

## Teachers' Evaluation of The Suitability of Reading Syllabus Specifications to The CEFR

Nurul Farehah Mohamad Uri<sup>1\*</sup> & Mohd Salehuddin Abd Aziz<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Universiti Kuala Lumpur British Malaysian Institute, Kuala Lumpur Malaysia

<sup>2</sup>Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia

\*Corresponding Author: Nurul Farehah Mohamad Uri, nfarehah@unikl.edu.my

### ABSTRACT

The objectives of this study are to determine the suitability of reading syllabus specifications against CEFR reading scale and to find out if the CEFR levels of reading syllabus specifications suggested by teachers match the CEFR level set by Ministry of Education. 331 secondary school English teachers took part in this study through distribution of syllabus checklist. The teachers were required to determine if the current reading syllabus specifications are suitable and still relevant to be used against CEFR global scale. The teachers also recommended suitable CEFR levels for reading syllabus specifications. Data was analysed using Winstep since it measures suitability of an item. It was found that there are syllabus specifications which are still relevant and suitable to be used with CEFR global scale. Findings also reveal that reading syllabus specifications are aligned and matched the target CEFR level of B2 since CEFR level B1/B2 are the target level set by Ministry of Education for Form 5 English. Most of the reading skills syllabus specifications were placed at CEFR level B2 by the teachers. In conclusion, reading syllabus specifications which are found to be suitable and relevant to the CEFR should be retained so that these syllabus specifications could be used with the new CEFR aligned English syllabus.

**KEY WORDS:** CEFR global scale; English syllabus; teachers' judgement; CEFR level; suitability.

### INTRODUCTION

The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages or CEFR was formulated in 2001 (Council of Europe, 2001) and designed to establish international standards for foreign language education to cater to the needs of language learners as well as academics and other professions related to assessment, teaching and learning of languages. CEFR is known as a multifunction framework and it functions well with these criteria: comprehensive, transparent and coherent. CEFR is not a test but a universal framework which functions more as a guide. It can be used in constructing, administering and measuring of a language test which is aligned to the framework. Besides the CEFR global scale which comprises of the four English skills in the same table, there are also individual scale for reading, listening, speaking and writing skills. Table 1 is the CEFR reading scale with the descriptors.

**Table 1:** CEFR Reading Descriptors

CEFR level	Reading Descriptors
C2	I can read with ease virtually all forms of the written language, including abstract, structurally or linguistically complex texts such as manuals, specialised articles and literary works.
C1	I can understand long and complex factual and literary texts, appreciating distinctions of style. I can understand specialised

	articles and longer technical instructions, even when they do not relate to my field.
B2	I can read articles and reports concerned with contemporary problems in which the writers adopt particular stances or viewpoints. I can understand contemporary literary prose.
B1	I can understand texts that consist mainly of high frequency every day or job-related language. I can understand the description of events, feelings and wishes in personal letters.
A2	I can read very short, simple texts. I can find specific, predictable information in simple everyday material such as advertisements, prospectuses, menus and timetables and I can understand short simple personal letters.
A1	I can understand familiar names, words and very simple sentences, for example on notices and posters or in catalogues.

Over the years, CEFR has become a familiar concept and idea to many leading Asia countries such as Japan, Taiwan, Hong Kong, China and Korea because these countries have been adopting this framework five to seven years after the official introduction. Japan, Taiwan and Hong Kong were among the earliest countries in Asia to adopt CEFR back in 2005. Two years later in 2007, Korea and China started to implement CEFR in their language teaching and learning particularly English language. In Taiwan, CEFR is mapped against several English proficiency tests such as General English Proficiency Test (GEPT), IELTS, TOEFL and TOEIC. On the other hand, Japan has used CEFR comprehensively in teaching and learning, curriculum development as well assessment. Japan has also modified the CEFR quite extensively to ensure that the framework fits its local context. As a result, the Japanese have managed to modify and establish their own standards of foreign language proficiency known as the CEFR- J (Negishi, 2012). After 12 years of adoption and implementation of CEFR in their education system from pre – school level up to tertiary level. China is currently working on their own version of CEFR known as the Common Chinese Framework of Reference for English (CCFR- E), a project funded and supervised by the Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press (FLTRP) of China (Jin, Wu, Alderson & Song 2017).

