Implementation of Common European Framework of Reference for Languages-Aligned Assessment in Malaysian Secondary Schools

Noor Azli Bin Affendy Lee and Aini Akmar Binti Mohd Kasim

Abstract--- The execution of the Malaysian Education Blueprint 2013-2025 has created several curriculum reforms in the Malaysian ESL (English as a Second Language) syllabus, teaching and assessment. With the adaptation and implementation of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), starting with primary one and secondary one in Malaysian schools in 2016, this action-oriented approach warranted a degree of essential changes in teaching, learning and assessment in the English classrooms. Therefore, the main aim of this preliminary study was to investigate the views of English teachers on the implementation of the CEFR-aligned assessments in the ESL secondary school classroom. It also explored the challenges encountered by teachers in view of the adoption of CEFR onto the lower secondary form English syllabus and assessment. Data were collected via google form questionnaires from English teachers in schools located throughout Malaysia via random convenient sampling. The initial findings revealed that the implementation of CEFR-aligned syllabus and assessments are still divisive among Malaysian ESL school teachers. Most of the English teachers had sufficient knowledge about the revised CEFR-aligned ESL curriculum and how it affects students but find designing CEFR-aligned assessments based on the descriptors challenging even after it has been implemented for two years. This resulted in several difficulties faced when incorporating CEFR in their teaching and assessment. In formative assessments, teachers provide sufficient variety of feedbacks but face time constraint issues related to extra administrative duties, heavy workload, school events, and heavy syllabus content. These are the main factors that pose as the main challenges against the effective implementation of the CEFR-aligned assessment. Therefore, to ensure smoother implementation of CEFR in ESL classrooms, all stakeholders need to work together to iron out any issues faced by teachers. Furthermore, a clearer CEFR-aligned assessment guide needed to be developed and added into the syllabus to sufficiently assist ESL teachers in teaching and assessment in Malaysian school.

Keywords--- ESL, CEFR, English Teachers, CEFR-aligned Assessment, Secondary School.

I. INTRODUCTION

In 2001, The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) was established to provide a viable framework that shows what language learners require to learn in order to exploit a language efficiently in practice. Initially, its purpose was to offer assessment and teaching means for all languages in Europe.

However, according to Fulcher (2010) due to its ease of practice in numerous areas, CEFR has increased in popularity in countries outside Europe, particularly as a measurement for standards-based assessments. It has been

---

Noor Azli Bin Affendy Lee, Academy of Language Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Cawangan Pulau Pinang, Permatang Pauh, Pulau Pinang, Malaysia. E-mail: azli.affendy@gmail.com
Aini Akmar Binti Mohd Kasim, Academy of Language Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA Shah Alam, Shah Alam, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia.

adopted and adapted to match several requirements and demands mostly in various countries' educational policies, language examination and assessment, language curriculum enhancement and other vital areas in language education.

Various countries are tackling CEFR differently. Some in favor to simply adopt the framework particularly those countries' backgrounds which have close associations and resemblances to native English-speaking countries while others take to adapt CEFR to be concurrent with their distinctive cultures and local language acquisition developments.

English Language Education in Malaysia

In Malaysia, children have been familiarized to the English language as early as preschool at the age of 5 to 6 years old, and the language resumes to be taught all the way through their education phases from primary to tertiary level. The English language is an obligatory subject in the Malaysian education curriculum and it is generally established as an essential second language in Malaysia. Despite that, Azman (2016) stated that Malaysian students, in general, have been inept to accomplish a sufficient level of proficiency in the language. Therefore, low English proficiency is cited as one of the leading causes for graduate unemployment.

Consequently, there is an alarming attention in determining benchmarks for English language teaching and assessment in terms of international standard due to the necessity to improve the English language aptitude among Malaysian students (Uri & Aziz, 2018). After going through several modifications in educational policies, the Ministry of Education of Malaysia has decisively enlisted into the trend of employing CEFR in its strategic working for English language education in Malaysia. The launching of the Malaysian Education Blueprint 2013-2025 has generated several curriculum modifications in the Malaysian English as a Second Language (ESL) program, instruction and evaluation and will operate as an instrumentation for a systemic reform of English language education in Malaysia.

