



Does CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference) fit the expectation: Voices from the classroom

Khairunnisa Dwinalida^{1✉}, Muflihah¹, Bunga Putri Maulia²

¹*English Education, Universitas Islam Negeri Profesor Kiai Haji Saifuddin Zuhri Purwokerto
Jl. A Yani No. 40A, Purwokerto Utara, Banyumas 53126, Indonesia*

²*Doctoral Program, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta
Jl. Colombo No. 1 Karangmalang Yogyakarta, 55281, Indonesia*

✉khairunnisadwinalida@uinsaizu.ac.id

Received 10 May 2024; Accepted 28 November 2024; Published 29 December 2024

Abstract: The CEFR, known globally as a key framework for structuring English language curricula, has been adopted in many educational systems worldwide. However, despite its widespread recognition, its practical application within Indonesian universities has not gained the same level of traction, remaining relatively limited compared to other regions. This difference has attracted scholarly interest, leading to research exploring the framework's applicability and potential adaptation. The research investigated how students view the fit between the framework and their expectations of the competencies of English teacher training graduates. To gather numerical data on students' perceptions, a targeted sample of 94 participants completed a questionnaire developed based on C1-level CEFR descriptors. Complementing the quantitative data, semi-structured interviews were conducted with a subset of respondents to gather richer qualitative insights into their perceptions. Analysis of the quantitative data, including calculating the average score, showed a generally positive student perception of CEFR, with an average score of 3.78. Qualitative analysis of the interview data identified four key reasons for student agreement with the CEFR descriptors: alignment with job requirements, usefulness as communication tools, the reflection of the community expectations, and potential to support their learning. The findings imply that the stakeholders must specify the curriculum framework in which CEFR adoption can be an option. Based on these findings, it is implied that stakeholders responsible for curriculum development should specify a clearly defined framework within which CEFR adoption can be effectively implemented.

Keywords: CEFR; English curriculum; students' perception.

A. Introduction

To truly embody the ideals of effective communication, potential English teachers must possess strong English communication skills, setting a positive example for their

students. As stated in the document, Graduate Competency Standards and Learning Outcomes for Bachelor's Level Graduates of the English Language Teaching Study Program, section 3.c.2.53. c. 2.5, graduates of the English Teaching Study Program (TBI) must “excel in conveying concepts effectively, persuasively courteously using the target language, both verbally and orally” ([Director General of Islamic Education, Ministry of Religion, Republic of Indonesia, 2018](#)). The program's graduate competencies, as defined by the CEFR, are equivalent to level C1, ensuring graduates possess advanced communication skills.

Despite universal agreement on the importance of English proficiency, many Indonesian English teachers struggle to meet this expectation. A study by [Renandya et al. \(2018\)](#) underscored Indonesian English teachers' comparatively low English proficiency, ranking them 10th among 20 Asian nations. This issue regarding insufficient target language proficiency extends beyond in-service teachers and is reflected within the TBI program at UIN SAIZU Purwokerto. Lecture evaluations reveal that most student-teachers lack the ability to convey their thoughts effectively in English during academic forums. This phenomenon raises serious concerns about their future ability to communicate effectively with students and deliver quality instruction ([Renandya et al., 2018](#)).

Unpacking the issue of low English proficiency among TBI students reveals a complex interplay of various contributing factors, making it difficult to pinpoint a single root cause. Considering the curriculum's central role in shaping learning experiences, however, a comprehensive evaluation of its development and effectiveness, particularly regarding graduate proficiency level and alignment with desired outcomes, can pave the way for targeted improvements. Based on the preliminary review, there is a problem in the technical aspects of curriculum development at TBI: lack of agreement among lecturers. Without any defined standard and reference framework, curricula for English courses within the program are independently developed by individual lecturers, drawing upon the learning outcomes outlined by the Indonesian National Qualification Framework (KKNI). Limited consensus on curriculum development parameters poses a potential barrier to effectively assessing the alignment of learning outcomes with the KKNI framework.

To enhance graduates' foreign language proficiency, numerous countries have adopted internationally standardized learning frameworks. Global benchmarks such as the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) provide a

unified measure for evaluating language proficiency. Furthermore, the implementation of these standards enables countries to adapt their curricula to achieve learning outcomes that are competitive on an international scale (Steiner-Khamsi, 2016; Read, 2019).