The influence of CEFR has also reached South East Asian nations with Vietnam being the first South East Asian country to implement CEFR in their education system. Vietnam was categorized as one of the “low proficiency” countries based on a report gathered from language test data in 2013. A large number of Vietnamese workers failed to meet global demands and compete internationally due to low proficiency in English. Consequently in 2008, the Vietnamese Government announced educational reforms to incorporate global language standards into language teaching and learning in Vietnam because there was a need for a standardize guideline for measuring and assessing language policies (Nguyen & Hamid, 2015). The

Ministry of Education Malaysia has also decided to adopt CEFR into the education system, following the footsteps of Vietnam and Thailand. Hence it would be vital to view the current status of CEFR adoption in Malaysia.

### CEFR in Malaysia

The implementation of CEFR in Malaysia is necessary as an effort in improving the English proficiency of the students (Zuraida Mohd Don, 2015). The Ministry of Education has appointed the English Language Standards and Quality Council (ELSQC), chaired by Prof. Dr. Zuraidah Mohd Don and a team of English language experts from local universities to create the roadmap of implementation plan for the systematic reform of English language education as well as introducing CEFR into the education system. The implementation of CEFR in Malaysia is divided into three waves as illustrated in Table 1. Wave 1 was the evaluation period of the current education system. The first two years of the implementation plan focused on strengthening the current education system and curricula which included sending teachers to various trainings. CEFR descriptors were developed and CEFR level for each educational stage was also set within 2013 to 2015. In Wave 2, the structural changes were introduced to teachers in 2016. In the same year, the process of aligning English syllabus and curricula as well as School Based Assessment (SBA) to the CEFR also took place. ELSQC also selected and purchased imported CEFR aligned textbooks and support materials from Cambridge English to be used in schools starting 2017. Wave 2 is currently on going with classroom implementation involving Year 1, Year 2, Form 1 and Form 2 students. Wave 3 was created to review, revise and evaluate the implementation of CEFR from all aspects. The success or failure of CEFR implementation in elevating the standard of English among Malaysians especially among the younger generation can only be measured after 2025.

**Table 2:** CEFR implementation plan

Wave 1 (2013 – 2015)	Wave 2 (2016 – 2020)	Wave 3 (2021 – 2025)
Strengthening the current education system and curricula.	Introduce structural changes.	The developed CEFR descriptors will be reviewed and revised.
English teachers Malaysia were sent for various trainings.	Suitable CEFR descriptors were being developed for each educational level.	Development of CEFR-M by the CEFR special task force.
CEFR descriptors are developed, educational staged targets are set and capacity is built.	The process of aligning English syllabus and curricula as well as School Based Assessment (SBA) to the CEFR.	Evaluation of the selected textbooks and support materials.
	International CEFR-aligned textbooks and support materials were selected.	Evaluate teachers' use of the CEFR in teaching and learning process as well as assessment practices.

## **The aligning of English syllabus to the CEFR**

Malaysia has shifted from summative towards formative assessments a few years ago due to the concern over the effectiveness of evaluating and assessing students' ability and understanding through summative assessment such as final year examinations or national type of examinations. According to Ong (2010); Othman, Salleh & Md Noraini (2013), formative assessment have more advantages compared to summative assessment as it allows teachers to monitor and chart student learning as well as achievement. As shown in Table 2, English syllabus and curricula including School – Based Assessment (SBA) were aligned to the CEFR in 2016. The alignment was seen as vital and significant as it would elevate the standard of our English syllabus and curricula to be at par with international level because it conforms to the CEFR standard and requirement. Nonetheless, the main issue with CEFR alignment process is the dilemma between a total revamp or to adapt where necessary by retaining the suitable components of the current reading syllabus. O'Dwyer (2014) claimed that it would be sufficient to evaluate the current syllabus with necessary alignment but Athanasiou et. al (2016) were against adaptation because it could lead to interference and intervene of the authentic content as well as teaching materials. Therefore, it would be vital to conduct a study to find out if the current reading syllabus should be totally revamped or adapted in order to align it against CEFR reading descriptors.

