

The specific objectives of the research discourse shall be to evaluate, firstly the effectiveness of the implementation of CEFR reference of language in other countries. Secondly, the Malaysian teachers' perception on the implementation of CEFR in Malaysia. Thirdly, the effectiveness of implementing CEFR to secondary students in Malaysia.

CEFR REFERENCE OF LANGUAGES

In 2001, the Council of Europe established CEFR to act as "a common basis for the elaboration of curriculum guidelines, language syllabuses, textbooks, examinations, etc. across Europe" (Council of Europe, 2001 p.1.). CEFR was primarily introduced by the Council of Europe over twenty years prior. Later, after World War II as well as the establishment of the EU and Council of Europe, an urgent demand for the education of language arose to raise the free movement of citizens, ideas and information inside Europe (Byram & Parmentar, 2012). The CEFR has been recognized and grown in status in many countries and not merely in Europe (Asian Correspondent, 2015).

The CEFR is also starting to be given major attention in many parts of different regions. Vietnam is one of the earliest countries in South East Asian to formally adopt CEFR in its education system (Hai, 2018). Due to a massive number of learners in Vietnam who did not manage to fulfil the global standard compared to its competitors, the nation took further action to overcome this problem by implementing the international standard framework (Nguyen & Hamid, 2015). To date, the use of CEFR has rapidly spread outside Europe and has been successfully translated into more than 36 languages as an outline to define levels for language learning, language assessment as well as language teaching. The framework describes what language learners can do at different stages of their learning by referring to their unique descriptors for each level of proficiency. According to the CEFR framework, foreign language proficiency can be divided into six different levels namely A1 and A2 (Basic User), B1 and B2 (Independent User), C1 and C2 (Proficient User). CEFR also draws a distinction between the five key communication skills namely writing, listening, spoken interaction, spoken production and reading. Based on the five communication skills, a student's language proficiency is measured accordingly starting with a scale of A1, and followed by the subsequent scales which are A2, B1, B2 (Independent User) and C1 to C2 (Proficient User).

Through CEFR, not only the learners may improve the proficiency of their existing language skills but it also helps to enhance their communication skills and strategies. For instance, learners can gain compensation strategies by going from simple to autonomous, allowing them to fully utilize their existing language proficiency. For example, more advanced learners will continue their learning at a higher level. This allows them to be equally spontaneous and fluent where they will be capable of producing appropriate language which fits whatever situation they face. At each level, a list of "can do" statements are used to define a learner's proficiency according to the five different communication skills. These skill definitions concentrate on communicative purposes and offer a more practical approach that looks at what people can do rather than basic language abilities. Below is the table for the targets of CEFR and the CEFR language reference.

Figure 1 illustrated the aspirational targets by the Ministry of Education Malaysia. This target is possible to track student progress along a continuum from preschool to university. Preschool students are expected to get A1 in their English proficiency. The targets given are in line with the maturity and

knowledge acquired by the students. Hence, the targeted level is growing higher according to their age. At the university level, students are expected to reach Independent User or remark as B2 level of proficiency. This is a satisfactory level at which they can get a job and expected to function adequately in English. On the other hand, students who graduate from Teaching English as Second Language (TESL) courses, Teaching English to the Speaker of Other Languages (TESOL) or any English language teacher education and English-related programmes are expected to reach C1 level as Proficient User.

Figure 1. Aspirational Targets (MOE, 2015).

Table 1 demonstrates the level of English Proficiency in Global Scale. There are three types of language users which are Basic, Independent and Proficient. Within each language users have been divided into two levels and it has been differentiated by the given descriptors. The descriptor provides a "Can Do" statement at each level to describe a learner's ability and in a positive manner. By then, we could have a clear idea of what the levels mean and be able to track students' proficiency level.

