

## How Do the Indonesian Pre-service Teachers Perceive CEFR?

**Titis Dewi Cakrawati**  
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia  
titisdewi@uny.ac.id

**Antonius Setyawan Sugeng Nur Agung**  
Unika Santo Agustinus Hippo Landak, Indonesia  
antonius.setyawan.007@gmail.com

**Arif Nugroho**  
UIN Raden Mas Said, Surakarta, Indonesia  
arif.nugroho@iain-surakarta.ac.id

**Rizki Ramadhan**  
Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia  
rizkiramadhan@unesa.ac.id

**Abstract.** The Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) provides a basis for developing language education curriculum, conducting language learning and teaching, and administering language assessment. In the Indonesian context, the recently launched *Kurikulum Merdeka* refers to the CEFR that targets the English Proficiency levels that should be achieved in the English Subject across different schooling levels. Hence, teachers' understanding and perceptions of the framework become important. This study examined the pre-service EFL teachers' perception of the CEFR. A 5-point Likert Scale questionnaire and semi-structured interviews were conducted to collect quantitative and qualitative data from 49 pre-service EFL teachers selected through a random sampling technique. The results showed that the participants had positive perceptions of the CEFR, but they had a limited to a moderate understanding level of the CEFR. They only received limited CEFR exposure from a course in their teacher training program. They also mostly associated the CEFR with standardized testing and language certification without understanding the underlying principles of the framework. More comprehensive CEFR training for teacher candidates should be considered before *Kurikulum Merdeka* is compulsorily implemented. Also, the research can play a crucial role in shaping language education by influencing curriculum development, teacher training, policy decisions, quality assurance measures, student outcomes, and ongoing professional development within the field.

**Keywords:** CEFR, EFL, *Kurikulum Merdeka*, Pre-service Teacher

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Governments across the globe have put great emphasis on English education as a means to improve their countries' competitiveness in the global era. Various English language curricula, approaches, and teaching strategies have been developed by numerous experts to assist learners in becoming proficient users of the language (Khair & Shah, 2021). In the Indonesian context, the English education curriculum has been reformed periodically (Pajarwati et al., 2021; Rohimajaya et al., 2022). The English curriculum in Indonesia has progressed from Curriculum 1945-1950 without clear approaches and methods, *Kurikulum Gaya Lama* in 1954 with the grammar translation method, *Kurikulum Gaya Baru* in 1964, its revised version in 1968, and Curriculum 1975 with the audio-lingual method, Curriculum 1984 and Curriculum 1994 with the communicative approach, the Competence based Curriculum in 2001, to Curriculum 2004, *KTSP*, and the 2013 Curriculum with the SFL genre-based approach (Emilia, 2016; Rohimajaya et al., 2022). However, all the curriculum transformations have yet to yield a satisfactory result. The EF English Proficiency Index in Southeast Asia (2020) showed that Indonesia's English Proficiency Index was far below Singapore, the Philippines, and Malaysia.

The 2013 curriculum is still being implemented in most Indonesian schools. However, the Ministry of Education and Culture has launched a new curriculum called *Kurikulum Merdeka* in early 2022. The newly launched curriculum, which is student-centred and emphasizes differentiated learning (Aisyiyah, 2020), is expected to recover the learning loss during the COVID-19 pandemic (Rizaldi & Fatimah, 2022). The implementation of *Kurikulum Merdeka* is currently optional (Kamil, 2023). Schools may choose to continue using the 2013 Curriculum or adopt the new curriculum. Furthermore, although the English language education in *Kurikulum Merdeka* still relies heavily on the Genre-based Approach, the English education's objectives in this curriculum refer to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) (Kemendikbudristek, 2021). The goal of the English subject in this curriculum is to assist students in achieving at least the CEFR's B1 level upon completing Senior High School or its equivalent schooling levels (Kemendikbudristek, 2021). By referring to the proficiency levels of CEFR in determining the learning objectives of the English subject in *Kurikulum Merdeka*, the English education policy in Indonesia has started to attempt to align national assessment to internationally recognised proficiency. Although it remains to be seen to what extent *Kurikulum Merdeka* will incorporate the CEFR into English teaching practices, teachers' and pre-service teachers' understandings and perceptions of the CEFR become important.

