

Theory to Practice: Lecturers' Readiness in Implementing a CEFR-aligned Tertiary Curriculum

Sharifah Shahnaz bt Syed Husain^{1,*}, Julina Munchar¹, Zaemah Abdul Kadir¹, T. Parimala
Devi A/P Thevarajoo¹ & Puteri Zarina Binti Megat Khalid²

¹English Language Department, Akademi Pengajian Bahasa, Universiti Teknologi MARA, 40450 Shah Alam, Selangor, Malaysia

²Faculty of Languages and Communication, Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris, Tanjung Malim, Perak, Malaysia

*Corresponding author: English Language Department, Akademi Pengajian Bahasa, Universiti Teknologi MARA, 40450 Shah Alam, Selangor, Malaysia

Received: February 23, 2024 Accepted: May 18, 2024 Published: June 21, 2024

doi:10.5296/ije.v16i2.21729 URL: <https://doi.org/10.5296/ije.v16i2.21729>

Abstract

Malaysia is pushing for the implementation of a new English language education reform that would be implemented and integrated at all levels of the educational system, from preschool to tertiary education. Incorporating the Common European Framework of Reference is an apparent preference to satisfy the benchmark of a global platform (CEFR). This move involves an immediate review of present classes and adherence to the new national curriculum restructuring. Lecturers are expected to know the essentials to adopt and implement CEFR in the curriculum. However, because this is relatively new, there is a lack of guidelines for executing the new curriculum. This study investigates if lecturers are prepared to implement a curricular framework consistent with and guided by the CEFR. A survey was distributed to 40 lecturers from two public universities to gain insight into a few dimensions of readiness; quality, climate, cognitive, emotional, and other determinants. The offered findings serve as a guide for organizing and designing any essential training for lecturers. It will also help in the development of instructional materials that are suitable for a local setting.

Keywords: CEFR curriculum, lecturer's readiness, English Language Education Reform

1. Introduction

1.1 Introduce the Problem

The landscape of Education in Malaysia has changed to embrace the CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference). The Malaysian Education reform was introduced to include A CEFR-aligned curriculum which stresses the magnitude of communicative competence amongst students. Developed by the Council of Europe, central to CEFR is a comprehensive model that serves as a guide that can be adapted to improve learners' language abilities, to design assessments and teaching materials. The responsibilities of teachers and lecturers to implement the new curriculum can be overwhelming and challenging. Assessing lecturers' readiness is a step closer to ensuring that the transitional period of implementing the new CEFR-aligned curriculum is carried out successfully.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

In its effort to improve the standard of English in Malaysia, the Ministry of Education has continuously introduced changes, including the alignment of English Language teaching and assessment to CEFR. This is seen as a wise move as it will ensure that Malaysian English Language education remains relevant internationally (C. Alih et al., 2021). The introduction of a CEFR-aligned curriculum has nevertheless posed challenges, especially to teachers, as they need to be ready to implement CEFR in their lessons (Mohammed et al., 2021).

Several studies have been conducted to investigate teachers' readiness to implement a CEFR-aligned curriculum. A study conducted by C. Alih et al. (2021) on 365 English language school teachers in Johor, Malaysia, has revealed that they are positive about the change and are ready to implement the CEFR-aligned curriculum. However, aspects such as time, cooperation, and materials seem to affect their level of readiness. Yasin and Yamat's (2021) study also has shown similar results. Their study of 79 primary school teachers in Johor, Malaysia, also reveals that teachers are well-prepared and ready to implement the curriculum. Yet another study that presents similar results is Shukor and Sulaiman's (2022) study on 242 primary and secondary school teachers from Negeri Sembilan, Malaysia. The teachers view the implementation positively and are motivated to implement the change.

Though these studies reveal that teachers are ready to implement a CEFR-aligned curriculum, the focus is on school teachers' readiness to implement the curriculum. There seems to be a lack of literature on the readiness of English Language lecturers at the tertiary level to implement a CEFR-aligned curriculum. Lecturers and teachers will be required to adopt and implement the CEFR framework in their lessons. Their readiness and willingness to implement a curriculum guided by CEFR is pertinent as they prepare graduates to be globally competitive. Therefore, this study seeks to address the gap in the literature by fulfilling the following research objective.

This study aims to investigate lecturers' readiness to implement a curricular framework that is consistent with and guided by the CEFR.