The CEFR, introduced by the Council of Europe in 2001, provides a standardized reference for European countries, supporting the creation of unified learning materials, syllabi, curricula, and language competency assessments (Council of Europe, 2001). By crossing linguistic borders and offering a clear framework for evaluating language skills, the CEFR has gained widespread international attention. As a result, it has been translated into 40 languages and adopted by various non-European countries during its initial development phase (Council of Europe, 2017). A comprehensive review of academic literature reveals that the CEFR reigns supreme as the language proficiency scale receiving the most attention from researchers (Ito, 2020), and its influence on language learning is evident in its role in designing learning objectives, choosing materials, and structuring programs (Hulstijin, 2007). The CEFR defines six competency levels, grouped as Basic (A1 & A2), Independent (B1 & B2), and Proficient (C1 & C2), each outlining the language skills and knowledge needed for real-world communication. This framework, documented in a regularly updated paper, provides a clear roadmap for language learners and educators (Council of Europe, 2017).

Several studies on incorporating CEFR standards into tertiary English language curricula reveal consistent findings. Hismanoglu's (2013) survey of Turkish students showed a desire for CEFR-based curriculum development. Afip et al. (2019) recommended using CEFR in Malaysia to balance school English requirements with instructor skills, echoing Bakar's (2020) conclusion that CEFR alignment optimizes student proficiency growth at the higher education level.

Several studies examining the perception of CEFR implementation reveal similar positive outcomes. Faez et al. (2011) found that CEFR implementation in French language teaching in Canada positively impacted students' motivation, self-confidence, and awareness of their language competence. Normand-Marconnet and Bianco (2015) reported positive perceptions of CEFR among Australian students and teachers, citing its global use, simplicity, standardization, curriculum improvement, and level-based approach. Trang and Lap (2016) echoed these findings in their Vietnamese university study, with respondents approving curriculum policies based on CEFR at their institution.

The international education landscape is witnessing a surge in recognition of the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) as a valuable tool for building English language proficiency curricula. This growing awareness is evident in the increasing adoption of the framework by educational institutions and governments across diverse nations. Hence, evaluating its applicability to Indonesia's higher education curriculum becomes increasingly crucial. This urgency further intensifies in light of the government's already existing adoption of the CEFR as a benchmark for graduate achievement at the secondary level ([Badan Penelitian dan Pengembangan dan Perbukuan, 2021](#)).

Implementing the CEFR framework within the TBI program at UIN SAIZU Purwokerto necessitates a context-specific analysis, particularly by incorporating student perspectives as primary stakeholders in curriculum development. Although prior research has explored CEFR implementation in various countries, these studies often overlook Indonesia's unique sociocultural and educational conditions, where English remains a foreign language. This distinction may influence how teacher candidates perceive the relevance of CEFR as a curriculum reference. Additionally, the relatively recent establishment of the TBI program at UIN SAIZU Purwokerto presents specific student challenges. Their limited exposure to English in daily life, combined with the program's newness, affects their experiences and preparedness, in contrast to students in more established programs or regions where English is more embedded in everyday communication.

Therefore, this study aims to explore the perceptions of TBI students regarding the alignment of CEFR proficiency levels with the skills they seek to develop as future English teachers. Additionally, it will assess students' views on the relevance and applicability of CEFR levels to their professional aspirations while identifying essential skills and competencies for effective teaching. Furthermore, it will examine challenges in CEFR implementation within the TBI curriculum. By focusing on the specific conditions at UIN SAIZU Purwokerto, including the foreign status of English and the program's newness, this research will provide insights into how local contexts influence the adoption and adaptation of the CEFR framework and ultimately offer recommendations for enhancing its integration into the curriculum.

B. Method

This mixed-methods study investigates how students in the TBI program at UIN SAIZU Purwokerto perceive the alignment between CEFR proficiency levels and the professional skills needed for their future roles as English teachers. By integrating quantitative surveys and qualitative interviews, the study aims to comprehensively understand students' perspectives.