The 2015-2025 Roadmap will be a guide for educators in Malaysia to ensure students attain proficiency levels aligned to global standards. This is critical as school propounds the groundwork level for the job market, and Malaysian students are required to be skillful in the language upon graduating their secondary school or tertiary education. Using CEFR, teachers can evaluate how well their students are performing based on the CEFR scale levels and tackle any concern or challenges they encounter with respect to acquiring the language. With the execution of CEFR beginning with primary one students and secondary one pupils in all Malaysian schools in 2016, this more action-oriented and student-based approach guaranteed a level of indispensable changes in teaching, learning and assessment in the ESL classrooms.

However, the most significant factor continues to be the method of implementation of these processes at a micro-level where the actual challenges and outcomes are. According to Iber (2014), if erroneously executed, there is the possibility for a backlash against English as a mandatory subject from the students and system teachers and overseers. In its preliminary stage in which policymakers and stakeholders are yet to get use to the framework, Malaysia has chosen to adopt CEFR into its language curriculum development and gradually examine into its expansion and adapt to its outcomes.

Noteworthy alterations have been put together in lesson plans and the ESL syllabus starting 2019 and the stakeholders have begun adapting particular benchmarks and content to match the needs of Malaysian teachers and learners. While the CEFR framework and notions establish an affinity to Malaysian education instruction, voices from language teachers in classrooms are critical and need to be given consideration (Mison & Jang, 2011). Nevertheless, it will require years to attain an in-depth grasp with numerous studies and evaluation done before creating a complete adaptation.

The Study

It is irrefutable that Malaysia is instigating a revised curriculum based on international benchmarks to enhance its native English language standards. This scholastic reform does solve urgent worries but the implementation of CEFR requires it to be supervised and constantly assessed. However, the Malaysian education structures contain significant intricacy and heterogeneity at school and classroom stages, which are hard to administer through centralized management (Asada, Nixon, & Koen, 2017). We require a more methodical observation of the claims that are attained in associating classroom teaching and language proficiency assessments to the CEFR so that principles can be upheld and any possible bias can be circumvented (Urkun, 2008).

The writers of the CEFR were not very clear about its functions for schoolroom instruction (Westhoff, 2007). According to Zhao, Wang, Coniam, and Xie (2017), the CEFR is at certain occasions challenging to implement due to its language neutral capacity and a concertina-like reference instrument in which inadequate explanations are given on what students should understand in order to perform interrelated language assignments. This can be a cause in diminishing diversity and overlooking the cultural perspective of the country employing the CEFR (Fulcher, 2010). Hence, the duty falls on the shoulders of the classroom teachers to comprehend and exploit CEFR-aligned lessons and assessments to foster their students' ESL proficiency.

Of late, scholars and practitioners have requested for an extension of the CEFR into the area of teacher training, resources development, and syllabus design in an effort to eradicate the disconnection between the concept and the classroom (Mison & Jang, 2011).

This study is interested in looking into the implementation of CEFR in its micro-level in Malaysian secondary schools. Even though CEFR has been commenced and subjected to most stakeholders, especially ESL teachers, for over two years throughout Malaysia in its initial stage, there are still areas that required to be developed such as its operation in the precise territory it is intended to be applied in which is the school system, particularly in CEFR-aligned teaching and assessment practices. Darmi, Saad, Abdullah, Behak, Zakaria, and Adnan (2017) recommended additional research to be done on the connection between English language instruction and CEFR criterions in likelihood that upcoming design of teaching and evaluation can be further established.

Hence, studies should be done to advance methods on language learning techniques and assessments using CEFR. From there, practitioners and other stakeholders are able to reflect and generate the preferred effect of guaranteeing elevated quality of Malaysian students with adequate language proficiency upon graduating their secondary or tertiary education levels. Such studies can also offer a more transparent, intelligible and reliable guideline for English teaching, learning and evaluation for teachers, students and other related stakeholders.

Therefore, the main aim of this preliminary study was to investigate the views and practices of ESL secondary school teachers with regards to the implementation of the CEFR-aligned assessments in their classes. It also explored the challenges encountered by teachers in view of the adoption and adaptation of CEFR onto the lower secondary form English syllabus and assessment.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Fluency in English is no longer just a benefit, but is now a prerequisite for an accumulative number of professional jobs around the globe (Finch, 2009). However, Asada et al. (2017) in their study on productivity in Malaysia revealed that Malaysian students are floundering in mathematics, science and reading in which signifying Malaysia's basic education system was having problems in sustaining our nation's proficiencies with international standards despite delivering an escalating amount of graduates.