CEFR CASE STUDIES GLOBALLY

Many countries outside the European region have employed CEFR for their reference in assessing students' English language proficiency. The component of the "Can-do" list in the CEFR has been alleged to alleviate the English language assessors as well as the exam takers to identify their level of English language proficiency. Many research papers have been published concerning the effectiveness and views of implementing CEFR language reference as part of their foreign language learning (Fennelly, 2016; Tono, 2017; Abdul Hakim et al., 2018; Tono, 2019). Hence, this section intends to traverse the effectiveness of CEFR in other countries. To begin with, the influence and spread of the English language can be classified into few groups throughout the world, Kachru (1994) has conceptualized these groups into three parts; (1) The Inner circle, whereby English is their native language; (2) The Outer Circle, whereby the English language is an additional language that is commonly used or lingua franca between non-native speakers; (3) The expanding Circle, whereby the English language is used to communicate internationally for business, finance, etcetera.

Due to the expansion of business and finance worldwide, many Asian countries are learning the English language, including Japan. Japan has been categorized under the expanding circle as their native language is Japanese, hence the usage of the English language is not commonly used in their nation. Pressured by business and academic influence, the Ministry of Education in Japan has encouraged change for the Japanese people specifically in the attainment of foreign language (Fennelly, 2016). It is believed that the CEFR influence at school and tertiary level in Japan are not aligned. In school education, the central government tightly controls the system, thus, the reference of CEFR is

scarcely evident. Recent studies viewed CEFR as lacking in precisions due to the vague nature of the framework. The teachers and students alike focus more on passing the examination rather than the Ministry of Education goals in procuring long term good communication skills. The attainment of spoken English language proficiency is almost ignored completely (Tono, 2017).

Table 1. CEFR level of proficiency (MOE, 2015).

CEFR Global Scale		
Language User	**Level**	**Descriptors** **(There are also detailed 'Can Do' statements for different language skills, grammar and vocabulary)**
Proficient User	C2	Can understand with ease virtually everything heard or read. Can summarize information from different spoken and written sources, reconstructing arguments and accounts in a coherent presentation. Can express him/herself spontaneously, very fluently and precisely, differentiating finer shades of meaning even in more complex situations.
	C1	Can understand a wide range of demanding, longer texts, and recognize implicit meaning. Can express him/herself fluently and spontaneously without much obvious searching for expressions. Can use language flexibly and effectively for social, academic and professional purposes. Can produce clear, well-structured, detailed text on complex subjects, showing controlled use of organizational patterns, connectors and cohesive devices.
Independent User	B2	Can understand the main ideas of complex text on both concrete and abstract topics, including technical discussions in his/her field of specialization. Can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with native speakers quite possible without strain for either party. Can produce clear, detailed text on a wide range of subjects and explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various options.
	B1	Can understand the main points of clear standard input on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc. Can deal with most situations likely to arise whilst travelling in an area where the language is spoken. Can produce simple connected text on topics which are familiar or of personal interest. Can describe experiences and events, dreams, hopes & ambitions and briefly give reasons and explanations for opinions and plans.
Basic User	A2	Can understand sentences and frequently used expressions related to areas of most immediate relevance (e.g. very basic personal and family information, shopping, local geography, employment). Can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar and routine matters. Can describe in simple terms aspects of his/her background, immediate environment and matters in areas of immediate need.
	A1	Can understand and use familiar everyday expressions and very basic phrases aimed at the satisfaction of needs of a concrete type. Can introduce him/herself and others and can ask and answer questions about personal details such as where he/she lives, people he/she knows and things he/she has. Can interact in a simple way provided the other person talks slowly and clearly is prepared to help.

To rectify the existing CEFR language reference in Japan, scholars and researchers have launched a project called the CEFR-J. Tono (2019) highlighted this project is an improvised version of CEFR with unique features namely; (1) refined sub-levels of the CEFR (Pre-A1, A1.1-1.3, A2.1-2.2, B1.1-1.2, B2.1-2.2) with newly created and scaled descriptors; (2) each level of CEFR-J is prepared with pertinent grammar and vocabulary; (3) relevant text analysis features to represent the CEFR-J levels, and; (4) relevant tasks and tests are developed to serve each CEFR-J descriptors. Initially, CEFR-J was designed to cater to the needs of English language teaching in Japan, but recently this format has attained more interest in adopting CEFR-J to other foreign languages (Tono, 2019). The core heart of CEFR-J reference is based on the original CEFR that provides the very list of "Can Do" descriptors for each level. Likewise, Vietnam has experienced a similar situation as Japan whereby the CEFR's impact is not noticeable. During the early days, when CEFR was introduced in Vietnam, it was considered as a