The quantitative phase involved administering surveys to gauge student agreement with the CEFR framework. This data revealed strong support for CEFR descriptors, particularly to essential skills such as listening and speaking. To deepen this understanding, qualitative interviews were conducted, allowing students to elaborate on their survey responses and provide context for their perceptions.

Integrating these two data types enhances the analysis by illustrating how quantitative findings outline general trends, while qualitative insights reveal the motivations and experiences behind those trends. For instance, while surveys indicated strong agreement with listening skills, interviews highlighted a perceived disconnect between the CEFR's reading and writing descriptors and their practical application in teaching.

To examine student perceptions using quantitative data, a random sample of 94 undergraduate students from the fourth, sixth, and eighth batches of TBI program UIN Saizu Purwokerto academic year 2022-2023 participated in the study. The sample included approximately 30 students from each of the fourth, sixth, and eighth batches to ensure proportional representation from each batch. They have completed all English classes, including listening, speaking, reading, and writing instruction.

Supplementing the quantitative data, six students (two per batch) who had previously participated in the survey were chosen for the in-depth interviews. These participants, chosen based on their diverse responses in the quantitative survey, provided valuable qualitative data that enriched our understanding of student perceptions of the CEFR framework.

This study gathered quantitative data through a 12-question survey with Likert-scale responses (strongly agree/disagree). Designed based on the CEFR C1 descriptors and aligned with the Indonesian KKNi 3.c.2.5 framework, the questions targeted relevant language skills. The questionnaire underwent content and expert validation to ensure data validity, and respondents received pre-distribution clarifications through a discussion forum.

Building upon the questionnaire data, in-depth interviews provided nuanced insights into students' perspectives on the CEFR framework. By exploring their expectations and desired levels of English proficiency in reading, listening, speaking, and writing, these interviews revealed valuable information about whether the CEFR meets their needs and expectations as future English teachers.

Data analysis for the quantitative responses are collected through the questionnaire. It is involved pilot testing with 10 participants using SPSS to assess validity and reliability. Based on the pilot feedback, minor adjustments were made to the questionnaire before administering it to all respondents. Subsequent analysis employed various statistical techniques to draw comprehensive conclusions.

For the qualitative data, the interactive model analysis (Miles et al., 2014) guided the exploration of interview data about student perceptions regarding the alignment between CEFR levels and their desired teaching skills. This process involved four core stages: data collection, condensation, visual presentation, and conclusion verification. Interview data was segmented, coded by theme, and summarized. Findings were displayed using tables for clarity and then interpreted and compared to existing literature to arrive at well-founded conclusions. To ensure the validity of the qualitative findings, a member-checking process was conducted, wherein participants were asked to review and confirm the accuracy of the summarized data and interpretations. Triangulation was employed by comparing the interview data with questionnaire results and relevant literature, enhancing the credibility of the conclusions.

C. Result and Discussion

1. Students' perception

a. Quantitative Data

Table 1. Average questionnaire score

N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
94	2.50	5.00	3.78	0.66

The quantitative analysis of student responses, which is shown in table 1, reflects an overall positive perception of the CEFR framework, with an average score of 3.78 (SD = 0.66). This score falls within the "agree" range on the Likert scale, suggesting that students generally perceive the CEFR framework as beneficial for their development as future English teachers. Although some

variability exists, the relatively low standard deviation indicates moderate consistency in students' views. This variability could be attributed to differences in the students' familiarity with the CEFR, their diverse educational experiences, or varying expectations regarding the practical application of the CEFR in teaching contexts. This aligns with findings from Richards(2017), who highlighted the adaptability of the CEFR across diverse educational contexts. Given the CEFR's potential for developing language competencies, this overall positive perception strongly indicates that it could be an effective reference for enhancing the current English teacher preparation program.

Table 2. Mean questionnaire scores for every language aspect

	<i>Listening</i>	<i>Reading</i>	<i>Speaking</i>	<i>Writing</i>
<i>Mean</i>	3.95	3.59	3.85	3.73

When looking at the breakdown of language skills in Table 2, a more nuanced picture of student perceptions emerges. Listening received the highest rating, with an average score of 3.95, indicating that students view the CEFR descriptors for listening comprehension as highly relevant to their future teaching roles. Listening is crucial in a classroom environment, where teachers need to actively listen to students' responses, classroom interactions, and monitor understanding. The detailed progression of listening skills in the CEFR—from basic comprehension to understanding complex discourse—seems to resonate with students' views on the importance of listening as a core teaching skill. [Vandergrift and Goh \(2012\)](#) similarly highlight listening as foundational to effective communication, reinforcing its significance in teaching and broader language development.