The objectives of this study are:

- a. To determine the suitability of reading syllabus specifications against CEFR reading scale.
- b. To find out if the CEFR levels of reading syllabus specifications suggested by teachers match the CEFR level set by Ministry of Education.

## **METHODS**

### **Respondents**

A total of 331 English secondary school teachers around Putrajaya, Selangor and Kuala Lumpur participated in this study. The predetermined criteria's set in choosing the participants were their teaching experience since all the participants of this study have between 12 to 20 years of teaching English subjects for upper secondary level and the minimum of Bachelor degree in English education. The participants chosen for this study must also be very familiar with Form 5 English syllabus and assessment, particularly SPM English.

### **Instruments**

The instrument used in this study was syllabus checklist. The syllabus checklist was developed based on Form 5 English syllabus as the key reference. The checklist was verified and validated by three language

experts from local universities. The verification and validation process was conducted to ensure the construct of the syllabus checklist align with the Form 5 English syllabus. In addition, this study only covers reading and writing syllabus specifications because reading and writing parts of SPM English papers are standardized throughout the nation since this high stake examination is prepared by the Ministry of Education. Therefore, present study would only focus on these aspects of syllabus specifications. Other than the syllabus checklist, CEFR reading scale were also used as part of instruments.

**Table 3:** Reliability statistics of syllabus checklist

N of items	Cronbach's Alpha	Reliability (items)	Reliability (teachers)
29	.898	.84	.86

Table 3 illustrates the results of pilot study from Winstep and SPSS 23. Based on Table 3, it can be seen that the Cronbach's Alpha reading for the syllabus checklist is .898. Whereas, the reliability reading measured using Winstep are categorized into two, which are items (refers to reading syllabus specifications) and teachers. The reliability statistics for items is .84 and teachers is .86. Clearly, the reading syllabus checklist is considered good and reliable based on high value of Cronbach's Alpha and Winstep reliability readings which are 0.8 and above. According to Taber (2018), an overall alpha value of .70 is considered good and acceptable. Therefore, no necessary amendments were made to improve the syllabus checklist since the Cronbach Alpha and reliability reading from both SPSS and Winstep show high values.

### **Procedure**

The schools involved in this study were chosen at random. Once permission was granted by the school principal, the heads of English panel gathered all English teachers. Simple yet short briefing was given to the teachers to inform them of the objectives of the study. Explanation on how to respond to the syllabus checklist was also provided to the teachers. They were given around 14 days to complete and return the syllabus checklist. Nonetheless, due to unavoidable issues such as teachers who attended trainings and courses outside of schools for more than a week, some of the school teachers took around 3 to 4 weeks to return the syllabus checklist.

### **Data Analysis**

Winstep was used in data analysing to determine the suitability of the syllabus to CEFR level. The collected data was entered into excel which was then transferred to Winstep to be processed. Winstep was chosen for data analysis of this study because Winstep offers details results including the logit value, S.E value and Infit mnsq value which is suitable in finding suitability of an item. Moreover, Winstep is an established

computer software which has been used in other CEFR related studies by Zhao, Wang, Coniam and Xie (2017), Franz and Teo (2017) and Runnels (2013).

## RESULTS

### Reading syllabus specifications which are suitable and relevant to CEFR global scale

This section discusses the results of reading syllabus specifications measurement report as illustrated in Table 4. The results determine if these syllabus specifications are suitable and relevant to CEFR global scale.