A disparity between graduate abilities and employment force requisites is playing a part to underemployment problems the country is currently facing, especially when it comes to English language aptitude and competence. Hence, the CEFR is established in Malaysia to remedy this issue. It is a high level standard all-purpose model (Fulcher, 2010) and a adaptable tool to help in reflection, communication and networking and can be effortlessly adopted and adaptable to most circumstances (Urkun, 2008).

Its establishment into the Malaysian Education Blueprint 2013-2025 breathes new vivacity to the Malaysian ESL education system transforming it from an exam-oriented approach to a more action-oriented approach (Aziz, Ab Rashid, & Zainudin, 2018). Urkun (2008) further stated that numerous commercially-available ELT assessments have now revamped their exit levels matching to the CEFR bands. As many other countries around the world, English language teaching, learning and assessment are experiencing practical change towards the formation of a shared framework of gauging English language ability using appropriate scales. This can be seen in various studies in Asian countries, for example, in China (Zhao et al., 2017), Korea (Finch, 2009) and Vietnam (Ngo, 2017) apart from countless studies made on CEFR throughout the world.

CEFR-aligned assessment tools such as language portfolio, peer assessment, self-evaluation, and others are encouraged to be used in schools to consolidate learning and existing conventional teaching methods (Le, 2018; Read, 2014). Educators and instructors are inspired to delve into inventive means of assessing and developing students' interest and proficiency in the language in and out of classroom and their main role is to facilitate learning.

Challenges faced with regards to implementation of CEFR have been studied extensively to reimagine language instruction and to recuperate the employment of CEFR in numerous spheres of teaching and learning in different states and nations (Broek & van den Ende, 2013; Darmi et al., 2017; Iber, 2014; Pillai, 2017; Westhoff, 2007). Moonen, Stoutjesdijk, de Graaff, and Corda (2013) in their study showed that the use of CEFR is most prevalent in the use of CEFR-related textbooks but only a handful number of teachers employ CEFR-aligned instruments in their teaching.

Mison and Jang (2011) stated that teachers' fears in executing CEFR in their classrooms should be of highest importance to raise your spirits to support and participate in the adaptation of CEFR in a country. In looking at the

Malaysian Education Reform in primary schools in Malaysia, Azman (2016) and Sidhu, Kaur, and Chi (2018) called for ample support and professional training for the teachers and the development of operational CEFR-aligned syllabus and assessments by pinpointing difficulties faced by teachers and this was also echoed in Lo (2018) study of Malaysian lower secondary school teachers.

Uri and Aziz (2018) further reasoned that extra time should be provided in such professional improvement in relation to CEFR to guarantee all teachers are completely equipped with its strategies and knowledge and are very acquainted with the framework. From these findings, there is a need to nurture the implementation of CEFR-aligned educational innovations at school and teacher level.

III. METHODOLOGY/MATERIALS

In order to gain initial insight into the views and practice of Malaysian ESL teachers, the study was done to investigate their knowledge on CEFR and CEFR-aligned assessment, the frequency of practice and problems faced by school teachers when implementing CEFR-aligned assessment in their classrooms.

The respondents in this preliminary study involved Malaysian secondary school ESL teachers from various states in Malaysia. As parties who are directly engaged in assimilating CEFR-aligned teaching and assessment tools in their ESL classrooms (Uri & Aziz, 2018), teachers can offer a common agreement on the degree of execution level and frequency of applicable tools that can be used in cultivating their ESL students' proficiency.

After two years of top-down trainings by master trainers and curriculum alignment and content adaptation, these teachers should be well- familiarized to employing CEFR-aligned assessment in their own classrooms (Aziz et al., 2018). Secondary school teachers are chosen as they serve to give middle stage level education to Malaysian students. This is the bridge between beginner level (preschool and primacy schools) and higher level (tertiary education) and any problem in implementing CEFR-aligned assessment can be clearly identified at this stage.

Data for the study was collected using online questionnaire in the form of Google Form. The target group consisted of Malaysian ESL school teachers from lower secondary school level. The link for the questionnaire was sent to various individuals of the selected group and, at the request of the researcher, these individuals would forward the link to other teachers of the same category. This random convenient sampling method was done in a short duration from April 10 to 14, 2019. Due to this limitation, a total of 30 teachers responded.