Although reading comprehension received the lowest score (3.59) among the assessed skills, it still falls within the "agree" range, indicating a generally favorable perception. This suggests that students value the CEFR reading descriptors but perceive them as slightly less applicable than those for other language skills. Research by [Ahmadi \(2017\)](#) highlights the importance of integrating reading strategies that align with specific learner needs, particularly in educational contexts where reading tasks serve classroom-focused goals. Similarly, [McKay \(2018\)](#) notes that CEFR descriptors for reading are often designed for broad academic and personal tasks, which may not fully reflect the specific strategies required for guiding student comprehension or analyzing written texts in teaching scenarios. This underscores the value of adapting the CEFR framework to address

the nuanced demands of teacher education programs while retaining its comprehensive scope. Such adaptations can enhance its applicability and ensure reading instruction is as contextually relevant as the other language skills descriptors.

Speaking, with a mean score of 3.85, is highly valued by students, reflecting their recognition of its critical role in teaching. Effective verbal communication is essential for teachers to provide clear instructions, facilitate discussions, and manage classroom interactions. The CEFR framework's emphasis on fluency, coherence, and interaction in speaking closely aligns with these demands. As [Derakhshan and Eslami \(2019\)](#) noted, teachers must demonstrate proficiency in language accuracy and the ability to engage in dynamic communication with students. This aligns with the findings of [Goh \(2018\)](#), who emphasizes the importance of communication skills in fostering a supportive and interactive learning environment. Additionally, the CEFR's descriptors for speaking have been recognized as valuable in training teachers to meet the demands of effective classroom discourse ([Thornbury, 2017](#)), highlighting the framework's relevance for developing the communicative competencies required for successful teaching. These studies reinforce the importance of integrating speaking skills into teacher training programs, ensuring that future educators are equipped to meet the communication challenges they will face in the classroom.

Writing scored 3.73, slightly lower than listening and speaking but still indicating agreement with the CEFR descriptors. However, the relatively lower score suggests that students may feel the CEFR's writing descriptors do not fully address the specific professional writing tasks teachers encounter, such as creating lesson plans, providing feedback, or writing academic reports. While the CEFR focuses on general writing ability, future teachers may benefit from incorporating writing tasks that reflect these professional responsibilities into the curriculum, bridging the gap between general writing proficiency and the practical demands of teaching. Research by [Anderson et al. \(2017\)](#) points out that while the CEFR provides a valuable model for general writing proficiency, it often lacks specificity for professional contexts, particularly in educational settings where writing tasks are closely tied to classroom management and instructional needs. Furthermore, it has been noted that the CEFR descriptors primarily target academic and personal writing tasks, which may not sufficiently address the day-to-day professional

writing demands teachers face (Green, 2014). As such, adapting the CEFR's writing descriptors to reflect these specific teacher-related tasks better could enhance its relevance and utility for teacher education, ensuring that prospective educators are prepared for the writing challenges they will encounter in their careers

The overall positive perception of the CEFR framework, as reflected in the survey results, is consistent with previous research (Faez et al., 2011; Normand-Marconnet & Bianco, 2015; Trang & Lap, 2016), which highlights the CEFR's potential value in language teaching and learning. However, it is important to note that the current teacher training curriculum does not yet align with the CEFR framework. The students' high scores reflect their belief in the relevance and utility of the CEFR in developing essential language skills for future teaching roles. Adopting the CEFR framework within the curriculum would be a strategic move to capitalize on the students' positive perceptions. By incorporating CEFR-aligned objectives, teacher education programs could offer more structured and comprehensive training, ensuring that future teachers acquire both the language proficiency and the practical teaching skills necessary for effective classroom instruction.

b. Quantitative Data

The qualitative data from student interviews provided more profound insights into their perceptions of the CEFR framework and how it aligns with their future roles as English teachers. These interviews helped illuminate the rationale behind their agreement with the CEFR descriptors, which supports the quantitative findings.