**Table 4:** Reading syllabus specifications measurement report

Syllabus specifications	Logit	S.E	Infit MnSq
R27	.60	17	.90
R28	.11	18	.59
R29	.08	18	1.77
R6	.93	20	.93
R5	.73	20	.77
R10	.69	20	.55
R12	.65	20	1.54
R11	.56	20	.49
R15	.56	20	.79
R7	.48	20	1.71
R14	.48	20	1.25
R19	.35	21	.96
R1	.18	21	.74
R20	.18	21	.67
R17	.14	21	.79
R18	.01	21	1.67
R16	-.04	21	.86
R8	-.08	21	.62
R2	-.13	21	1.56
R9	-.13	21	.50
R13	-.13	21	1.01
R26	-.79	21	.75
R3	-.54	22	.81
R22	-.64	22	.76
R4	-.69	22	2.09
R23	-.73	22	.89
R21	-.78	22	.51
R24	-.97	22	1.14
R25	-1.07	22	1.12

Logit values of syllabus specifications for reading skills are between -1.07 to .60 as shown in Table 4 and in specific it illustrates the details of reading items measurement report for reading skills syllabus specifications. Generally, there are seven syllabus specifications with the highest standard error (S.E) value

of 22 which means these seven syllabus specifications are the easiest out of twenty – nine syllabus specifications because it has the biggest reading of S.E value. The easiest syllabus specifications with the highest value of S.E are R3 (Giving opinion on articles read or accounts heard), R22 (Identifying cause and effect), R4 (Responding to problem page letters in the newspaper or in popular magazines by first discussing them and then writing letters to the editor), R23 (Making inferences), R21 (Predicting outcomes with reason), R24 (Drawing conclusions) and R25 (Identifying and discussing points of view).

These syllabus specifications are considered as the easiest syllabus specifications not only based on the high value of S.E but the negative logit values for these items also support the findings that the seven syllabus specifications which are placed at the bottom are the seven easiest items of syllabus specifications for reading skill. The values of logits for the seven syllabus specifications are R3 (-.54), R22 (-.64), R4 (-.69), R23 (-.73), R21 (-.78), R24 (-.97) and R25 (-1.07). Although these syllabus specifications are considered as the easiest items of all based on logit and S.E values, several syllabus specifications such as R3, R22, R23, R24 and R25 have the infit mnsq values of .81, .76, .89, 1.14 and 1.12 each. These values are within the suggested value of 0.6 – 1.4. Directly, these syllabus specifications R3, R22, R23, R24 and R25 are appropriate and can be retained to represent easy items of syllabus specifications. This implies the idea that easy tasks are also needed and it is equally important in producing a balanced English language syllabus with a variety mix of difficult, moderate and easy items. Unfortunately, two syllabus specifications R4 and R21 are suggested to be removed because both syllabus specifications are not suitable. This is proven with the values of infit mnsq of these syllabus specifications which are not between 0.6 – 1.4. The value of infit mnsq for syllabus specification R4 is 2.09 which are more than 1.4 and the infit mnsq for syllabus specification R21 is less than 0.6 with .51.

S.E value of 21 represents eleven easy syllabus specifications in the same group which can be divided into two categories. The first category consists of five syllabus specifications with positive logit values and the remaining six syllabus specifications have negative logit values belong to the second category. Syllabus specifications with positive logit values are R19 (Listening to and understanding a variety of texts) with the logit value of .35, R1 (Making enquiries after reading the adverts column in the newspaper/yellow pages and identifying a number of similar services and products) with the logit value of .18, R20 (Reading silently a variety of materials in print and from the Internet) also with the logit value of .18, R17 (Listing important details) with the logit value of .14 and R18 (Acquiring meaning of words by understanding: word formation through the use of prefix and suffix and contextual clues) with the logit value of .01. The positive logit values and S.E values of syllabus specifications R19, R1, R20, R17 and R18 are in line and it implies that these syllabus specifications are placed correctly as syllabus specifications with moderate difficulty level which also means syllabus specifications R19, R1, R20, R17 and R18 are more difficult than syllabus specifications R16 – R26 but are less difficult than syllabus specifications R6 – R14.