Various studies have examined practitioners' perceptions of the CEFR in Asian contexts. Khair & Shah (2021) studied issues and challenges of the CEFR implementation in Malaysia from ESL teachers' perceptions. The results showed that teachers felt they had limited knowledge and minimal exposure to the CEFR practices. Kok & Aziz (2019) also examined English language teachers' perspectives on CEFR implementation in elementary schools in Malaysia. The research reported that many teachers had limited knowledge and experience with the CEFR. However, the teachers were optimistic that the CEFR-aligned curriculum could improve English education in the country. Kanchai (2019) explored the CEFR's impact on Thai EFL university lecturers' teaching practices. Although the results revealed that the lecturers

demonstrated a relatively good understanding of the CEFR in the assessment domain, they had limited insight into the action-oriented approach underlying the CEFR. In European contexts, a study conducted in Turkiye showed that although teachers displayed positive attitudes towards the CEFR, they had little or no CEFR training and had difficulty implementing the framework in their classes (Tosun & Glover, 2020). Díez-Bedmar & Byram (2019) also conducted a research project addressing the teachers' familiarity and perspectives of the CEFR in Spain. She attempted to discover the 44 in-service teachers' perspectives on the CEFR. The research results reported that the in-service teachers were highly familiar with CEFR but had limited knowledge of the changes that the CEFR had made since its first publication.

Regarding the relevant literature, few studies have been conducted on Indonesian pre-service EFL teachers' perceptions of the CEFR. Indonesia has a rich and diverse cultural landscape with many languages and dialects across the archipelago. Understanding how pre-service teachers in Indonesia perceive the CEFR can provide insights into how a framework developed in a European context is understood and adapted in a completely different cultural setting. Indonesia is known for its linguistic diversity, with hundreds of languages spoken. Pre-service teachers' perceptions of the CEFR may be influenced by the multilingual nature of the country, and the research could explore how the framework aligns with or needs adjustments for a multilingual educational environment. Also, the structure and focus of the Indonesian educational system are unique. Investigating pre-service teachers' perceptions in this context can provide valuable information on how the CEFR aligns with or challenges the existing educational practices and policies in Indonesia. Furthermore, Indonesia has its language education policies and priorities. Research in this area can uncover how the CEFR aligns with or contrasts these policies, shedding light on the potential challenges or synergies in incorporating a European framework into a Southeast Asian educational context. As Indonesia continues to emphasize global competence and internationalization in its education system, understanding how pre-service teachers perceive the CEFR can contribute to discussions on the role of international frameworks in preparing students for global communication and collaboration. Research findings can have practical implications for language teaching methodologies in Indonesia. It may identify areas where the CEFR can enhance language instruction or adjustments are needed to make it more applicable and effective in the Indonesian context. The research can uncover any unique challenges Indonesian pre-service teachers face in understanding or implementing the CEFR. Identifying these challenges can pave the way for developing targeted solutions and support mechanisms. Since the study is in the intersection of cultural diversity, linguistic complexity, unique educational structures, and the evolving landscape of language education policies in Indonesia, it can contribute to understanding the CEFR and the broader discourse on global frameworks in diverse educational settings. Hence, this study seeks to answer the question 'How do Indonesian pre-service EFL teachers perceive CEFR?'

The Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) is a standardized language learning and teaching document developed by the Council of Europe in 2001 (Kanchai, 2019), and it has since been updated and added with a companion volume (Council of Europe, 2020; Schneider, 2020). The CEFR offers practical guidelines for developing language curriculum and syllabus, developing language learning materials, developing and administering language testing and assessment, and other areas of

language education (Supunya, 2022).

CEFR is notably known for its categorization of language users' proficiency in three bands and six levels: basic users (A1 and A2), independent users (B1 and B2), and proficient users (C1 and C2) (Fleckenstein et al., 2020; Saville, 2010; Schneider, 2020). These three levels were not entirely novel; most EFL teachers and learners should be familiar with the distinction between beginner, intermediate, and advanced learner levels established before the CEFR was published (Deygers, 2021; Schneider, 2020). Since its release, the CEFR has faced criticism for several reasons. The framework has been criticised because it lacks scale for some descriptors. Its complexity causes difficulties for practitioners in understanding and implementing the framework (Schneider, 2020). The CEFR's descriptors were designed based on teachers' perspectives and experiences instead of learners' empirical data (Hynninen, 2014). To address the critiques, the Companion Volume (CV) was developed. The CEFR Companion Volume addresses teaching for competence in action; alignment of planning, teaching, and assessment; language learners seen as social agents, an integrated approach using four modes: reception, production, interaction, and mediation; and plurilingual education (North, 2021). Plurilingual competence, pluricultural competence, and mediation have garnered massive attention because they are increasingly becoming relevant (Schneider, 2020).