Section 1 of the questionnaire comprised 6 general questions related to respondents' demographic background. Unlike section 1, sections 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 totally utilized Likert scale items. Likert scale items were chosen because they are simple to construct and analyze, and likely to produce a highly reliable scale and easy to read and complete by the respondents (Uri & Aziz, 2018).

For sections 2 (10 items on the viewpoints of respondents on CEFR), 3 (11 items on the implementation of CEFR-aligned assessment by respondents) and 6 (12 items on the challenges faced by respondents in CEFR implementation), this study employed a six-point scale response ranging from 6 = Strongly Agree, 5 = Agree, 4 = Slightly Agree, 3 = Slightly Disagree, 2 = Disagree and 1 = Strongly Disagree. Sections 4 and 5 of the questionnaire comprised 13 items related to the tools used by respondents and 6 items on feedbacks given by them respectively

with a six-point frequency scale ranging from 6 = Always, 5 = Very Frequently, 4 = Occasionally, 3 = Rarely, 2 = Very Rarely and 1 = Never.

The closed-ended questionnaire was constructed by the researcher based on the objectives of the preliminary study. The items in the questionnaire were influenced and adapted from three published journal articles (Lo, 2018; Sidhu et al., 2018; Uri & Aziz, 2018).

IV. RESULTS AND FINDINGS

Out of the 30 teachers who responded to the questionnaire, 28 were females and only 2 males responded of mixed teaching experiences. The data from the findings were analyzed to answer four main research questions posed in this study:

1. What are the teacher's views and understanding of CEFR as a whole and the CEFR-aligned assessment in general?
2. What are the teachers' perceptions of implementing CEFR-aligned assessment in their classes?
3. What tools are used by the teachers and their frequency of use?
4. What are the challenges faced by the teachers in implementing CEFR?

Teachers' Views on the Implementation of CEFR into ESL Syllabus and Assessment

The data from the findings were shown in Table 1. To answer the first and second research objectives which are to investigate teachers' views and understanding of CEFR and their perceptions of its implementation in class assessment, participants were required to read statements from Section 2 and 3 and indicate their extent of agreement or disagreement.

The results reveal that more than half of the respondents are familiar with CEFR (66.67%) and do have the knowledge on its practices (70%) and have read the necessary documents (76.67%). Majority also agreed that CEFR affect their students positively (76.67%) in terms of preparing for post-school (76.67%), elevating their English proficiency level (76.67%) and giving them a chance to compete internationally (83.33%). Due to that, most respondents accepted CEFR in their teaching practices (73.33%) and deemed it appropriate (66.67%) to be used in their own classes (73.33%).

However, most of the other responses appear to be divisive with majority of the responses leaned heavily either on slightly disagree or slightly agree descriptors. Half of the teachers have sufficient understanding of the CEFR-aligned assessment standards (53.33%). Their awareness of CEFR-aligned assessment tools are of concern (only 56.67% are aware of CEFR-aligned tools but the number of respondents are using ICT tools in classrooms is slightly higher at 60%.

Even though only 14 respondents have no problem incorporating CEFR into their lessons (46.67%), 23 respondents admitted that they faced difficulty in designing assessments based on the CEFR descriptors (76.67%). Only 33.33% of the respondents focus on CEFR can-do descriptors and 46.67% admitted they were more concerned of finishing the syllabus than on CEFR-aligned assessment. Hence, only 14 respondents agreed that all ESL lessons should include CEFR-aligned assessments (46.67%).