"quick-fix" in revising the national foreign language education system. Although it has been implemented for almost ten years there are still challenges and obstacles as such "limited human resources" to "deficits in teacher professionalism" (Nhung, 2017). Despite the unresolved issue, the Ministry of Education and Training (MOET) in Vietnam has put a heavyweight on the general English (GE) teachers as high school leavers and learners of non-English major university students are required to attained B1 CEFR-aligned learning outcome for them to graduate.

Hai (2018) has conducted a qualitative-in depth interview with eight general English (GE) teachers concerning the implementation of CEFR. It has resulted that the impact of CEFR-aligned outcomes on the assessment practice could be seen in the appearance of CEFR aligned tests and the focus on the students' self and peer assessments. Firstly, the GE teachers have revamped and altered the format for formative classroom assessment to help the non-English major student to pass their required CEFR-aligned A1-B1 examinations. Due to their unrestrained focus to pass the exams, the GE teachers did not pay ample attention to the can-do descriptors of CEFR A1-B1 to improve the students' language proficiency. Instead, they focused more on the format and requirements of the exams and became very test-oriented. Secondly, the self - and – peer assessment was revealed to be the most favourable method among the students. Although the method is engaging, however, the pertinent aspects for the overall aims of students' autonomy and proficiency improvement were not able to fully achieve. This is due to the lack of focus on the pertinent elements, and the sustenance of long-term English language proficiency is hard to achieve. The vagueness of the implementation of CEFR in Vietnam has resulted in an unclear structure for teaching and learning. Henceforth, a new approach similar to CEFR-J has been introduced by the name of CEFR-V. As explained by the Management Board for the National Foreign Language Teaching Program, the particular language framework will be adjusted to the Vietnamese suitability in learning a foreign language (Foley, 2019).

Despite the several issues of CEFR and its implementation in both Japan and Vietnam, the core idea of the framework has given many countries the solid backbone of language proficiency assessment. By observing these two countries it could be discerned that the CEFR reference of language is flexible in its context. Nevertheless, there is a high potential for CEFR to be used internationally for all reference to foreign languages in the future.

MALAYSIAN TEACHERS PERSPECTIVES ON IMPLEMENTING CEFR

Despite the ruckus that arose, the implementation of CEFR in Malaysia has brought many changes in the education world. The shift of syllabus, the changing classroom practices, the new books that have to be used in class have some impacts on the teachers that are carrying out the task. Therefore, the teachers' perceptions toward the implementation of CEFR should be the main focus to improve the education system especially in teaching English as a second language. Their opinions would help the Ministry of Education to decide the direction for developing strategies to help the students as well as the teachers in applying CEFR as reference for languages.

The implementation of the CEFR at school occurred almost extremely rapidly after the ministry implemented the new reform. Although all teachers have been trained in the implementation of the CEFR, full and holistic understanding of the CEFR is still vague for the teachers (C. Alih & Md. Yusoff, 2020). To begin with, many studies have reported that the educators have positive feedback towards the implementation of CEFR in Malaysia (Faez et al., 2011; Aziz et al., 2018; Sidhu, Kaur & Lee, 2018; Sabbir, 2019). Although the majority of the teachers' perceptions of CEFR are optimistic, they are facing many setbacks on the vague structure. The teachers believe that the implementation of CEFR has prepared the students to be ready for post-secondary education. Many of them support the notion that CEFR reference of language produces the school leavers to be able to work and compete internationally due to the common framework of English language used globally (Aziz et al., 2018). However, the teachers are still having difficulties in comprehending the structure of CEFR. Teachers have voiced out that they do not get sufficient exposure to the CEFR reference of language structure. Their experience of going to a seminar of introduction to CEFR for two to three days is not enough to grasp the idea of creating a new module and managing the task in the real field. They felt that they lacked sufficient support to effectively implement the change in the classroom, with the insufficient

training hours. Due to the aforementioned reason, they had low levels of awareness about CEFR because the teachers have not undergone adequate training on the design of CEFR-based class activities (C. Alih & Md. Yusoff, 2020).