The action-oriented approach has been consistently mentioned in the CEFR versions 2001, 2018, and 2020, demonstrating its significance for language learning and development within the framework. The CEFR states that language development can be cultivated through social agenda-driven actions that enable communicative ability and activate specific discursive strategies (Novawan et al., 2023).

Van Lier in Novawan et al. (2023) proposed the action-based approach relying on Vygotsky's Socio-cultural Theory and Gibson's Affordance Theory of Cognitive Psychology. Within this framework, ecological situations play a vital role in encouraging and enhancing learners' participation (Kramsch & Steffensen, 2008). It suggests the learning environment's significance in enabling learners to engage in ecological learning as social agents, act in real-life situations, and complete tasks of different natures; this type of learning is transformative (Council of Europe, 2001, 2008, 2020). The CEFR is more than just three levels of language proficiency. Therefore, language teachers must note the innovative perceptions of language learning and teaching within the CEFR.

CEFR was developed specifically for European contexts and needs. However, Europe is diverse regarding race, culture, language, and education. Therefore, the CEFR is also ideal for adoption or adaptation outside European countries. In Asian contexts, Japan has adapted the CEFR for language education nationally, and research suggests that the language education in the country benefits from the framework (Moser, 2018; Negishi, 2022). Vietnam also adapted the CEFR to fit the country's contexts and needs to improve its language education system (Foley, 2019). In Malaysia and China, adapting the CEFR was also seen as a critical step to improve language education and a more transparent language education system (Foley, 2019). It should also be noted that the CEFR works most effectively if combined with other literature because the framework is not a complete document and is still open to changes (Moser, 2018). Each country could refer to the framework tailored to its needs and context.

## 2. METHOD

This study employed the mixed-methods design (Nassaji, 2015) with a survey and semi-structured interviews to collect the data. Both the survey and semi-structured interviews were conducted in March 2023. The quantitative data of the pre-service EFL teachers were collected using a 5-point Likert-scale questionnaire (from 1= strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree) consisting of 11 items. The questionnaire was adapted from the studies of Phoolaikao & Sukying (2021) and Martyniuk & Noijons (2007), covering pre-service teachers' familiarity with the CEFR, their perceptions towards the CEFR as the guideline for designing and conducting teaching and learning, as well as the CEFR as the guideline for developing and administering assessment. The questionnaire was distributed through Google Forms, involving 49 participants. The participants were third-year students of the English Education Department in an Islamic State University in Cirebon, West Java, Indonesia. The items' validity and reliability were measured with Pearson's Product-moment Correlation and Cronbach's Alpha Correlation. All 11 items had a significant. Values  $< 0.05$  were considered valid. In terms of reliability, the items were also considered reliable with the Cronbach's Alpha  $> 0.6$ .

**Table 1.** Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.894	11

The qualitative data were collected through semi-structured interviews with five randomly selected participants, which were conducted to explore the survey data further.

## 3. RESULT

The data collected from the questionnaire were analysed using the SPSS software, and the semi-structured interview results were analysed with thematic analysis. Of the 49 pre-service EFL teachers who responded to the questionnaire, 8 (16.33%) were male, and 41 (83.67%) were female. Their age ranged from 19 to 24.

### 3.1. *Pre-service Teachers' Familiarity with the CEFR*

Three items explore pre-service EFL teachers' familiarity with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). The data is based on a sample of 49 participants who were asked to rate their familiarity with the CEFR on a scale of 1 to 5, with one being strongly disagree and five being strongly agree.

**Table 2.** Participants' familiarity with the CEFR

No	Item	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	have read CEFR-related documents	49	1	5	3.49	.960
2	I am very familiar with CEFR	49	1	4	2.80	.816

3	Received an introduction to CEFR from the English Education Program	49	3	5	4.08	.759
---	---	----	---	---	------	------

Item number 1 (I have read CEFR-related documents) has a mean score of 3.49, suggesting that participants are moderately familiar with the CEFR-related documents. Item number 2 (I am very familiar with the CEFR) obtained a mean score of 2.80, indicating that they perceived themselves as less familiar with the CEFR. Meanwhile, the last item (I received an introduction to CEFR from the English Education Program) had a mean score of 4.08, showing that, on average, the participants had obtained information related to the framework from their teacher training program.

The qualitative data were also consistent with the survey results on this aspect. The participants had heard about the CEFR but could not provide more details about the framework.