1) Job Requirement

A prominent theme emerging from the interviews is the critical role of English proficiency as a foundational job requirement for future educators. The near-universal agreement among respondents regarding the CEFR descriptors underscores their recognition of the framework as integral to their professional preparation. Respondents articulated a clear connection between their language skills and their capacity to facilitate student learning, emphasizing that strong English proficiency is vital for instructional and non-instructional tasks. For instance, one participant stated:

As a future teacher, I stand by this completely. With the responsibility of equipping students with knowledge and information, it's crucial for me

to become proficient in English and create a truly enriching learning experience for them. (MSA, personal communication, August 22, 2022)

This sentiment reflects a broader understanding of the pedagogical implications of language proficiency. The CEFR's structured approach provides a roadmap for developing essential competencies, equipping future teachers to meet diverse classroom needs. The respondents' emphasis on being role models for their students further highlights the necessity of high proficiency levels; they are acutely aware that their effectiveness as educators hinges on their language skills.

Moreover, their responses align with the findings of [Renandya et al. \(2018\)](#); Jones, N., & Saville, N. (2008), which stress the importance of English fluency in establishing professional credibility. Another study also emphasizes that teachers with higher levels of language proficiency can serve as better role models for students, deliver more precise instructions, and foster more effective learning environments ([Van Canh & Renandya, 2017](#)). However, while they acknowledge the importance of the CEFR framework, there is a palpable demand for more targeted training that addresses context-specific applications of language skills. Teacher education programs may benefit from incorporating CEFR-aligned assessments that simulate real classroom scenarios, ensuring that prospective teachers can demonstrate both language proficiency and pedagogical effectiveness. However, while they acknowledge the importance of the CEFR framework, there is a palpable demand for more targeted training that addresses context-specific applications of language skills. Teacher education programs may benefit from incorporating CEFR-aligned assessments that simulate real classroom scenarios, ensuring that prospective teachers can demonstrate not only language proficiency but also pedagogical effectiveness.

2) Communication tool

Another significant insight from the qualitative data is recognizing English as a crucial communication tool in a globalized world. Respondents articulated a desire to leverage English proficiency to foster connections and navigate complex social interactions. One interviewee highlighted this perspective:

English mastery unlocks the world for me. Imagine being able to connect with anyone, anywhere! That's a treasure trove of information waiting to be tapped, fueling my future career and igniting endless possibilities. (HY, personal communication, August 22, 2022)

This demonstrates the high-value students place on the CEFR's focus on practical communication skills. The respondents emphasized the need for proficiency for teaching and broader global interactions, which aligns with Hulstijn (2007) perspective on English as a global language.

However, some respondents also expressed anxiety over the strict rules of English grammar, indicating that while they value fluency, they are also aware of the challenges it presents. This suggests a potential area where teacher education programs could support future teachers by addressing fears around grammatical accuracy and promoting confidence in language use.

3) Community expectation

The qualitative data also illuminated the significant impact of community expectations on students' perceptions of the CEFR framework. Many respondents articulated a sense of pressure stemming from societal beliefs about the capabilities of English majors, suggesting that their professional identity is closely tied to public expectations. One respondent noted:

English mastery unlocks the world for me. Imagine being able to connect with anyone, anywhere! That's a treasure trove of information waiting to be tapped, fueling my future career and igniting endless possibilities. (MNR, personal communication, August 22, 2022)

This societal pressure may reinforce the students' agreement with the CEFR descriptors, as they view the framework as a means to fulfill these expectations. It underscores the importance of aligning the teacher preparation curriculum with the CEFR, as doing so can enhance students' confidence in their professional identity and reinforce their commitment to continuous improvement in their language skills.

Integrating community expectations into the curriculum can foster a collaborative environment where students understand the real-world demands of their future profession, enhancing their professional development and confidence. This approach can also reinforce their commitment to continuous improvement in their language skills, as emphasized by research on teacher identity (Noonan, 2021).