Table 1: Teachers' Views on CEFR and CEFR-aligned Assessment

Examples of Items	*Strongly Disagree*	*Disagree*	*Slightly Disagree*	*Slightly Agree*	*Agree*	*Strongly Agree*
I am familiar with CEFR.	0	0	10	4	14	2
I have sufficient knowledge on CEFR.	0	3	6	14	4	3
I have read CEFR documents.	0	0	7	6	14	3
I am keen to accept CEFR.	1	3	4	11	8	3
CEFR is appropriate in my class.	4	0	6	7	8	5
I am in favor to use CEFR-aligned assessment.	1	0	7	8	12	2
I understand the CEFR-aligned assessment standards.	0	0	14	7	9	0
I know the types of CEFR-aligned assessments that can be used in my class.	0	1	12	8	9	0
I find the CEFR-compatible textbook suitable to be used in my class.	1	3	9	11	5	1
I have sufficient knowledge of the use of ICT tools for CEFR-aligned assessments.	3	3	6	9	9	0
It is easy to incorporate CEFR in my teaching and formative assessment.	1	4	11	11	0	3
It is a challenge for me to design formative assessments based on CEFR descriptors.	0	1	6	11	9	3
I focus more on key strategies and answers for CEFR-aligned assessments than on CEFR can-do descriptors.	1	0	9	14	6	0
I am more concerned with students achieving the required learning outcomes than students improving their language proficiency.	3	3	10	9	5	0
I think all lessons should include CEFR-aligned formative assessment.	3	5	8	10	4	0

Teachers' Use of CEFR-Aligned Assessment Tools

The data from the findings were shown in Table 2. To answer the third research objective which is to investigate types of CEFR-aligned assessment and feedbacks used by the teachers, participants were required to read items from Section 4 and 5 and indicate the frequency of their practices for each item.

The results reveal many respondents prefer conventional methods of assessing their students such as written quizzes (93.33%), oral quizzes (80%), textbook exercises (80%) and worksheet exercises (73.33%).

The teachers also prefer to use interactive methods for classroom activities such as group discussions (93.33%), i-Think maps (86.67%), mind maps (80%), role plays (76.67%) and language games (76.67%).

Coincidentally, activities that require continuous effort from students and constant attention and guidance from teachers such as portfolio and scrapbooking are rarely used by the respondents (46.67% and 30% respectively). Activities which consume classroom time such as slide presentations and feedback slips where teachers need to assess the students individually are also less focused on (36.67% and 40% respectively).

Table 2: Teachers' use of CEFR-aligned Assessment Tools and Feedbacks

Examples of Tools	Never	Very Rare	Rare	Occasionally	Very Frequently	Always
Worksheet exercises	0	1	7	14	6	2
Portfolio	0	8	9	11	3	0
Scrapbooking	2	6	13	9	0	0
Mind mapping	0	1	5	9	12	3
Oral Quizzes	0	1	5	9	12	3
Written Quizzes	1	0	1	14	9	3
Textbook Exercises	0	0	6	6	7	11
i-Think maps	0	0	4	14	11	1
Group Discussions	0	0	2	9	18	1
Role Plays	1	2	4	12	8	3
Language Games	0	1	6	8	14	1
Slide Presentations	5	3	11	10	1	0
Feedback Slips	3	6	9	8	4	0
Written Feedback	0	0	8	15	6	1
Oral Feedback	0	0	0	13	12	5
Marks	0	0	4	14	9	3
Grades	0	0	5	15	9	1
Peer Evaluation	2	3	8	10	7	0

In general, the teachers provided a variety of feedbacks to their students even though 60% of the respondents took longer time to provide sufficient feedbacks.

Compared to written feedbacks (73.33%), all respondents constantly provided oral feedback (100%) which shows it is the easiest way for them to develop students' ESL proficiency. The respondents also prefer to give marks (86.67%) or grade (83.33%) to their students to help facilitate their learning. Only 17 out of the 30 respondents encouraged peer evaluation (56.67%).

Challenges Encountered by Teachers in Implementation of CEFR

The final research question explored the challenges teachers encountered when implementing CEFR-aligned assessment which are presented in Table 3. Many saw themselves as one of the challenges in the implementation of CEFR (76.67%).

Majority agreed that the extra administrative duties given to them in their schools (90%) and the heavy teaching workload (90%) served as major problems for them to implement CEFR successfully. The students' different level of proficiency in a class prove to be a bane for teachers when practicing CEFR (86.67%).

Furthermore, various events held in schools also served as a distraction for them (86.67%). With the exception of textbook use (40%) and lack of administrative support (43.33%), half or more of the respondents agreed they are facing problems implementing CEFR in their classrooms due to a variety of factors.