**Table 3.** Interview results on CEFR in the teaching and learning aspect

Question	What do you know about CEFR?
Participant 1	I have heard about CEFR from my lecturer. It is about mapping the language learning program, covering purposes such as lesson planning, teaching, learning, and assessments.
Participant 2	I do not know much about CEFR, but it relates to TOEFL and IELTS.
Participant 3	CEFR can be the global standard of Someone's English level or English skills.
Participant 4	It is for knowing the level of students' proficiency in English.
Participant 5	I think CEFR is used to make a standard for English proficiency.

Overall, these data indicate that although pre-service EFL teachers perceived themselves as familiar with the CEFR to some extent, there was still space for growth, especially concerning their knowledge of the CEFR. The pre-service teachers' perspective of the CEFR tends to be oversimplified. Most participants (Participant 1, Participant 2, Participant 3, and Participant 4) merely associated the CEFR with standardized English tests such as TOEFL and IELTS. This simplification can lead to possibly too much emphasis on language testing, and Freeman (2017) called this the 'deficit view' of teachers. This concern was also addressed by Novawan et al., (2023) stating that this kind of perspective may result in superficial comprehension and problematic adoption of the CEFR without taking note of the innovative views of language learning such as 'culture', 'interculturality', or 'learner profile' provided by the CEFR. Only one participant (Participant 1) associated the CEFR with language lesson planning, teaching, learning, and language assessment. This participant, who had their English Education Program introduce them to the CEFR, seemed to know more about it, demonstrating the value of such training programs in preparing teacher

candidates for their future jobs.

### 3.2. CEFR as the Guideline for Designing and Conducting English Teaching and Learning

The second aspect is the participants' perceptions of the CEFR as a guideline for designing and conducting English teaching and learning. Four items explored this variable.

**Table 4.** Participants' perceptions of the CEFR as the Guideline for Designing and Conducting English Teaching and Learning

No	Item	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	CEFR can be a guideline for English language teaching practices	49	2	5	4.10	.872
2	CEFR is an essential document for curriculum design in English language teaching.	49	2	5	3.90	.872
3	CEFR can be a guidebook used to design teaching materials.	49	2	5	3.84	.943
4	CEFR can enhance learners' English Proficiency in the Indonesian context.	49	2	5	3.76	.925

The participants highly believed that the CEFR can be a guideline for their English teaching practices, as shown by the mean score of 4.10 for item 4 ("CEFR can be a guideline for developing English language teaching"). For item number 5, "CEFR is an essential document for curriculum design in English language teaching," a mean score of 3.90 was obtained, indicating that the participants moderately agreed that CEFR is beneficial for designing the English education curriculum. Meanwhile, for the last item, participants also moderately agreed that the CEFR could enhance learners' English proficiency. The findings imply that pre-service EFL teachers view the CEFR as a helpful resource for planning and carrying out English teaching and learning.

**Table 5.** Interview results on CEFR in the language teaching and learning aspect

Question	From your perspective, is CEFR helpful in planning and developing curricula/ syllabi in language education?
Participant 1	It would be helpful if curricula/syllabi were planned and developed according to the learners' CEFR level.
Participant 2	I am not sure about this. I still do not know how to implement CEFR when designing lesson plans.
Participant 3	It is beneficial since, by referring to CEFR, we can more precisely meet students' needs, although I do not have the experience to develop a lesson plan or syllabus based on CEFR.

- Participant 4 CEFR is very useful. It allows us to obtain information about our students' level of English proficiency, which allows us to design English learning that suits their levels and needs.
- Participant 5 With CEFR, the content of our English lessons can be adjusted to our students' levels.

The interview results are also consistent with the survey results. The interview results showed that most pre-service teachers find the CEFR helpful in planning and developing language learning curricula/syllabuses. This suggests that the CEFR is deemed helpful for language educators to tailor language learning materials and activities to the needs and levels of their students.

It is also interesting to note that Participant 2 and Participant 3 expressed uncertainty in implementing the CEFR when designing the lesson plans and syllabus. Although the participants perceived themselves as familiar with the CEFR, they admitted not knowing how to integrate the framework into their lesson planning. This highlights the need for more training and guidance on effectively implementing the CEFR for teachers and candidates.

### 3.3. CEFR as the Guideline for Designing and Administering English Test and Assessment

The third aspect is the pre-service EFL teachers' perceptions of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) as a guideline for designing and administering English tests and assessment. As many as four items were used to explore this aspect.