Moreover, many teachers argued that they are having difficulty in attaining teaching materials, the lack of technological resources and the proficiency level of the learners. English teachers find it difficult to align the structure of CEFR with the textbook provided for secondary ESL classrooms (Aziz et al., 2018). Instead of having to create their content, using a good reference textbook would save them more time. Almost all of the educators have said that they have too much workload, leaving them with little time for other activities. There are still several teachers who, despite these constraints, can take on the additional work to search for other resources in complementing their teaching material because their students simply cannot understand the given textbook. The major concern posed by the teachers about the textbook prescribed by the ministry is contextualization. Since most of the content in the textbook is internationalised, students, especially those with limited language skill, have a hard time comprehending the material (Byram & Parmenter, 2012). In the 2015-2025 roadmaps, the Ministry of Education had highlighted their concern regarding the materials produced. The producers of materials need to meet the needs of teachers and students (MOE, 2015).

Next, the lack of technical tools for speaking and listening practices at school is also one of the contributing factors on the setbacks of CEFR implementation. In this era, it is pivotal for the authorities to provide pertinent technological tools to ensure smooth conduct of the teaching and learning environment in the ESL classroom. The use of technology would trigger more active learning and increase students' interest in learning the English language, as technology is a powerful tool to facilitate learning for students (Alismail & McGuire, 2015). Lastly, teachers from urban and rural areas agree that students with low English language proficiency find that CEFR-aligned content is rather difficult since the framework was developed by native speakers (Sabbir, 2019). Students who have prior knowledge of the English language would score well compared to those who do not use the English language in their conversation. Unfortunately, students that are staying in the rural area are exposed less to such an environment. The original CEFR reference of language might be too advanced for them as the content is internationalised (Aziz et al., 2018).

Thus, it is clear that more time and continuous encouragement must be provided to teachers to ensure the success of the new move. While improvement is necessary for all teachers to be enforced in school, it is important to remember that it takes more than guidelines and procedures for a change to function effectively. Other covert variables such as readiness for change (Kondakci et al., 2017), organisational confidence (Zayim & Kondakci, 2015; Winardi & Priyanto, 2016), motivation (Lehman et al., 2002), staff quality and leadership (Rafferty et al., 2010) are not only critical but also necessary prerequisites for effective implementation of change.

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF IMPLEMENTING CEFR FOR SECONDARY LEVEL EDUCATION IN MALAYSIA

The emergence of CEFR in Malaysian English education brings a more systematic process and new environment in teaching and learning English in school from an exam-oriented approach to a more action-oriented approach. CEFR is designed to establish international standards for foreign language education to cater to the needs of language learners as well as academics and other professions related to assessment, teaching and learning of languages (Aziz et al., 2018). CEFR is a globally recognised framework which provides detailed descriptions of learning a language; either foreign or second language with the four essential language skills which are listening, speaking, reading and writing at particular six levels of proficiency. Those days, traditional English learning in Malaysia was only based on the given grades or score in academic reports. However, these grading did not explain nor provide accurate information on learners' proficiency level based on the target language. Therefore, the introduction of CEFR has given a better method in assessing learners in the English language.

The Link between English Learning Content and CEFR

It takes a long journey for a framework to be identified as a successful plan, but within six years CEFR has brought a large number of improvements among learners. English Language Education in Malaysia has undergone at least three important reforms in the last 30 years (Azman, 2016). In this fast past progressive world, what has been introduced in the last 30 years back by the Ministry of Education (MoE) and Government of Malaysia are just not good enough for today. Since the Integrated English Language Syllabus for Primary School or KBSR was introduced in 1982, it was more focused on Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) then faded out in the early 1990s. CLT was implemented and learned the language for communication instead of grammatical knowledge. Therefore, it received a lot of rejections from netizens and the teacher as there was inadequate support from MoE in terms of teacher training and materials and less satisfactory results of using communicative ways and syllabus objectives (Musa et al., 2012).