Syllabus specifications R16 (Identifying main ideas in the text read) with the logit value of -.04, R8 (Skimming for the gist of the text) with the logit value of -.08, R2 (Reading topics of current interest and exchanging ideas) with the logit value of -.13, R9 (Scanning for details) also with the logit value of -.13, R13 (Acquiring vocabulary through: word association and word collocation) with the logit value of -.13 and R26 (Comparing and contrasting data collected from graphs, tables, charts and diagrams) with logit value of -.79 are the ones with negative logit values. Even though, these syllabus specifications have the S.E value of 21 but it is still considered as easy items due to the negative logit values. These six syllabus specifications R16, R8, R2, R9, R13 and R26 are recognized as easy items but these syllabus specifications are not as easy as syllabus specifications with S.E value of 22 and R16, R8, R2, R9, R13 and R26 are slightly difficult than syllabus specifications R3, R22, R4, R23, R21, R24 and R24. Still syllabus specifications R16, R8, R2, R9, R13 and R26 are not as difficult as syllabus specifications R19, R1, R20, R17 and R18 although it shares the same value of S.E.

Referring to the values of infit mnsq of syllabus specification R19 – R26, there are only two syllabus specifications which are not suitable and shall not be retained in the list of syllabus specifications for reading skills because the value of infit mnsq are more than 1.4. Syllabus specification R18 has the infit mnsq value of 1.67 and R2 with the infit mnsq of 1.56. The values of 1.67 and 1.56 indicate that these items are overfit with a value exceeding the suggested maximum infit value of 1.4. Hence, syllabus specifications R18 and R2 should be removed from the list. The remaining syllabus specifications R19, R1, R20, R17, R16, R8, R9, R13 and R26 shall not be removed and suitable to be used in the Form 5 English syllabus because these syllabus specifications have appropriate value of infit mnsq. The value of infit mnsq for these suitable syllabus specifications are .96 (R19), .74(R1), .67(R20), .79 (R17), .86(R16), .62(R8), .50 (R9), 1.01 (R13) and .75 (R26). It shows that the teachers agreed that reading topics of current interest and exchanging ideas and acquiring meaning of words by understanding: word formation through the use of prefix and suffix and contextual clues are no longer suitable especially to be used with CEFR global scale.

There are also eight difficult syllabus specifications with positive high logit values between .48 - .93. These items have the S.E value of 20 which makes it are more difficult that items R19 – R26 with the S.E value of 21. From Table 2, it is found that the most difficult item with the highest logit value of .93 among the eight syllabus specifications is syllabus specification R6 (Reading silently a variety of materials in print and from the Internet). Syllabus specification R6 has infit mnsq value that is within 0.6 – 1.4. The infit mnsq value of this syllabus specification is .93 which makes it moderately difficult yet suitable item in the list. The list of syllabus specification is followed by syllabus specifications R5 (Listening to and understanding a variety of texts) with the logit value of .73, R10 (Following the sequence of ideas) with the logit value of .69 and R12 (Using the dictionary to find the meaning of the words) with the logit value of



.65. These syllabus specifications also share another similarities apart being on top of the list as moderately difficult items, the S.E value for syllabus specifications R5, R10 and R12 are 20.

A small value of S.E indicates the items are moderately difficult aside from the high value of logit. Out of these three syllabus specifications, only syllabus specification R5 has a reasonable value of *infit mnsq* of .77. On the other hand, both syllabus specifications R10 and R12 have *infit mnsq* values which do not fit within the range of 0.6 to 1.4. Syllabus specification R10 has the *infit mnsq* value of .55 which is less than 0.6 whereas syllabus specification R12 has the *infit mnsq* value of 1.54 which is more than 1.4. Due to the values of the *infit mnsq* which do not fall within the range of 0.6 – 1.4, both syllabus specifications R10 and R12 are not suitable and should be removed from the list despite having a high logit value.