**Table 6.** Participants' perceptions of the CEFR as the Guideline for Designing and Administering English Test and Assessment

No	Item	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	The development of language assessment should be aligned with the CEFR descriptions.	49	1	5	3.73	.995
2	The language assessment designs should be consistent and aim to improve language proficiency.	49	2	5	4.04	.957
3	The language assessment results can be used to identify English language proficiency.	49	2	5	3.90	1.005
4	CEFR should be referred to for assessing students in EFL classes in Indonesia.	49	1	5	3.67	.987

Looking at the mean scores of each item, the participants moderately agreed that the development of language assessment should be aligned with the CEFR descriptions

(mean=3.73), highly agreed that the language assessment designs should be consistent and aim to improve language proficiency (mean=4.04), and moderately agreed that the results of the language assessment can be used to identify English language proficiency (mean=3.90). The participants were somewhat unsure about utilizing the CEFR as a reference for assessing students in EFL lessons in Indonesia, as indicated by the mean score for item 11, which was 3.67.

**Table 7.** Interview results on CEFR in the language testing and assessment aspect

<i>Question</i>	<i>From your perspective, is CEFR helpful in planning and developing testing/assessment in language education?</i>
<i>Participant 1</i>	<i>It helps plan and develop language education, testing, assessment, and certification.</i>
<i>Participant 2</i>	<i>Yes, definitely for language certification.</i>
<i>Participant 3</i>	<i>Yes, it is extremely useful since we can get an international certification.</i>
<i>Participant 4</i>	<i>I think it cannot always be helpful. For designing the syllabus, it might be yes, but I think it is not for this [assessment].</i>
<i>Participant 5</i>	<i>Yes, it is useful, but it depends on the curriculum used.</i>

Consistent with the survey, the interview results also showed that almost all participants perceived the CEFR as applicable for language assessment—only one participant stated that the CEFR applies for syllabus design but not assessment development. The interview results also suggest that the pre-service EFL teachers mostly associated the CEFR with standardized language testing and language certification. These perceptions could lead to problematic adoptions or adaptations of the CEFR. Pre-service teachers might be influenced by their personal experience when conducting their English classes in the future by focusing only on obtaining a certain CEFR level in English.

### 3.4. Discussion

Some previous relevant research has been conducted to support the study's findings. Khair & Shah's (2021) study examined the perspectives of English teachers about implementing the CEFR-aligned curriculum in primary ESL classrooms in Malaysia. The study uses a quantitative methodology, with data being gathered through survey questions that are modified and given to Malaysian ESL primary school instructors through random purposive selection. Teachers favour the adoption of a curriculum aligned with the CEFR. Most educators exhibit optimism and a favourable outlook regarding its implementation and adjustment. Teachers also think that the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) is crucial for raising the country's English language standards, particularly for student competence levels to match those of other countries. Nonetheless, a tiny percentage of educators do not appear to support the inclusion of the CEFR in the curriculum. For now, they exhibit some opposition and are

hesitant to accept the new policy. Through their research, Hai and Nhung present preliminary data about how English language professors at a Vietnamese university perceive the top-down application of the CEFR for students who do not major in English. The study uses a mixed-method sequential design, collecting data through interviews and questionnaires. The results have demonstrated that General English (GE) teachers are somewhat aware of the need to implement the CEFR, believe it is ready, and have a solid comprehension of its ideals. However, they voice serious worries regarding the labour and duties of implementing the CEFR. Time constraints, restricted availability of pertinent teaching materials, and the stark discrepancy between students' admission levels of competency and the anticipated CEFR-based learning outcomes are the most commonly mentioned causes. Pertinent recommendations are outlined to facilitate positive educational changes and enhance the process of using the CEFR in a particular setting. Furthermore, Faez et al. (2011) concentrate on the advantages and disadvantages that teachers see while implementing CEFR-informed practice in FSL classes. Participants in this province-wide survey included 943 primary and secondary school students and FSL teachers (n = 93). The curriculum and materials informed by the CEFR were presented to the participating instructors. Afterward, teachers employed the materials in their classrooms for around three months. Teachers took part in focus groups and interviews after this time, discussing how they felt about the action-oriented approach of the CEFR. Teachers indicated that using the CEFR to inform their instruction improved learner autonomy, boosted student enthusiasm, and helped students develop self-confidence. These results may affect FSL courses in Canada and other global second language learning initiatives.