1.3 Literature Review

Malaysia's education policies have undergone many changes to meet the needs of a globally demanding world (Chong & Yamat, 2021). In line with this, the Malaysian Education Blueprint (MEB) was announced in 2013, and it provides the framework for the transformation of the Malaysian education system until the year 2025. One of the features in this blueprint is the development of English language education, which resulted in the conceptualization of the English Language Road Map 2015-2025. To boost the standard of the English Language and to ensure that the English Language education system is on par with international standards, the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) was adopted (Mohammed et al., 2021). The Council of Europe developed CEFR in 2019, which focuses on three main objectives. Among them is providing a pathway for collaboration among educational institutions around the world and a universal recognition for language achievements (Council of Europe, 2020). CEFR's approach is different from the traditional approach, and it is an "action-oriented" approach where language learning is "oriented towards real-life tasks and constructed around purposefully selected notions and functions" (Council of Europe, 2020 p 28).

CEFR provides a common descriptive scheme where overall language proficiency is grouped under general competences, communicative language competences, communicative language activities, and communicative language strategies. The four key communicative language strategies are reception, production, interaction, and mediation. Learners are expected to utilise these strategies and be involved in language activities that will enable them to practice and use the language in specific domains. The domains that are mentioned include personal, public, educational, and occupational. The learner's language ability is measured according to six different levels - A1 and A2 (Basic User), B1 and B2 (Independent User), C1 and C2 (Proficient User). A detailed description of what a learner can do at each level is also provided in the framework (Council of Europe, 2020). The move by the Education Ministry to align the curriculum and assessment to the CEFR is to ensure that the Malaysian English Language is recognised globally, and the graduates are ready for the international job market (Abidin & Hashim, 2021).

The success of the implementation of a CEFR-aligned curriculum depends on many factors, however, the driving force behind its success is the teaching profession (Wok Zaki & Darmi, 2021). Educators play a key role in the implementation and practices of the CEFR-aligned curriculum. Chong and Yamat (2021) add that educators are crucial in the successful implementation of the curriculum as they are the ones who ensure that the learners' needs are met, and the lessons being taught are within the framework of the CEFR-aligned curriculum. To be able to do this, educators need to be ready to embrace the change. According to Shukur and Sulaiman (2022), there are a few factors that may influence educators' readiness to embrace change. One of the factors is educators' attitudes, which may have an impact on the implementation of the curriculum. A positive outlook may result in the success of the implementation. Another factor that needs to be considered is motivation. Teachers' internal and external sources of motivation, can be a strong influence on the success of implementation. Yasin and Yamat (2021) have further outlined four other factors that may

influence teachers' readiness. They include lack of training, teachers' incompetency, lack of localised content and learning materials, and school-based assessments. The importance of educators' readiness for the success of implementing a CEFR-aligned curriculum is crucial and cannot be overlooked. Thus, this study aims to investigate whether lecturers are prepared to implement a curriculum that is consistent with and guided by the CEFR.

2. Method

A survey was distributed to 40 lecturers in three public universities to gain insight into a few dimensions of readiness; quality, climate, cognitive, emotional, and other determinants. The survey involved 40 lecturers from a public university. All respondents were lecturers who have been given exposure to CEFR, and many have also attended training on CEFR on their own by attending webinars shared on a common platform. All have background information on CEFR and its implementation in Malaysian education reform. The questionnaire chosen for the study was adapted from Alih et al. (2020) which was used to gauge teachers' readiness to implement CEFR. The questionnaire was divided into a few dimensions of readiness; quality, climate, cognitive, emotional, and other determinants. The questions also include responses to investigate lecturers' readiness to accept the change into a CEFR-aligned framework, and the dimensions of change readiness, which include emotional, cognitive, and intentional. Other determinants for readiness include time, materials, and training. These dimensions of change were specifically significant in investigating lecturers' readiness to embrace the new CEFR-aligned curriculum.