The remaining four syllabus specifications which share the same S.E value of 20 are syllabus specifications R11 and R15 with .56 logit values and syllabus specifications R7 and R14 with .48 logit values each. Although, the S.E value of 20 means that these syllabus specifications are moderately difficult but the level of difficulty decreases as the logit values get smaller too. Therefore, based on the values of logit, it is found that syllabus specifications R11, R15, R7 and R14 are slightly less difficult than the previous four syllabus specifications R6, R5, R10 and R12. In terms of the *infit mnsq* values of these syllabus specifications, only syllabus specifications R15 and R14 shall be retained due to good values of .79 and 1.25 each. Meanwhile, syllabus specifications R11 with *infit mnsq* value of .49 and R7 with *infit mnsq* value of 1.71 are regarded as too easy and confusing item because it does not meet the stipulated range of 0.6 – 1.4 *infit mnsq* values.

Table 3 also reveals that there are two difficult items and one most difficult items of reading skill syllabus specifications. The two difficult items with S.E value of 18 are R28 (Discussing values explored in the text) and R29 (Understanding the figurative language of the text). Despite being the two top difficult items according to the S.E value of 18, the logit value for both R28 and R29 do not support the S.E value. It is because the logit values are rather small with the value of .11 (R28) and .08 (R29) which means that these are easy items although the value is positive. The S.E value should support the logit value, however it contradicts with each other. In addition, the *infit mnsq* value of R28 and R29 also suggest that these items are not good items for reading skill syllabus specification because the *infit mnsq* value of R28 falls below .6 with only .59, meanwhile R29 has the *infit mnsq* value which exceeds 1.4 with the value of 1.77. These values show that these two items are not suitable because R28 is too easy and R29 is too difficult and confusing. Hence, it is best that these two items to be removed from the list.

Out of the 29 items in the reading skill syllabus specification, there is only one item with the smallest S.E value of 17 which makes it the most difficult item, item R27 (Finding out the meaning of words by using the dictionary and/or contextual clues). Item R27 also has a good positive logit value of .60 and *infit*

mnsq of .90. The value of infit mnsq for item R27 fall within suggested value range which means this item is suitable and should be retained despite being the most difficult item for reading skill. To summarise, the details results of the logit, S.E and infit mnsq values of these syllabus specifications reveal that not all difficult items must be retained and not all easy items are not needed and shall be removed. The results suggest that a syllabus should comprise of difficult, moderate and easy syllabus specifications to cater different needs of language learners.

### CEFR level of reading syllabus specifications assigned by teachers

This section highlights the CEFR level recommended by the participants for each of the reading syllabus specifications. The participants were asked to suggest suitable CEFR level based on their judgements as subject matter experts. Details findings are shown in Table 5.

**Table 5:** CEFR level for reading skill syllabus specifications

Syllabus specifications	CEFR level	Syllabus specifications	CEFR level
R1	B1	R16	B2
R2	B2	R17	B2
R3	B2	R18	B2
R4	B1	R19	B2
R5	B2	R20	B2
R6	B2	R21	B2
R7	B2	R22	B2
R8	B2	R23	B2
R9	B2	R24	B2
R10	B2	R25	C1
R11	B2	R26	C1
R12	B2	R27	B1/B2
R13	B2	R28	B2/C1
R14	B2	R29	B2
R15	B2		

Results from Table 5 show that most of the reading skills syllabus specifications were placed at CEFR level B2 by the teachers and they were only three CEFR levels recommended by the teachers, namely: CEFR level B1, B2 and C1. Table 4 also reveals that they are two syllabus specifications with two levels of CEFR. Syllabus specification R27 was recommended with CEFR levels B1 and B2 and syllabus specification R 28 with CEFR level B2 and C1. Syllabus specification R27 is considered as the most difficult syllabus specification in the list based on logit and S.E values, therefore CEFR level C1 would be the most suitable CEFR level for R27.