Table 3: The Challenges in Adapting CEFR in Teaching and Learning

Examples of Items	*Strongly Disagree*	*Disagree*	*Slightly Disagree*	*Slightly Agree*	*Agree*	*Strongly Agree*
I see myself as one of the challenges in the implementation of CEFR in Malaysia.	0	4	3	7	11	5
I do not have enough time to prepare my daily teaching based on CEFR.	1	1	9	5	11	3
I have difficulties following the CEFR-aligned scheme of work in the lesson plan given.	0	1	10	8	8	3
I have difficulties in using the CEFR-compatible textbook as it was intended.	1	5	12	6	6	0
Insufficient teaching and learning materials	0	3	9	12	3	3
Insufficient training on CEFR	0	3	6	7	5	9
Lack of clear guidelines	0	3	7	9	5	6
Lack of students' interest	0	0	7	9	5	6
Frequent ad-hoc meetings and attending courses	1	8	6	6	9	0
Additional administrative duties	0	0	3	9	10	8
Heavy teaching workload	0	0	3	7	9	11
Numerous school events and activities	1	0	4	5	9	11
Large class size	0	4	9	3	6	8
Varied students' language ability and proficiency	3	0	1	6	14	6
Need to complete syllabus	0	1	4	6	11	8
Too many assessments to conduct	0	1	5	9	6	9

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

From the findings, the impact of CEFR-aligned outcomes on the assessment practice of teachers could be seen in higher frequency of assessments given by teachers to students but it is still not extensively practiced even after two years of implementation. The findings supported Sidhu et al. (2018) study that the implementation of CEFR in schools is still insufficient. The good news is, echoing past studies done by Uri and Aziz (2018), Sidhu et al. (2018) and Lo (2018), teachers are positive and generally receptive of the CEFR framework and its advantages. Most teachers are familiar with CEFR after it is implemented for two years. This contradicts Uri and Aziz (2018) study indicating the unfamiliarity of CEFR by teachers. However, the findings indicate lack of understanding and awareness of the incorporation of CEFR into classroom assessment as teachers needed more guidance and training for them to fully understand and utilize more innovative CEFR-aligned assessments in their classrooms. This was agreed by Aziz et al. (2018) that despite several efforts made in training of Malaysian teachers to apply and practice CEFR-aligned teaching and assessment in the past two years, there are still various aspects that need improvements.

In Lo (2018) study, he stated that lower secondary school ESL teachers are generally well familiar with the CEFR innovation but this study generally shows the opposite is happening where teachers having difficulty in designing CEFR-aligned assessments. Most practices of assessment for learning were found to be frequently practiced by ESL teachers (Aziz et al., 2018). This is supported from the findings where teachers employed a variety of assessments and feedbacks in their classrooms. However, echoing Sidhu et al. (2018) and Moonen et al. (2013) studies, many are still falling back to the conventional textbook exercises as their standard practice and guide in developing students' ESL proficiency. The conventional methods used by teachers from the findings indicate that

the teaching and learning in standard classrooms are still teacher-based where teachers act as instructors. Many are still primarily focused on task outcomes than developing their students' proficiency (Lo, 2018) due to time constraint in finishing the syllabus.

More celebrated CEFR-aligned self-assessment tools such as portfolio and scrapbooking are still less favored by teachers as many preferred one-off activities to assess their students' current performance and understanding in contrast with studies by Le (2018) and Read (2014) on assessment practices in Vietnam and East Asia respectively which instructors focused more on peer and self-assessment tools. Le (2018) highlighted that in order for CEFR to allow a convincing impression on our education targets, focus should be modified to more peer assessment and self-reflection practices in classroom learning that renovates teacher as facilitators of learning.

As opposed to Sidhu et al. (2018) findings, teachers do provide sufficient feedbacks to their students as teachers want to use the results for actions that support learning (Hopster-den Otter, Wools, Eggen, & Veldkamp, 2017). However, the findings do support the former's study in which peer assessment is not favored by teachers and teachers still find implementing CEFR as a challenge due to various factors such as administrative duties and heavy teaching workload. This shows that there is no difference in problems faced by primary school teachers in Sidhu et al. (2018) study with secondary school teachers in this study.