3. Results

Table 1. Demographic Information of Research Participants

		Age					
		25-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51 and above
Experience	<1 year						
	1-5 years	5	7	1			
	6-10 years		6	7			
	11-20 years			3	1	3	1
	>21 years					2	4
Qualification	Degree		1				
	Masters	4	12	9		5	4
	PhD	1		2	1		1
Teaching Level	Foundation/Matric	1	3	3		2	1
	Diploma						
	Degree	4	10	7	1	3	3
	Post-grad			1			1

3.1 Demographic Information

The research participants include 40 lecturers comprising five different age groups, including 25-30 years old, 31-35 years old, 36-40 years old, 41-45 years old, 46-50 years old, and 51 years old and older. The five (12.5%) lecturers in the 25-30 years old age group comprise 4 lecturers with a Master's degree and 1 with a PhD qualification. Further, all of them have 1-5 years of experience in teaching, with four of them currently teaching degree students while one teaches foundation/matriculation students.

Next, there are 13 (32.5%) lecturers in the 31-35-year-old age group, including 12 with a Master's degree and 1 with a Bachelor's Degree. Seven of the lecturers have been teaching for 1-5 years, while 6 have 6-10 years of teaching experience. Other than that, ten of the lecturers are teaching degree students, three are teaching foundation students, and one is teaching post-graduate students. Meanwhile, there are 11 (27.5%) lecturers in the 36-40 years old age group with Master's degrees and two lecturers with PhD qualifications. Seven of them have been teaching for 6-10 years, while three lecturers have been teaching for 11-20 years, and one lecturer has been teaching for 1-5 years. Then, the only lecturer in the 41-45-year-old age group is a PhD holder, teaching degree students with 11-20 years of teaching experience.

Additionally, all five (12.5%) lecturers in the 46 to 50 years age group have a Master's degree, with two lecturers teaching foundation/matriculation students and the remaining three teaching degree students. Three of the lecturers in this age group have been teaching for 11-20 years, and two of them have more than 21 years of experience in teaching. Lastly, four out of five (12.5%) from the 51-year-old and above age group have a Master's degree and one has a PhD qualification. Three of the lecturers from this age group teach degree students, one teaches post-graduate students, while the last one teaches foundation/matriculation students. Four of them have more than 21 years of teaching experience, while one has 11-20 years of experience.

3.2 Readiness for Change

3.2.1 Quality of Change Communication (QCC)

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviations of the Participants' Responses on the Quality of Change Communication (QCC)

Item no.		Mean	Std. Deviation
1	I am regularly informed on how the change is going.	3.83	.934
2	There is good communication between the authority and lecturers about the government's policy toward the change.	3.4	.900
3	The information provided on the change is clear.	3.45	.932
4	Information concerning the change reaches us mostly as rumours.	2.7	1.04
5	We are sufficiently informed of the progress of the change.	3.32	.971
6	The authority clearly explains the necessity of the change.	3.43	1.07
7	We were well-informed about why the change was being implemented.	3.53	1.132

The participants moderately agree ($M = 3.83$, $SD = .934$) that they are regularly informed on the progress of the change. Next, they moderately agree ($M = 3.4$, $SD = .900$) that the lecturers and authority have good communication about the change in government policy. They moderately agree ($M = 3.45$, $SD = .932$) that the information provided on the change is clear. Meanwhile, they are not sure ($M = 2.7$, $SD = 1.04$) that the information concerning the change reaches them mostly as rumours. They also moderately agree ($M = 3.32$, $SD = .971$) that they are sufficiently informed of the progress of the change. They were found to moderately agree ($M = 3.425$, $SD = 1.07$) that the authority clearly explains the necessity of the change. Lastly, they moderately agreed ($M = 3.425$, $SD = 1.132$) that they were well-informed about why the change was being implemented.

3.2.2 Participation (PAR)

Table 3. Means and Standard of the Participants' Responses on the Participation (PAR)

Item no		Mean	Std. Deviation
1	Changes that will happen at the university are always discussed with the lecturers concerned.	3.5	1.09
2	Lecturers, who implement the change, are given enough opportunity to share their opinions in developing the proposal for the change.	3.43	1.06
3	Decisions concerning work at the university are taken in consultation with the lecturers who are affected.	3.3	1.06
4	The authority takes account of the lecturers' remarks on the change.	3.43	.984
5	The faculties are sufficiently consulted about the change.	3.5	1.09
6	Lecturers are well-informed about the reasons for change	3.5	1.09
7	Lecturers are sufficiently involved in the planning of the change.	3.3	1.223
8	Lecturers are sufficiently involved in the implementation of the change.	3.7	1.1