4) Learning Process Requirement

Lastly, the interviews revealed that respondents experience a direct correlation between their academic success and English language proficiency, as outlined by the CEFR. One participant illustrated this:

My days as an English major are synonymous with deep dives into English learning materials. Mastering the language is practically baked into the curriculum, making us language explorers by default. (NAS, personal communication, August 22, 2022)

The comment reflects English majors' immersion in their coursework, indicating that the CEFR's focus on specific skills such as reading comprehension, academic writing, and spoken interaction is highly relevant to their educational journey. It highlights the need for teacher preparation programs to integrate CEFR-aligned content that addresses the complexities of academic discourse, as well as the specific linguistic challenges students face in their studies.

Research by [Hyland and Hamp-Lyons \(2019\)](#) supports this idea, arguing that language proficiency is critical for success in academic settings, especially in higher education, where clear communication and academic literacy are essential. Furthermore, integrating CEFR-aligned content in teacher preparation programs is crucial for addressing the complexities of academic discourse and the linguistic challenges students face. As such, incorporating collaborative projects that mimic real-life teaching scenarios would allow students to apply their language skills in meaningful contexts. These initiatives support academic success and reinforce the importance of continuous professional growth, as noted by [Coyle et al. \(2018\)](#), who emphasize the role of ongoing language development in effective teacher preparation.

2. Possible challenges of CEFR implementation

The quantitative and qualitative analyses reveal an overall positive perception of the CEFR framework among students in the TBI program at UIN SAIZU Purwokerto. However, while the benefits of CEFR adoption are evident, addressing the challenges and barriers that may hinder its effective implementation is essential, particularly within the context of higher education in Indonesia.

One notable challenge stems from the varying levels of familiarity with the CEFR among students. As the TBI program is relatively new, students may not have adequate

exposure to the framework's principles and applications. This lack of familiarity can lead to misunderstandings about the CEFR's relevance to their training. Furthermore, the limited English proficiency among many students may present a barrier to fully embracing the CEFR's structured approach to language learning. The program must consider these challenges by providing targeted training and resources to help students navigate the complexities of the CEFR and develop the necessary language competencies effectively.

Moreover, integrating national policies, such as the Indonesian National Qualification Framework (KKNI), presents both opportunities and challenges. While the KKNI outlines expectations for graduate competencies, the lack of clear guidelines on harmonizing these expectations with the CEFR can create confusion for educators and students. For effective CEFR implementation, it is crucial to establish a clear framework that aligns national policies with the CEFR's competencies. This alignment will ensure that graduates meet the local educational standards and the internationally recognized benchmarks that the CEFR provides.

Incorporating community expectations into the curriculum can provide valuable context for students to understand the significance of their training. Many students feel societal pressure to excel in English, which can be both motivating and overwhelming. Addressing this pressure requires a balanced approach that emphasizes continuous improvement while also acknowledging the diverse backgrounds and experiences students bring to their studies. Workshops involving local educators and community stakeholders could foster a collaborative environment where future teachers can gain insights into the practical demands of the profession, helping them navigate both the expectations of their communities and the complexities of language instruction.

Finally, as the CEFR emphasizes lifelong learning and language development, teacher preparation programs should adopt an approach beyond mere proficiency assessment. The curriculum could incorporate collaborative projects that mimic real-life teaching scenarios, allowing students to apply their skills in meaningful contexts. This hands-on approach would reinforce the importance of continuous language development and position the CEFR as not just a framework for assessment but a guide for professional growth throughout their careers.

In summary, while the positive perceptions of the CEFR among TBI students reflect its potential as a valuable framework for developing language competencies, addressing the challenges and barriers to its implementation and thoroughly

examining how national policies interact with CEFR objectives is essential. By acknowledging these complexities and making strategic adjustments, the TBI program at UIN SAIZU Purwokerto can enhance the effectiveness of its curriculum and better prepare future English teachers for the profession's demands.