Half of the respondents agreed to place syllabus specifications R28 at CEFR level B2 while the rest of the respondents believed it should be CEFR level C1. Syllabus specifications R28 is the second in the list,

right after the most difficult syllabus specifications. S.E value of 18 and positive logit value support that syllabus specification R28 should be considered as difficult syllabus specification. Therefore, CEFR level C1 might be more appropriate compared to B2. It is the same with syllabus specification R29 since it share the same S.E value of 18 with R28 which makes it a difficult syllabus specification too. However, the teachers suggested CEFR level B2 for R29. Unfortunately, CEFR level B2 is not in line with the values of logit and S.E. Again, CEFR level C1 might be more appropriate for syllabus specification R29.

Syllabus specifications R6 to R18 were recommended to match level B2 of the CEFR by the teachers except for syllabus specification R1. B2 seems to be a suitable CEFR level for these syllabus specifications as it matches the logit values and S.E values of all 12 syllabus specifications. CEFR level B1 might also be a suitable CEFR level for syllabus specifications R19 – R18 considering the S.E values for these syllabus specifications are 21 which indirectly means syllabus specifications R19 – R18 are supposed to be slightly less difficult compared to syllabus specifications R6 – R 14. Thus, CEFR level B1 would better and more suitable CEFR level for syllabus specifications R19 – R18 as compared to CEFR level B2 or perhaps syllabus specifications R19 – R18 could take both CEFR level B1 and B2.

The teachers also suggested CEFR level B2 for syllabus specifications R16 – R13. However, CEFR level B2 does not match syllabus specification R16 until R13 because these syllabus specifications have negative logit values unlike syllabus specifications R19 – R18 although these syllabus specifications share the same S.E value of 21. S.E value of 21 also makes syllabus specifications R16 – R13 less difficult than syllabus specifications R6, R5, R10, R12, R11, R15, R7, R14, R19, R1, R20, R17 and R18. CEFR level A2 would be a more appropriate level for syllabus specifications R16, R8, R2, R9, R13 and R3 because the negative logit values should make these syllabus specifications to be placed with one level lower than syllabus specifications R19 – R18.

Some syllabus specifications from R3 to R25 were placed at CEFR level B2, B1 or C1 by the teachers. Obviously, the suggested CEFR levels for syllabus specifications R3 – R25 do not match the values of logit, S.E and infit mnsq of these syllabus specifications. CEFR level C1, B2 and B1 are too high for items with negative logit values and the biggest value of S.E. These seven syllabus specifications belong to the easy typed of items with syllabus specification R25 being the easiest of all these items in reading skills. Therefore, CEFR level which matches the values of logit and S.E of these syllabus specifications are between A1 and A2. Again, the teachers overrated the difficulty level of syllabus specifications R3 – R25.

## **CONCLUSION**

The findings of this study show that most reading syllabus specifications are suitable and aligned to CEFR level B2 as set by the Ministry of Education. This is in line with a study conducted in Indonesia which aligned English syllabus for junior and senior level. The English syllabus was found to be within the range

of A1 – B2 of CEFR (Farah, Talitha & Marcyandi, 2019). The school teachers' ability to suggest suitable CEFR level to reading syllabus specifications indicates their understanding of the alignment process. Hence, modification of the current reading syllabus specifications against the CEFR is sufficient because most of the reading syllabus specifications could still be retained. Obviously, there is no need for the current reading syllabus to be totally revamped.