The participants moderately agree ($M = 3.5$, $SD = 1.09$) that the changes that will occur in the university are constantly discussed with the lecturers involved. Furthermore, the participants moderately agree ($M = 3.43$, $SD = 1.06$) that the lecturers who are responsible for implementing the change are given ample opportunities to share their perspectives in developing the proposal for the change. They moderately agree ($M = 3.3$, $SD = 1.06$) that the decisions concerning work at the university are taken into consideration by the affected lecturers. They moderately agree ($M = 3.43$, $SD = .984$) that the authority takes account of the lecturers' remarks on the change. They moderately agree ($M = 3.5$, $SD = 1.09$) that the faculties are sufficiently consulted about the change. They moderately agree ($M = 3.5$, $SD = 1.09$) that the lecturers are well-informed about the reasons for change. Lastly, they moderately agree ($M = 3.3$, $SD = 1.223$) that the lecturers are sufficiently involved in the

planning of the change and moderately agree ($M= 3.7$, $SD= 1.1$) on the implementation of the change.

3.3 Climate of Change

3.3.1 Trust in Leadership

Table 4. Means and Standards of the Participants' Responses on Their Trust in Leadership

Item no		Mean	Std. Deviation
1	The authority consistently implements its policies in all the faculties.	3.7	.883
2	The ministry fulfills its promises related to changes in education reform.	3.3	.939
3	If the reform fails to achieve its goals, the authority holds them against the lecturers.	2.9	1.01

The participants moderately agree ($M= 3.7$, $SD= .883$) that the authority consistently implements its policies in all the faculties. Other than that, they moderately agree ($M= 3.3$, $SD= .939$) that the ministry fulfills its promises related to changes in education reform. Participants have a neutral view ($M= 2.9$, $SD= 1.01$) on whether they will be held accountable by the authority if the reform fails to achieve its goals.

3.3.2 Politicking

Table 5. Means and Standards of the Participants' Responses on Politicking

Item no		Mean	Std. Deviation
1	Lecturers are consulted for opinions and suggestions before a change is implemented.	3.08	1.047
2	The change is rolled out by the authority and universities are merely implementers.	3.63	.896
3	All decisions regarding the change are taken by the authority alone.	2.95	1.011
4	The authority would consider any suggestions from lecturers regarding the change.	3.425	.984

The participants moderately agreed ($M = 3.08$, $SD = 1.047$) that they were consulted for opinions and suggestions before the change was implemented. They also moderately agree ($M = 3.63$, $SD = .896$) that the authorities integrated the change while the universities are merely implementers. They are relatively neutral ($M = 2.95$, $SD = 1.011$) on whether the authorities make all the decisions regarding the change alone. Lastly, they moderately agree ($M = 3.425$, $SD = .984$) that the authority would consider any suggestions from lecturers

regarding the change.

3.3.3 Cohesion

Table 6. Means and Standards of the Participants' Responses on the Cohesion

Item no		Mean	Std. Deviation
1	It is easy to ask for help from my colleagues when I am having difficulty implementing the change.	4.00	.716
2	I believe all my colleagues are sufficiently competent in implementing the change.	3.75	.839
3	I have confidence in my colleagues that we can implement the change successfully.	3.975	.697
4	My faculty is very open to any change.	3.85	.863

The participants strongly agree ($M= 4.00$, $SD= .716$) that it is easy to ask for help from colleagues when having difficulty implementing change. They moderately agree ($M= 3.75$, $SD= .839$) that all of their colleagues are sufficiently competent in implementing the change. They moderately agree ($M= 3.98$, $SD =.697$) that they have confidence in their colleagues' ability to implement the change successfully. Moreover, they moderately agree ($M= 3.85$, $SD= .863$) that their faculty is very accommodating to any change.

3.4 Dimensions of Readiness for Change

3.4.1 Emotional Readiness for Change

Table 7. Means and Standards of the Participants' Perspectives on Their Emotional Readiness for Change

Item no		Mean	Std. Deviation
1	I have a good feeling about the change.	3.78	.832
2	I experience the change as a positive process.	4.00	.716
3	I find the change refreshing.	3.85	.802
4	I am completely ready for the change.	3.78	.999
5	I am ready to accommodate and incorporate changes into my teaching.	4.10	.709
6	I am not confident that this change can work out well with my students.	2.98	1.187

The participants moderately agree ($M= 3.78$, $SD= .832$) that they have a good feeling about the change. They strongly agree ($M= 4.00$, $SD= .716$) that they experience the change as a positive process. Besides, they moderately agree ($M= 3.85$, $SD= .802$) that they find the change refreshing. They moderately agree ($M= 3.78$, $SD= .999$) that they are ready for the

change. They strongly agree ($M= 4.10$, $SD= .709$) that they are ready to accommodate and incorporate changes into their teaching. Finally, the participants are somewhat confident ($M= 2.98$, $SD= 1.187$) that this change can work out well with their students.