The second initiative was the Standard English Language Curriculum for Primary School (KSSR) and was launched in 2002. The concept of CLT was revived and enhanced more by having on-going School-Based Assessment. However again, this initiative has suffered most of the teachers and the occurrence of the same problems as the previous curriculum (Aziz et al., 2018). Therefore, the Ministry has initiated to reconstruct the module to suit the needs of the learners as well as to have them proficient in the language. The KSSR curriculum contents have been designed to re-highlight and emphasize language arts, phonics and penmanship (Mihat, 2015). Since it includes creativity and innovation as well as entrepreneurship. Although it sounds reliable, it is still not relevant to the current era. In the year 2017, Secondary School Standard Curriculum (KSSM) was also introduced in revising the KSSR which is an initiative to be aligned with the CEFR standard framework.

In the advancement of technology and the needs of credibility as well as proficiency of the English language to make it International standard level, many researchers conclude that CEFR has brought a bright future for our learners today. Hence, the new reform is set to finally provide a systematic guide for the development of trained English language teachers, benchmarked syllabus items and teaching materials, internationally standardized assessments, and clearly defined language competency expectations and outcomes for all educational levels (Azman, 2016). Due to the flexibility and adaptability to cater to different needs and contexts of language users, CEFR has been widely used across countries in Asia and Europe. The CEFR has been divided by three broad levels of language proficiency: Basic (A1 and A2), Independent (B1 and B2) and Proficient (C1 and C2), which have been illustrated in the CEFR introduction section.

Based on the descriptors, the new reform gives teachers, stakeholders, parents and learners an eventually much clearer picture of what pupils' level of capability is. Although there are several misconceptions of CEFR that occurred during the first years of the implementation, slowly learners and teachers are getting into the bigger picture of the advantages based on the framework. Many individuals have thought that CEFR is exam-oriented, however, it is not but more in providing basis measuring and describing language proficiency. CEFR makes it possible to track student progress along a continuum from preschool to university (Mohd Don & Abdullah, 2019). It has been proven that during 2019 SPM results, there is an increasing percentage for English as reported in the *New Straits Time* and announced by Education director-general Dr Habibah Abdul Rahim in 2020 (Azizi, 2019). A total of 78.93 per cent candidates have mastered two languages Bahasa Melayu and English which were obtained from a passing grade during SPM last year. The effort in the adaptation of CEFR in the roadmap has led to a bigger change in Malaysian Education curriculum, teaching and learning. Through various efforts by the Ministry of Education in improving English language proficiency for Malaysian students has brought encouraging results today and is expected to provide the most satisfactory results in the future.

It was not only in the year 2019 the SPM candidate's improvement revealed after the implementation of CEFR, but earlier in 2017 a study by the Cambridge English reported about 40% students exceeded the 2025 CEFR targets of B1 at the secondary level stated by Dr Habibah. Besides, the study showed large improvement compared to the 2013 baseline study by Cambridge English where the result found a large gap between several criteria on students' language proficiency. It also includes such factors like attitudes towards learning, school type and location, class specialisation, gender and current national curricula, assessment and learning materials (Cambridge English Assessment) (Azizi, 2019). Astoundingly, within four years after the first study commenced, the outstanding outcomes

achieved are magnificent and breathtaking to all parties and will continue to boast to everyone.

The credits should be remarked to all ESL Teachers as well as the Ministry who have struggled to give their full energy towards the achievement today. It is undeniable that ESL teachers encounter many trials such as readiness in implementing CEFR in the teaching and learning process. Majority of the teachers are still not ready although they have attended CEFR familiarization workshops and other CEFR related in-house training (Aziz et al., 2018). Other than that, lack of knowledge and materials preparation also count in the challenges. In the dispute of the hardships, nevertheless, it somehow shows the best outcome in the aftermath.