## REFERENCES

- Athanasiou, A., Constatinou, E.K., Neophytou, M., Nicolau, A., Sophocleus, S.P & Yerou, C. 2016. Aligning ESP courses with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. *Language Learning in Higher Education*. 6(2). 297 – 316. doi:10.1515/cercles-2016-0015.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, and Assessment*. Retrieved on January 31, 2019 from [http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/cadre1\\_en.asp](http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/cadre1_en.asp)
- Farah Aulia, Talitha Amalia & Marcyandi Rayi. (2019). Solve Education! English Curriculum Alignment within the National Curriculum of Indonesia. High Income. World Bank Open Data: World Bank Group. Retrieved from [https://solveeducation.org/wp-content/uploads/English-Curriculum-Alignment\\_revisi.pdf](https://solveeducation.org/wp-content/uploads/English-Curriculum-Alignment_revisi.pdf) (15 October 2019).
- Franz, J & Teo, A. 2017. "A2 is normal" – Thai secondary school English teachers' encounters with the CEFR. *RELC Journal*. 0(0). 1 – 7. doi: 10.1177/0033688217738816
- Jin, Y., Wu, Z., Alderson, C & Song, W. (2017). Developing the China Standards of English: challenges at macropolitical and micropolitical levels. *Language Testing in Asia*. 7(1). 1 – 19. doi: 10.1186/s40468-017-0032-5
- Negishi, M. (2012). The development of the CEFR-J: Where we are, where are we going?. Paper presented at the International Symposium "New Prospects for Foreign Language Teaching in Higher Education. Tokyo, Japan, March 2-3. Retrieved October 17, 2019 from [http://www.tufs.ac.jp/common/fs/ilr/EU\\_kaken/\\_userdata/negishi2.pdf](http://www.tufs.ac.jp/common/fs/ilr/EU_kaken/_userdata/negishi2.pdf)
- Nguyen, V.H. & Hamid, M.O. (2015). Educational Policy Borrowing in a Globalized World: A Case Study of Common European Framework of Reference for Languages in a Vietnamese University. *Journal of English Teaching, Practice & Critique*. 14 (1), 60-74. doi:10.1108/ETPC-02-2015-0014 [ 21 September 2015].
- O'Dwyer, F. 2014. Towards critical, constructive assessments of CEFR – based language teaching in Japan and beyond. *Osaka University Knowledge Archive*. 31(3). 191 – 204. Retrieved from [https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/repo/ouka/all/51427/slc\\_41-191.pdf](https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/repo/ouka/all/51427/slc_41-191.pdf) [11 September 2018].
- Ong, L.S. (2010). Assessment profile of Malaysia: High – stakes external examinations dominate. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice*. 17 (1). 91 – 103. doi:10.1080/09695940903319752
- Othman, I., Salleh, N.M. & Norani, N.A.M. (2013). The implementation of school based assessment in primary school standard curriculum. *International Journal of Education and Research*. 1(7). 1 – 10.
- Runnels, J. 2013. Student ability, self – assessment and teacher assessment on the CEFR – J's can do statements. *The Language Teacher Journal. JALT SIG Special Issue*. 37 (5), 3 – 5. Retrieved from [https://jalt-publications.org/files/pdf-article/37.5tlt\\_art01.pdf](https://jalt-publications.org/files/pdf-article/37.5tlt_art01.pdf) [16 September 2016]

- Taber, K.S. (2018). The use of Cronbach's Alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in Science Education. *Research in Science Education*. 48(6). 1273 – 1296. doi: 10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2.
- Zhao, W., Wang, B., Coniam, D & Xie, B. 2017. Calibrating the CEFR against the China Standard of English for College English vocabulary education in China. *Language Testing in Asia Journal*. 7(5), doi: 10.1186/s40468-017-0036-1
- Zuraidah Mohd Don. (2015). English language proficiency, graduate employability and the role of CEFR. ASEAN Seminar 2015 on "Best Practices in English Teaching in ASEAN Universities". UM repository. Retrieved from <http://repository.um.edu.my/98438/1/Asean%20Seminar%202015%20English%20language.pdf> [27 October 2016].

PRELIMINARY