3.4.2 Cognitive Readiness for Change

Table 8. Means and Standards of the Participants' Perspectives on Their Cognitive Readiness for Change

Item no		Mean	Std. Deviation
1	Most changes that are supposed to solve problems in English education are working effectively well.	3.475	.933
2	I think the new change will be successfully implemented by teachers.	3.775	.800
3	I believe that the change will improve my teaching.	3.95	.749
4	I believe that the change will simplify work.	3.35	.975

Firstly, the participants moderately agree ($M= 3.475$, $SD= .933$) that most changes that are supposed to solve problems in English education are working effectively well. They moderately agree ($M= 3.775$, $SD= .800$) that they think the new change will be successfully implemented by teachers. They also moderately agree ($M= 3.95$, $SD= .749$) that they believe that the change will improve my teaching. They moderately agree ($M= 3.35$, $SD= .975$) that they believe that the change will simplify work.

3.5 Other Determinants of Readiness for Change

3.5.1 Time

Table 9. Means and Standards of the Participants' Perspectives on Time as a Determinant of Readiness for Change

Item no		Mean	Std. Deviation
1	The change is implemented almost automatically and in haste	3.025	.999
2	There is sufficient time given to lecturers to learn what the CEFR is before its implementation.	3.35	1.075
3	Lecturers should be given more time to become familiar with the CEFR before implementing it.	4.075	.694
4	Lecturers need more time to implement the CEFR in the courses.	3.90	.871
5	The workload lecturers have does not affect their preparation time to implement the CEFR.	2.95	1.131

The participants moderately agree ($M= 3.025$, $SD= .999$) that the change is implemented almost automatically and in haste. They moderately agree ($M= 3.35$, $SD= 1.075$) that there is sufficient time given to lecturers to learn what the CEFR is before its implementation. They strongly agree ($M= 4.075$, $SD= .694$) that the lecturers should be given more time to be familiar with the CEFR before implementing it. They moderately agree ($M= 3.90$, $SD= .871$) that they need more time to implement the CEFR in the courses. They moderately agree ($M= 2.95$, $SD= 1.131$) that the workloads lecturers have do not affect their preparation time to implement the CEFR.

3.5.2 Training

Table 10. Means and Standards of the Participants' Perspectives on the Trainers and the Training They Received on CEFR

Item no		Mean	Std. Deviation
1	The training given is sufficient to make lecturers understand and aware of the change.	3.075	.888
2	The training gives sufficient knowledge to lecturers on how the change can be implemented.	3.20	1.159
3	The training provides sufficient opportunity to lecturers to exercise the knowledge they get about the CEFR.	3.475	.960
4	The training allows lecturers to discuss the issues they encounter in implementing the CEFR.	3.50	.960
5	The training provides hands-on practice to lecturers about the CEFR implementation.	3.60	.955
6	There were a sufficient number of trainers to train lecturers on the CEFR implementation.	3.55	.959
7	The trainers are well-versed in the CEFR.	3.30	1.043
8	The trainers can clear all my doubts about the CEFR.	3.60	.900
9	The trainers explained the CEFR very effectively, and I could understand the CEFR very well.	3.475	.905
10	I think the trainers have high credibility to train others.	3.525	.877

The participants moderately agree ($M= 3.075$, $SD= .888$) that the training given is sufficient to make lecturers understand and aware of the change. They moderately agree ($M= 3.20$, $SD= 1.159$) that the training gives lecturers sufficient knowledge on how the change can be implemented. They moderately agree ($M= 3.475$, $SD= .960$) that the training provides sufficient opportunity for lecturers to exercise the knowledge they get about the CEFR. They moderately agree ($M= 3.50$, $SD= .960$) that the training allows lecturers to discuss the issues they encounter in implementing the CEFR. They moderately agree ($M= 3.60$, $SD= .955$) that the training provides hands-on practice to lecturers about the CEFR implementation. They moderately agree ($M= 3.55$, $SD= .959$) that the number of trainers to train lecturers on the