Phoolaikao & Sukying's (2021) study looked at preservice English teachers' opinions on the CEFR in a Thai setting. This study included 200 preservice English teachers in their fourth and fifth years. Semi-structured interviews and questionnaires with a seven-point Likert scale were employed in a mixed-method design to gather data. According to the quantitative data, the participants demonstrated a high comprehension of the CEFR, particularly in the assessment domain and the creation of reference level descriptions. In contrast, the qualitative data showed that preservice teachers in Thailand had a minimal concept of the CEFR and very little knowledge of it. However, preservice teachers in Thailand had excellent things to say about incorporating the CEFR into classroom instruction. Overall, these results show that preservice English teachers' comprehension of the CEFR idea was lacking, indicating that Thai stakeholders need to increase their knowledge about how the CEFR should be implemented correctly and fit into the national curriculum.

In their study, Bedmar and Byram (2018) examine how the CEFR affects educators by examining the opinions and views of a group of Spanish instructors preparing to enroll in a master's course module on the framework. These in-service teachers completed a 35-item online survey to assess their acquaintance with the CEFR, their opinions of its influence, and their comprehension of its contents. The data reveal that teachers' knowledge of the CEFR was limited to the surface. Though they believed the CEFR had a significant overall impact on curriculum, syllabi, and methodologies, they reported being highly familiar with the levels of competence but having little awareness of the modifications it suggests. To guarantee a deeper comprehension of the CEFR, teacher education has obvious ramifications.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

This study explored pre-service EFL teachers' familiarity and perspective on the CEFR. The survey and interviews revealed that most pre-service teachers were moderately familiar with the CEFR. They only received an introduction and a brief training on the CEFR from a course in their current teacher training program. They also displayed a positive perspective of the CEFR as a helpful guideline to develop EFL curriculum and syllabus (Hulstijn, 2007; Richards, 2013) as well as EFL assessment and test (Kanchai, 2019; Paquot, 2018; Yüce & Mirici, 2022). However, upon closer examination through the interview, most pre-service EFL teachers tend to have an oversimplified CEFR understanding. They merely connect the CEFR to the language testing without truly understanding the philosophical and innovative views on language education provided by the framework. Some participants also felt unsure how to implement the CEFR in their future classes. Therefore, through language teacher education programs, the government should provide more instructions and training on how to use the CEFR effectively.

The current study investigated how pre-service EFL teachers perceived the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). Overall, the research results revealed that the pre-service EFL teachers perceived themselves as familiar with the CEFR. However, there was still room for development, especially regarding their comprehension of the framework. It is also noteworthy that many pre-service EFL teachers oversimplify the CEFR by merely connecting it to language certification and standardized English tests like the TOEFL, IELTS, and other tests. This oversimplified perception could lead the language educators to overlook the innovative perspectives on language learning, teaching, and evaluation within the CEFR. The notions such as culture, interculturality, plurilingualism, action-oriented approach, mediation, learner profile, and other innovative views that the framework provides tend to be unnoticed.

The research also showed that prospective EFL teachers considered the CEFR helpful in designing a curriculum and a syllabus for language instruction. From their perspectives, the CEFR can assist language teachers in adjusting their lessons and activities to their pupils' needs and proficiency levels. However, some participants expressed uncertainty in incorporating the CEFR into their lesson planning. They were not trained on using the CEFR to plan their English classes and conduct the teaching and learning process. It is also worth noting that participants who had more exposure to the CEFR by their lecturers demonstrated better understanding of the CEFR. This emphasizes the language teacher education program's role in shaping prospective English teachers' perceptions of the framework (Díez-Bedmar & Byram, 2019).

Overall, research on Indonesian pre-service teachers' perceptions of the CEFR may contribute to a better understanding of how the framework aligns with Indonesia's cultural and linguistic context. It could explore how aspects of language teaching and assessment promoted by the CEFR resonate with the local educational landscape. Investigating pre-service teachers' perceptions can shed light on how well the CEFR aligns with existing language education curricula in Indonesia. This information can be valuable for curriculum developers and policymakers in ensuring that the national curriculum is in harmony with international frameworks. Research in this area may highlight the professional development needs of Indonesian pre-service teachers

concerning the implementation of the CEFR. Understanding their perceptions can inform the design of training programs to enhance teachers' skills and knowledge related to the framework.

Furthermore, exploring how pre-service teachers perceive the CEFR can provide insights into its potential impact on classroom practices. It may reveal whether teachers feel empowered or challenged by the framework and how it influences their teaching methods, assessment strategies, and language learning goals. Regarding policy implications, research findings can inform educational policies related to language teaching and assessment in Indonesia. If there are discrepancies between the CEFR and local perceptions, policymakers may need to consider adjustments or provide additional guidelines to ensure effective implementation. Also, regarding feedback for framework improvement, understanding the perceptions of pre-service teachers can serve as valuable feedback for the continuous improvement of the CEFR. It can highlight aspects of the framework that may need clarification, adaptation, or enhancement to better suit the needs of Indonesian language educators.