3. Limitations and Future Research Directions

The study presents several limitations that warrant consideration. Firstly, the sample size may not adequately represent the diversity of perspectives within the broader population of English teacher candidates. This limitation could affect the generalizability of the findings, as perceptions may vary significantly across different regions, educational backgrounds, and cultural contexts. Additionally, the reliance on self-reported data from questionnaires and interviews may introduce biases, as participants might provide socially desirable responses rather than their true perceptions, particularly regarding their language proficiency and alignment with CEFR descriptors. To mitigate this, future studies could incorporate objective language proficiency measures alongside self-reported data for validation. Moreover, while essential, the focus on core language skills—listening, reading, speaking, and writing—does not encompass other competencies such as intercultural communication, critical thinking, or digital literacy, which are increasingly relevant in modern education contexts. Expanding the scope of future research to include these dimensions could yield a more holistic understanding of the skills necessary for effective teaching.

Furthermore, the study's cross-sectional design captures perceptions at a single point in time, limiting the ability to track changes over time or assess the impact of specific curricular interventions on student understanding of the CEFR. Longitudinal studies would be beneficial in exploring how perceptions evolve throughout the teacher education program and into their teaching careers. The context of the study, conducted in Indonesia, may also influence the findings, as local educational policies and cultural attitudes toward English can shape perceptions. Thus, generalizing these results to other contexts without further research may not be appropriate. Future studies should consider comparative analyses across different educational systems to explore how context affects the adoption and implementation of the CEFR.

To address these limitations, future research directions could include longitudinal studies to assess the changing perceptions of CEFR among teacher candidates over time, and mixed-methods approaches that integrate quantitative and qualitative data for a richer understanding of experiences with CEFR-related training.

Additionally, investigating the integration of intercultural competence within the CEFR framework could enhance educators' effectiveness in diverse classrooms. Research could also focus on the practical applications of CEFR in curriculum design for teacher preparation programs, evaluating various pedagogical approaches and materials aligned with CEFR descriptors. Conducting comparative studies across different countries or educational contexts could shed light on the diverse perceptions and applications of the CEFR framework. Lastly, investigating the barriers to implementation faced by teacher educators in integrating the CEFR into curricula would provide valuable insights, informing strategies to enhance the successful adoption of the framework in English teacher preparation.

D. Conclusion

The findings of this study emphasize the significance of the CEFR framework as a critical reference for English teacher training programs in Indonesia. Students in the TBI program at UIN SAIZU Purwokerto recognize the CEFR's alignment with their professional aspirations, communication goals, community expectations, and personal learning needs. This underscores the importance of systematically incorporating the CEFR into curricula to establish clear learning outcomes and ensure that graduates are adequately prepared for teaching roles. Furthermore, setting a minimum proficiency standard, such as the B2 level of the CEFR, is essential for equipping students with the necessary skills to succeed in their future careers.

A comprehensive approach is necessary to achieve this, involving both curriculum development and complementary strategies to support proficiency attainment. These include integrating the CEFR into the curriculum, defining clear proficiency standards such as the B2 level, and implementing supplemental programs for increased language exposure. Additionally, enhancing input standards through stricter entrance requirements and collaborating with external language programs will help reinforce students' proficiency. Furthermore, collaboration among policymakers, educational authorities, and TBI institutions is crucial to developing clear CEFR implementation guidelines. Faculty training and continuous professional development are vital to ensure educators can effectively apply CEFR principles. By adopting these measures, Indonesia's teacher preparation programs can align more closely with

international standards, ultimately improving the quality of English education for future teachers and their students.

References

- Afip, L. A., Hamid, M. O., & Renshaw, P. (2019). Common European Framework of reference for languages (CEFR): Insights into global policy borrowing in Malaysian higher education. *Globalization, Societies and Education*, 17(3), 378–393. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2019.1578195>
- Ahmadi, M. R. (2017). Reading strategies and their application in EFL classrooms. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 8(2), 289–295. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0802.23>
- Anderson, J., Brown, M., & Taylor, P. (2017). *Revisiting the CEFR: Adapting the framework for teacher education*. Language Education Press.
- Bakar, E. W. (2020). Can-do descriptors: Realigning English language curriculum at higher education institution to CEFR. *International Journal of Modern Languages and Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 84–97. <https://doi.org/10.24191/ijmal.v4i2.9366>
- Cambridge English. (2011). Using the CEFR: Principles of good practice. *Cambridge ESOL*. <https://www.cambridgeenglish.org/images/126011-using-CEFR-principles-of-good-practice.pdf>
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages*. Cambridge University Press. https://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/Framework_EN.pdf
- Council of Europe. (2017). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment companion volume with new descriptors*. <https://rm.coe.int/CEFR-companion-volume-with-new-descriptors-2018/1680787989>
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2018). *Content and language integrated learning: Learning, teaching and assessment*. Cambridge University Press.
- Derakhshan, A., & Eslami, Z. R. (2019). The role of speaking in language learning and teaching. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 8(2), 107–112. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.8n.2p.107>
- Dirjen Pendidikan Islam Kemenag RI. (2018). *Standar kompetensi lulusan (SKL) dan capaian pembelajaran lulusan (CPL) program studi jenjang sarjana pada perguruan tinggi keagamaan Islam dan Fakultas Agama Islam (FAI) pada perguruan tinggi*.