CEFR implementation was sufficient. They moderately agree ($M= 3.30$, $SD= 1.043$) that the trainers are well-versed in the CEFR. They moderately agree ($M= 3.60$, $SD= .900$) that the trainers can clear all my doubts about the CEFR. They moderately agree ($M= 3.475$, $SD= .905$) that the trainers explained the CEFR very effectively, and could understand the CEFR very well. They moderately agree ($M= 3.525$, $SD= .877$) that the trainers have high credibility in training others.

4. Discussion

The widespread acceptance and implementation of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) at the tertiary level underscore the importance of readiness in navigating the transition to a new curriculum framework. Revisiting the belief of Wok Zaki & Darmi's (2021), factors such as positive acceptance, emotional response, cognitive input, and adequate training play pivotal roles in ensuring the success of this transformative process. The findings of the study revealed that participants demonstrated a readiness to accept the new curriculum, leaning towards acceptance to a certain degree. Notably, the study identified a significant aspect of this readiness—participants exhibited a favorable disposition towards the quality of change. This encompassed their willingness to participate in the change, trust in leadership, and considerations of political factors. Although the decision to implement the new framework is well accepted, it is still a huge concern that teachers will not be able to implement the curriculum efficiently. Such curriculum reforms and major changes in education should take into account educators' concerns and sufficient support should be given to ensure that teaching and learning are executed well (Kaur & Zhi Jian, 2022)

Overall, participants expressed a moderate agreement in various aspects. They acknowledged being regularly informed about the changes in the curriculum framework, moderately agreed on the importance of trust in the change process, and similarly endorsed the notion that their opinions and suggestions were sought during the transition. The transition to a new curriculum framework can be a complex emotional and cognitive shift for educators. However, the study revealed a positive impact, which corroborates the study by Shukor and Sulaiman (2022), with educators strongly agreeing that the change would bring about positive improvements in education. The same findings were not reported by teachers in a survey conducted by Mohamad Uri (2023) as the results of the survey revealed that almost all teachers claimed that they doubted their abilities to teach as they were unclear on the details and the process of implementing a CEFR curriculum-aligned syllabus. Some of the concerns identified were the 6 levels of descriptors and the resources that can be used for teaching. According to Muhammad et. al. (2021), the concerns faced by teachers could also be the result of several other factors, such as insufficient CEFR training, time constraints, and the placement of students according to their proficiency level.

Beyond attitudes, other critical determinants of readiness include training and time. The findings suggested that participants held a moderate agreement regarding the implementation process. While there was a moderate agreement that the implementation seemed somewhat automatic and hasty, there was also a consensus that participants were given sufficient time to

familiarize themselves with the CEFR. This study reinforces the findings of Alih et al. (2021) about the significance of training. The majority of participants expressed a moderate level of agreement with receiving sufficient knowledge and understanding of the new curricular framework. Mohamad Khair and Mohd Shah (2021) also concur with Alih et al (2021). They acknowledge that training and workshops are needed to enhance lecturers' understanding of CEFR and provide the necessary skills so that they can implement the new curricular framework. They also emphasise the importance of having regular training and workshops to ensure the success of the implementation, as the lecturers' level of understanding is still at a very early stage.

This study has limitations in sample size, thus, generalisation to a broader group of educators is not recommended. The rate of implementing the CEFR framework for each institution differs, which will also influence the state of readiness. The findings from the study may not be a representation of the population for a larger scope of tertiary educators. The findings of the study are significant to many relevant parties: educators, management, and policymakers. The findings reveal the actual state of readiness of educators at the receiving end of policy, which can be invaluable insights to navigate in the implementation of CEFR into the curriculum. The study identifies the areas of concern such as training, knowledge, and emotional support needed in the process of changing curriculum, which can be useful in making strategic decisions to ensure the success and continuous improvement of aligning tertiary curriculum to CEFR.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, this study provides valuable insights into the state of educators' readiness for the implementation of the CEFR at the tertiary level. It emphasizes the significance of positive acceptance, emotional preparedness, cognitive engagement, and the provision of ample training and time as integral components for a successful transition to a new curriculum framework.