These results suggest the need for more comprehensive training provided by both the government and language teacher education programs on CEFR and its innovative concepts in language learning and how to effectively use the framework to create syllabi and lesson plans and conduct English teaching and learning in the Indonesian context. Based on the research findings that have been discussed, suggestions are compiled. Suggestions can refer to practical action, developing new theories, and/or follow-up research.

## REFERENCES

- Aisyiah, S. (2020). *The Role of Leadership in Education for Sustainable Development Curriculum Reform in Indonesian Higher Education*. Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/s2055-364120200000022014>
- Azmi Rohimajaya, N., Hartono, R., Yuliasri, I., & Wuli Fitriati, S. (2022). Need Analysis of English E-book Based on Merdeka Curriculum for Indonesian Senior High School Students. *International Conference on Science, Education, and Technology*, 8(1 SE-1001–1100), 1033-1038. <https://proceeding.unnes.ac.id/index.php/ISET/article/view/1875>
- Deygers, B. (2021). The CEFR Companion Volume: Between Research-Based Policy and Policy-Based Research. *Applied Linguistics*, 42(1), 186–191. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amz024>
- Díez-Bedmar, M. B., & Byram, M. (2019). The current influence of the CEFR in secondary education: teachers' perceptions. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 32(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2018.1493492>
- EF-EPI. (2020). *EF English Proficiency Index*.
- Emilia, E. (2016). *Pendekatan Berbasis Teks dalam Pengajaran Bahasa Inggris*. Kiblat Buku Utama.
- Europe, C. of. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Language: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. In *New Cambridge Modern History* (Vol. 13). Council of Europe Publishing. <http://universitypublishingonline.org/cambridge/histories/ebook.jsf?bid=CBO9781139055895%5Cnhttp://www.cambridge.org/ca/academic/subjects/history/europe>

an-history-general- interest/new-cambridge-modern-history-volume  
13?format=HB

- Faez, F., Majhanovich, S., K. Taylor, S., Smith, M., & Crowley, K. (2011). The Power of “Can Do” Statements: Teachers’ Perceptions of CEFR-informed Instruction in French as a Second Language Classrooms in Ontario. *The Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14(2011), 106–128.  
<http://ez-proxy.cdc.qc.ca/docview/1016751445?accountid=50242>
- Fleckenstein, J., Keller, S., Krüger, M., Tannenbaum, R. J., & Köller, O. (2020). Linking TOEFL iBT® writing rubrics to CEFR levels: Cut scores and validity evidence from a standard setting study. *Assessing Writing*, 43(July 2019), 100420. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2019.100420>
- Foley, B. (2019). Intersectionality: A Marxist Critique. *New Labor Forum*, 28(3), 10–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1095796019867944>
- Freeman, L. (2017). The importance of explicitly teaching language and literacy to English language learners. *Practical Literacy: The Early & Primary Years*, 22(2), 37–39.  
<http://ezproxy.msu.edu/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eue&AN=122939605&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Hulstijn, J. H. (2007). The shaky ground beneath the CEFR: Quantitative and qualitative dimensions of language proficiency. In *Modern Language Journal* (Vol. 91, Issue 4). [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00627\\_5.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00627_5.x)
- Hynninen, N. (2014). The Common European Framework of Reference from the perspective of English as a lingua franca: what we can learn from a focus on language regulation. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 3(2), 293–316. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1515/jelf-2014-0018>
- Kamil, D. (2023). Are They Finely Tuned? Mapping the CEFR level of the reading texts of the English textbook for grade 10 of Indonesian senior high school. *Eduvelop: Journal of English Education and Development*, 6(2), 93–102. <https://doi.org/10.31605/eduvelop.v6i2.2332>
- Kanchai, T. (2019). Thai EFL University Lecturers’ Viewpoints towards Impacts of the CEFR on their English Language Curricula and Teaching Practice. *NIDA Journal of Language and Communication*, 24(35).
- Khair, A. H. M., & Shah, P. M. (2021). ESL Teachers’ Perceptions on the Implementation of CEFR in Malaysian Primary Schools: Issues and Challenges. *Journal of Advances in Education Research*, 6(1), 31–48. <https://doi.org/10.22606/jaer.2021.61005>
- Kok, N. M., & Aziz, A. A. (2019). English language teachers’ perspectives on the implementation of CEFR in primary schools in Malaysia. *Prosiding Seminar Wacana Pendidikan 2019 (SWAPEN 2.0)*, 24(2), 87–100.
- Kramsch, C., & Steffensen, S. V. (2008). Ecological Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition and Socialization. *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, 8, 2595–2606. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3\\_194](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3_194)
- Martyniuk, W., & Noijons, J. (2007). *Executive summary of results of a survey on the use of the CEFR at the national level in the Council of Europe Member States*. Council of Europe Language Policy Division.
- Moser, A., & Korstjens, I. (2018). Series: Practical guidance to qualitative research. Part 3: Sampling, data collection, and analysis. *The European Journal of General*