In summary, the effectiveness of implementing CEFR for secondary level in Malaysia has shown a very outstanding improvement today. The belief that the upcoming achievement would be more satisfying led to an extraordinary outcome aligned to the objective and goals of the roadmap in 2025. The cooperation from all parties; learners, teachers, the Ministry of Education and stakeholders should be motionless and strengthened to achieve greater success in the future. As pointed out by Shulgina and Sagaran (2017), the Malaysian Government takes leaps to provide positive opportunities for English learners. Therefore, it is expected that the impacts of CEFR towards the achievement of Malaysian students will be more highlighted and therefore, it is expected that the impacts of CEFR towards the achievement of Malaysian students will be more highlighted and emphasized in the coming years.

CONCLUSION

Although the CEFR reference of language has been adopted in many countries, there is still plenty of room for improvement especially on the implementation of CEFR in schools. Teachers particularly need to have a clear insight of what the framework is and how it can help them in their teaching and assisting their students in the right direction. Presently, many still have not mastered the new curriculum, and are only relying on the materials given such as textbooks and activity books by the government. All parties such as the Ministry of Education, State Education Departments, District Education Offices, schools, teachers and parents should be well versed on the implementation of this framework to get a gist of knowledge on how other countries implement the core idea of CEFR reference of language efficiently. The implementation of CEFR might be time-consuming and tedious to be fixed in a short period, but with resilience and hard work, there is potential that the CEFR framework will be successfully implemented in the future.

REFERENCES

Abdul Hakim, A.A.A., Radzuwan A. R., & Wan Z.W.Z. (2018). The enactment of the Malaysian common European framework of reference (CEFR): National master trainer's reflection. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics,* 8(2), 409-417. doi: https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v8i2.I3307

Alismail, A.A., & McGuire, P. (2015). 21st century standards and curriculum: Current research and practices. *Journal of Education and* Practice, 6(6), 150-154.

Asian Correspondent (2015). https://asiancorrespondent.com/2015/04/thai-schools-adopt-european- framework-to-boost-english-language proficiency/#9bRDEjS291IpdY2i.99. Accessed: October 16, 2017

Azman, H. (2016). Implementation and challenges of English Language Education Reform in Malaysian Primary Schools. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Students,* 22(3), 65-78. doi: https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2016-2203-05

Azizi, N.A. (2019, December 4). Shaping English language education in Malaysia. *New Straits Times.*

Aziz, A., Rashid, R., & Zainudin, W. (2018). The enactment of the Malaysian common European framework of reference (CEFR): National master trainer's reflection. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 8*(2), 409-417. doi: https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v8i2.13307

Byram, M., & Parmenter, L. (2012). The Common European Framework of Reference: The Globalisation of Language Education Policy. Bristol: Multilingual matters.

C. Alih., N.A., & Md. Yusoff, M.A. (2020). Teachers' Knowledge and Belief on the CEFR Implementation in Malaysian ESL Classroom. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary and Current Educational Research*, pp. 126-134.

Council of Europe (2001), *The Common European Framework of Reference for Language Learning Teaching Assessment.* Cambridge University Publisher, Cambridge. English Language Education Reform in Malaysia: The Roadmap 2015-2025, 2016, pp. 5-6.

Darmi, R., Mat Saad, N. S., Abdullah, N., Puteh-Behak, F., Zakaria, Z. A., & Adnan, J. N. I. A. (2017). Teachers' Views on Students' Performance in English Language Proficiency Courses Via Cefr Descriptors. *International E-Journal of Advances in Education*, 3(8), 363–370. https://doi.org/10.18768/ijaedu.336688

Faez, F., Taylor, S.K., Majhanovich, S., & Brown, P. (2011). Teacher reactions to CEFR's task-based approach for FSL classrooms. *Synergies Europe*, 6, 109-120.

Fennelly, M.G. (2016). The influence of CEFR on English language education in Japan. *Bull. Shikoku Univ*, 46, 109–122. Retrieved from https://www.Shikoku-u.ac.jp/education/docs/A46p109-122.pdf

Foley, J.A. (2019). Issues on Assessment using CEFR in the Region. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 12(2), 28–48.