The research has provided insights into the complex structure of lecturer preparedness. By meticulously examining key dimensions including quality, climate, cognitive, and emotional factors, the researchers were able to achieve a nuanced grasp of the several-sided challenges and opportunities associated with this process. Therefore, the findings do not only identify the current state of lecturer preparedness but also form the basis for the development of interventions needed to build their capacity to effectively implement this new curriculum environment.

The findings of this research are not restricted to theoretical observation but can serve as a vital basis for the development of appropriate training programs that will equip lecturers with the necessary knowledge assets and competencies vital for the successful implementation and integration of the CEFR-based curriculum. Furthermore, educational stakeholders can also design training programs that address specific needs among lecturers, thereby fostering a supportive environment conducive to professional growth and development.

In addition, the results of this study have great potential in terms of the development of better English language education in the future. This means that the materials will not only be well-adjusted to international standards but also well-tailored to the specific nuances of the national educational context. More specifically, with the help of the right educational resources, tailored to the local needs of the country, students will acquire the necessary skills more quickly, and teachers will be able to follow the guidelines more sufficiently. Thus, this study is a key to more qualitative adjustment of the curriculum to combine international standards and creativity, which is so typical of traditional education.

References

- Abidin, N. Z., & Hashim, H. (2021). Common European framework of reference (CEFR): A review on teachers' perception & Plurilingualism. *Creative Education, 12*(04), 727-736. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2021.124051>
- C. Alih, N. A., Abdul Raof, A. H., & Md. Yusof, M. A. (2021). Policy change implementation: The case of the CEFR in Malaysian ESL classrooms. *Journal of Nusantara Studies (JONUS), 6*(2), 296-317. <https://doi.org/10.24200/jonus.vol6iss2pp296-317>
- Chong, G., & Yamat, H. (2021). Teachers' implementation of CEFR-aligned curriculum: A preliminary study. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics, 3*(3), 05-09. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jeltal.v3i3.1366>
- Council of Europe. (2020). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment: Companion volume*. Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/common-european-framework-of-reference-for-languages-learning-teaching/16809ea0d4>
- Kaur, P., & Jian, M. Z. (2022). The CEFR-aligned curriculum: Perspectives of Malaysian teachers. *Asian Journal of Research in Education and Social Sciences, 4*(1), 138-145. <https://doi.org/10.55057/ajress.2022.4.1.13>
- Mohamad Khair, A. H., & Mohd 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). Retrieved from <http://www.isaac-scientific.org/12/2073/6/1/2/2021/JAER.html>
- Mohamad Uri, N. F. (2023). Challenges in CEFR adoption: Teachers' understanding and classroom practice. *International Journal of Modern Languages and Applied Linguistics (IJMAL), 7*(1), 49-62 e-ISSN: 2600-7266. Retrieved from <https://myjms.mohe.gov.my/index.php/ijmal/index>
- Mohammed, N. A., Abdul Raof, A. H., & Md Yusof, M. A. (2021). Challenges in implementing the CEFR in English language classrooms. *LSP International Journal, 8*(2), 115-128. <https://doi.org/10.11113/lspi.v8.17977>
- Shukor, E. A., & Sulaiman, N. A. (2022). ESL Teachers' Attitude and Motivation towards

CEFR Implementation. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 12(6), 62-72. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v12-i6/13951>

Wok Zaki, A., & Darmi, R. (2021). The implementation of CEFR in ESL Learning: Why does it matter to the Malaysian Education System? *Asian Journal of Assessment in Teaching and Learning*, 11(2), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.37134/ajatel.vol11.2.1.2021>

Yasin, N., & Yamat, H. (2021). Factors influencing ESL primary school teacher's readiness in implementing CEFR-aligned curriculum. *International Journal of English Language Studies*, 3(2), 44-51. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijels.2021.3.2.6>

Acknowledgments

The research would not have been possible without the funds provided by an internal faculty grant (GIA). We would also wish to express our gratitude to educators/lecturers for their participation in the research. This research is the result of a collaborative effort of all.

Authors contributions

Not applicable.

Funding

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Informed consent

Obtained.

Ethics approval

The Publication Ethics Committee of the Macrothink Institute.

The journal's policies adhere to the Core Practices established by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

Provenance and peer review

Not commissioned; externally double-blind peer reviewed.

Data availability statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

Data sharing statement

No additional data are available.

Open access

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.