- Faez, F., Majhanovich, S., 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. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14(2), 1–19. <https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/CJAL/article/view/19855/21653>
- Goh, C. C. M. (2018). *Teaching speaking in the language classroom*. Routledge.
- Green, A. (2014). *Exploring the CEFR and its implications for teacher development*. Cambridge University Press.
- Badan Penelitian dan Pengembangan dan Perbukuan. (2021). *Keputusan Kepala Badan Penelitian dan Pengembangan dan Perbukuan Nomor 028/H/KU/2021 tentang Capaian pembelajaran PAUD, SD, SMP, SMA, SDLB, SMPLB, dan SMALB pada program sekolah penggerak* [Salinan keputusan].
- Hismanoglu, M. (2013). Does English language teacher education curriculum promote CEFR awareness of prospective EFL teachers?. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 93, 938–945. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.09.307>
- Hulstijn, J. H. (2007). The shaky ground beneath the CEFR: Quantitative and qualitative dimensions of language proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(4), 662–666. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4626094>
- Hyland, K., & Hamp-Lyons, L. (2019). EAP and the CEFR: Meeting academic literacy demands. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 39, 26–36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2019.04.001>
- Ito, H. (2020). Orthoepic competence descriptors in Japanese language education: CEFR levels B1 to C2. *Acta Linguistica Asiatica*, 10(1), 49–66. <https://doi.org/10.4312/ala.10.1.49-66>
- Jones, N., & Saville, N. (2008). Scales and frameworks. In J. Cummins & C. Leung (Eds.), *The Handbook of Educational Linguistics* (pp. 495–509). Blackwell Publishing.
- McKay, P. (2018). *Practical English language teaching: Reading*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. Sage Publications.
- Noonan, M. (2021). *An affinity for learning: Teacher identity and powerful professional development*. Harvard University Press.
- Normand-Marconnet, N., & Bianco, J. L. (2015). The common European framework of reference down under: A survey of its use and non-use in Australian universities. *The Journal of Language Learning in Higher Education*, 5(2), 281–307. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cercles-2015-0014>

- Read, J. (2019). The influence of the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) in the Asia-Pacific region. *Language Education and Acquisition Research Network (LEARN) Journal*, 12(1), 33–39. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1225686>
- Renandya, W. A., Hamied, F. A., & Nurkamto, J. (2018). English language proficiency in Indonesia: Issues and prospects. *The Journal of ASIA TEFL*, 15(3), 618–629. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2018.15.3.4.618>
- Richards, J. C. (2017). Teaching English through English: Proficiency, pedagogy and performance. *RELC Journal*, 48(1), 7–30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217691593>
- Steiner-Khamsi, G. (2016). New directions in policy borrowing research. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 17(3), 381–390. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-016-9432-4>
- Thornbury, S. (2017). *The speaking skills: A guide for teachers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Trang, D. D., & Lap, T. Q. (2016). Lecturers and students' perception of EFL policy and practice at a higher education institute. *CTU Journal of Innovation and Sustainable Development*, 3, 49–56. <https://doi.org/10.22144/ctu.jen.2016.023>
- Canh, V. L., & Renandya, W. A. (2017). Teacher's English proficiency and classroom language usage: A conversation analysis study. *RELC Journal*, 48, 67–81. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217690935>
- Vandergrift, L., & Goh, C. C. M. (2012). *Teaching and learning second language listening: Metacognition in action*. Routledge.