- Practice*, 24(1), 9–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13814788.2017.1375091>
- Nassaji, H. (2015). Qualitative and descriptive research: Data type versus data analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, 19(2), 129–132. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168815572747>
- Negishi, M. (2022). The Impact of the CEFR in Japan. In D. Little & N. Figueras (Eds.), *Reflecting on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages and Its Companion Volume. Multilingual Matters*, 10–22.
- North, B. (2021). The CEFR Companion Volume - What is new and what might it imply for teaching/learning and assessment? *CEFR Journal - Research and Practice*, 4(North), 5–24. <https://doi.org/10.37546/jaltsig.cefr4-1>
- Novawan, A., Tosalem, S. M. P. A., Binarkaheni, S., & Mariana, E. R. (2023). Reflecting on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, and Assessment (CEFR) in the Indonesian Context. *Journal of English in Academic and Professional Communication*, 9(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.25047/jeapco.v9i1.3754>
- Pajarwati, D., Mardiah, H., Harahap, R. P., Siagian, R. O., & Ihsan, M. T. (2021). Curriculum Reform in Indonesia: English Education Toward the Global Competitiveness. *ETDC: Indonesian Journal of Research and Educational Review*, 1(1 SE-Articles), 28–36. <https://doi.org/10.51574/ijrer.v1i1.51>
- Paquot, M. (2018). Phraseological Competence: A Missing Component in University Entrance Language Tests? Insights from a Study of EFL Learners' Use of Statistical Collocations. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 15(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2017.1405421>
- Phoolaikao, W., & Sukying, A. (2021). Insights into CEFR and Its Implementation through the Lens of Preservice English Teachers in Thailand. *English Language Teaching*, 14(6). <https://econpapers.repec.org/RePEc:ibn:eltjnl:v:14:y:2021:i:6:p:25>
- Richards, J. C. (2013). Curriculum approaches in language teaching: Forward, central, and backward design. *RELC Journal*, 44(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688212473293>
- Rizaldi, D. R., & Fatimah, Z. (2022). Mataram City Student Perceptions in Recognizing and Using Smartphones. *Indonesian Journal of Education*, 1(1), 11–17. <https://doi.org/10.56495/ije.v1i1.172>
- Saville, N., & Salamoura, A. (2010). Exemplifying the CEFR: Criterial features of written learner English from the English Profile Programme. *Communicative Proficiency and Linguistic Development: Intersections between SLA and Language Testing Research*, 101–132. [http://eurosla.org/monographs/EM01/101-132Salamoura\\_Saville.pdf](http://eurosla.org/monographs/EM01/101-132Salamoura_Saville.pdf)
- Schneider, S. (2020). A critical analysis of the role of intercultural communication in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) Companion Volume. *Journal of Spanish Language Teaching*, 7(2), 193–199. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23247797.2020.1864112>
- Supunya, N. (2022). Towards the CEFR Action-Oriented Approach: Factors Influencing Its Achievement in Thai EFL Classrooms. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature*, 28(2), 33–48. <https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2022-2802-03>
- Tono, Y., Rannels, J., Rannels, V., Pavlovskaya, I. Y., Lankina, O. Y., Hai, L. T. T., &

- Nhung, P. T. H. (2020). *CEFR Journal: Research and Practice*. 1–67.
- Tosun, Ü. F., & Glover, P. (2020). How do school teachers in Turkey perceive and use the CEFR? *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, 7(4), 1731–1739. <http://iojet.org/index.php/IOJET/article/view/1041>
- Yüce, E., & Mirici, I. H. (2022). Self-assessment in EFL Classes of Secondary Education in Türkiye: The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR)-based implementations. *Pegem Egitim ve Ogretim Dergisi*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.47750/pegegog.13.01.38>