Hai, L.T.T. (2018). Impacts of Cefr-Aligned Learning outcome Implementation on Assessment Practice At Tertiary Level Education in Vietnam: an Exploratory Study. *Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 127(6), 87–99. https://doi.org/10.26459/hueuni-jssh.v127i6B.4899

Kondakci, Y., Beycioglu, K., Sincar, M., and Ugurlu, C.T. (2017). Readiness of teachers for change in schools. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 20(2), 176–197. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2015.1023361

Krishnan, P.D. & Yunus, M.M (2019). Blended CEFR in Enhancing Vocabulary among Low Proficiency Students. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ),* Special Issue on CALL (5), 141-153. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/call5.11

Kachru, B. (1994). *Englishization and contact linguistics.* University of Illionois Press: World Englishes.

Lehman, W. E., Greener, J. M., & Simpson, D. D. (2002). Assessing organizational readiness for change. *Journal of substance abuse treatment*, 22(4), 197–209. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0740-5472(02)00233-7

Mohd Don, Z. & Abdullah, M.H. (2019, May 22). The Reform of English Language Education in Malaysia – Free Malaysia Today, 23 Mei 2019. Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia.

Mihat W. (2015). The English Language Curriculum in Malaysian Indigenous Primary Classrooms: The Reality and the Ideal. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies,* 21(3), 1 – 12.

MOE. (2015). Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013-2025 (Preschool to Post-Secondary Education). Putrajaya, Malaysia.

Mohamad Uri, N.F. & Abd Aziz, M.S. (2018). Implementation of CEFR in Malaysia: Teacher's awareness and the challenges. In *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies,* 24 (3). 168-183. doi: https://doi.org/10.17576-2018-2403-13

Musa, N. C., Lie, K. Y., & Azman, H. (2012). Exploring English language learning and teaching in Malaysia. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 12(1), 35–51.

Nguyen, V.H. & Hamid, M.O. (2015). Educational Policy Borrowing in a Globalized World: A Case Study of Common European Framework of Reference for Languages in a Vietnamese University. *Journal of English Teaching, Practice & Critique*, 14(1), 60–74. doi: https://doi.org/10.1108/ETPC-02-2015-0014

Nhung, P.T.H. (2017). Chapter 6. Applying the CEFR to renew a general English curriculum: Successes, remaining issues and lessons from Vietnam. In North Brian (Ed.) *Critical, constructive assessment of CEFR-informed language teaching in Japan and beyond* (pp. 97–117). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rafferty, A. E., Jimmieson, N. L., & Armenakis, A. A. (2013). Change Readiness: A Multilevel Review. *Journal of Management*, 39(1), 110–135. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206312457417

Sabbir, F.B. (2019). *Perceived View of Teachers Towards Pentaksiran Tingkatan Tiga (PT3) (Form Three Assessment) English Language: A Case Study. Asian Journal of University Education,* 15(3), 34-44.

Shazali, S.S., & Hashim, H. (2018). Challenges in Using Frog VLE in Teaching English to ESL Learners: A Review of Past Studies. *Journal of Counselling and Educational Technology,* 1(1), 2018, 1-4. doi: https://doi.org/10.32698/0101

Sidhu, G.K., Kaur, S., & Lee, J.C. (2018). CEFR-aligned school-based assessment in the Malaysian primary ESL classroom. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics,* 8(2), 452-463. doi: https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v8i2.13311

Shulgina, T., & Sagaran, G. (2017). A Survey of English Language Teaching in Higher Institutions of Learning in Kuala Lumpur Malaysia. Preprints, November, 1–4. https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints201711.0013.v1

Tono, Y. (2017). The CEFR-J and its impact on English language teaching in Japan. *JACET International convention selected papers*, 4, 31–52.

Tono, Y. (2019). Coming Full Circle – From CEFR to CEFR-J and back. *CEFR Journal-Research and Practice*. *Japan Association for Language Teaching (JALT); CEFR & Language Portfolio.* SIG.ISSN 2434-849X, 3, 5-17.

Winardi & Prianto, A. (2016). Various determinants of individual readiness to change and their effects on the teachers' performance (A study on certified teachers in Jombang Regency East Java, Indonesia). *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 18(2), 22-32. https://doi.org/10.9790/487X-18212232

Zayim, M., & Kondakci, Y. (2015). An exploration of the relationship between readiness for change and organizational trust in Turkish public schools. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *43*(4), 610–625.