In conclusion, this paper has shown that, in general, teachers have a basic understanding of CEFR and appreciate its utility as a tool to compare target language proficiency on an international level. However, its use in daily teaching and assessment practice is in most cases limited to the use of CEFR-related textbooks and conventional methods. Assessment transparency and consistency are needed to further strengthen the use of CEFR in schools and classrooms. This can be found to varying degrees in pedagogical approaches of teachers. Hence, their voices need to be utilized and their perspectives on the CEFR framework need to be shared in order to meet the expectations and demands of what is currently missing in Malaysian ESL education. From there, the CEFR-aligned syllabus and assessment can be further standardized for a clearer understanding and implementation of CEFR into Malaysian classroom teaching and assessment.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

REFERENCES

[1] Asada, H., Nixon, S., & Koen, V. (2017). Boosting productivity in Malaysia. *OECD Economics Department Working Papers, No 1370*.
[2] Aziz, A.H.A.A., Ab Rashid, R., & Zainudin, W.Z.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.
[3] Azman, H. (2016). Implementation and challenges of English language education reform in Malaysian primary schools. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature®, 22*(3), 65-78.
[4] Broek, S., & van den Ende, I. (2013). *The Implementation of the Common European Framework for Languages in European Education Systems: Study*: EUR-OP.

[5]   Darmi, R., Saad, N.S.M., Abdullah, N., Behak, F.P., Zakaria, Z.A., & Adnan, J.N.I. (2017). Teachers' views on students' performance in English language proficiency courses via CEFR descriptors. *IJAEDU-International E-Journal of Advances in Education, 3*(8), 363-370.

[6]   Finch, A.E. (2009). Europass and the CEFR: Implications for language teaching in Korea. *English Language and Literature Teaching, 15*(2), 71-92.

[7]   Fulcher, G. (2010). The reification of the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) and effect-driven testing. *Advances in research on language acquisition and Teaching: Selected Papers*, 15-26.

[8]   Hopster-den Otter, D., Wools, S., Eggen, T.J., & Veldkamp, B.P. (2017). Formative use of test results: A user's perspective. *Studies in educational evaluation, 52*, 12-23.

[9]   Iber, G. (2014). English language teaching in Malaysia: The case for a dual track English curriculum. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 5*(4), 68-71.

[10]   Le, H.T.T. (2018). Impacts of the CEFR-Aligned Learning Outcomes Implementation on Assessment Practice. *Hue University Journal of Science: Social Sciences and Humanities, 127*(6B), 87-99.

[11]   Lo, Y.Y. (2018). English Teachers' concern on Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR): An Application of CBAM. *JuKu: Jurnal Kurikulum & Pengajaran Asia Pasifik, 6*(1), 46-58.

[12]   Mison, S., & Jang, I.C. (2011). Canadian FSL teachers' assessment practices and needs: Implications for the adoption of the CEFR in a Canadian context. *Synergies Europe, 6*, 99-108.

[13]   Moonen, M., Stoutjesdijk, E., de Graaff, R., & Corda, A. (2013). Implementing CEFR in secondary education: impact on FL teachers' educational and assessment practice. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 23*(2), 226-246.

[14]   Ngo, X.M. (2017). Diffusion of the CEFR among Vietnamese teachers: A mixed methods investigation. *Asian EFL Journal, 19*(1), 7-32.

[15]   Pillai, S. (2017). Local features of English pronunciation: To embrace or ignore in the ELT classroom. *Journal of English Language, Literature, and Teaching, 1*(1), 1-8.

[16]   Read, J. (2014). The influence of the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) in the Asia-Pacific region. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 33-39.

[17]   Sidhu, G.K., Kaur, S., & Chi, L.J. (2018). CEFR-aligned school-based assessment in the Malaysian primary ESL classroom. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 8*(2), 452-463.

[18]   Uri, N.F.M., & Aziz, M.S.A. (2018). Implementation of CEFR in Malaysia: Teachers' awareness and the Challenges. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature®, 24*(3), 168-183.

[19]   Urkun, Z. (2008). *Re-evaluating the CEFR: an attempt.* Paper presented at the The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFRL): Benefits and Limitations. IATEFL TEA SIG Croatia Conference Proceedings.

[20]   Westhoff, G. (2007). Challenges and opportunities of the CEFR for reimagining foreign language pedagogy. *The Modern Language Journal, 91*(4), 676-679.

[21]   Zhao, W., Wang, B., Coniam, D., & Xie, B. (2017). Calibrating the CEFR against the China Standards of English for College English vocabulary education in China. *Language Testing in Asia, 7*(5), 1-18.