

## **Curriculum Alignment and Skill Acquisition: A Case Study of CEFR Implementation on Speaking Course**

**Siti Hadiani**

[sitihadiani@ecampus.ut.ac.id](mailto:sitihadiani@ecampus.ut.ac.id)

**Hidayah**

[hidayah77@ecampus.ut.ac.id](mailto:hidayah77@ecampus.ut.ac.id)

**Benny Nugraha**

[bnugraha@ecampus.ut.ac.id](mailto:bnugraha@ecampus.ut.ac.id)

**Suci Madiarti Isman**

[sisman@ecampus.ut.ac.id](mailto:sisman@ecampus.ut.ac.id)

**Roihatul Millah**

[millah@ecampus.ut.ac.id](mailto:millah@ecampus.ut.ac.id)

**Anugrah Murtini**

[anugrah.murtini@ecampus.ut.ac.id](mailto:anugrah.murtini@ecampus.ut.ac.id)

**Universitas Terbuka**

### **ABSTRACT**

Students' English proficiency is often measured by their skills in listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Among these, speaking is a primary focus of the English Education Department at Universitas Terbuka (UT). To assess whether students reach the desired level of proficiency, the department relies on standardized frameworks like the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR). UT's curriculum on the Speaking course highlights the importance of CEFR, specifying that teaching should foster skills progression in English from elementary (A2) to intermediate (B2) levels. Despite this, there is a need to evaluate whether the implementation aligns with the curriculum's objectives, as the real-world application sometimes falls short of these standards. This research adopts a case study approach using mixed methods, combining qualitative and quantitative data in three regions. The result shows that the curriculum of speaking classes is based on the CEFR at the B2 level. By meaning, the finding will eliminate the question of whether the curriculum was not aligned with the B2 level. Moreover, the finding adds the fact that teaching through curriculum implementation has a tendency to support student's teaching skills.

**Keywords:** CEFR; Standardized Test; Speaking Skill; Open University

## INTRODUCTION

Teaching speaking is not a simple task. The fact that it needs to be done virtually adds to the gravity of the challenge, as it demands extensive practice and interaction. Gass et al., (2020) argue that successful language acquisition involves more than just grammatical and semantic understanding. This highlights the importance of interaction and the role of input and output in language learning, suggesting that engaging with the language through conversation and feedback is essential for developing speaking skills. Loewen & Sato (2018) also underscore the critical role of interaction in instructed second language acquisition. However, teaching through online learning, as is the case at Universitas Terbuka (UT), presents significant challenges.

UT is a university that the Indonesian government mandates to provide affordable and accessible higher education to all societal strata. It offers diverse learning support services, including online tutorials (Tuton), face-to-face (f2f) tutorials, webinar tutorials (Tuweb), radio tutorials, and TV tutorials (Afriani et al., 2024). These services are well-suited for flexible learning and promote inclusivity by removing restrictions on age, registration time, study duration, and exam frequency while requiring only a minimum of a high school education (Gurr, 2023). The student at UT was not restricted by age. The fact that it supports the big idea of long-life learning also occupies the students who have been blending with job market to improve themselves. Despite it being allowed to improve, it also became a challenge due to the condition that the university needs to adjust to the students' current condition. For instance, some quite senior students was not familiar with technology; therefore, the university through its representative needed to accommodate the issue. UT has quite a flexible registration time compared to other conventional universities. However, it also becomes a tricky issue since the learning pace needs to be adjusted. The lecturer and also students need to be familiar with pretty unique and different learning processes and it is also in line with the study duration. and exam frequency.

Given Indonesia's vast geographical landscape, this model is arguably the most effective to implement. Among many issues, the geographical landscape was the most challenging. The archipelago country is vastly separated by sea. Many students were located in remote areas with minimal access either physical such as road or internet access. These issues demand the university to creatively format the learning model and media as was mentioned such as online tutorials (Tuton), face-to-face (f2f) tutorials, webinar tutorials (Tuweb), radio tutorials, and TV tutorials. The fact that students were far from being reached by physically by university educators it is urgent for the university and faculty to make sure the curriculum design was worked and implemented as it was made for. Within the Faculty of Education and Teacher Training, particularly in the English Education Department, where English-speaking courses are taught, the coursework document explicitly states that the objective is to enable students to interact actively in English, achieving proficiency levels ranging from A1 to B2.

Referring to the objective it is a must for the lecturer to teach students as what minimum A1 and max B2. However, teaching is speaking by the fact online in process is even more difficult. Where the teaching needs more exposure and practice within an intense interaction, The tutor might not be able to interact as much as conventional class. In the sense the physical interaction would be different however, the accessible learning material for exposure accompanied by practice and discussion with the e-learning platform will cover the flaws and enrich the learning exposure.

The levels mentioned refer to the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR), a widely accepted guideline for language proficiency (North, 2021). The CEFR has consistently been an engaging research topic, with numerous studies exploring its application in education. For instance, Foley (2019) examined whether literacy development, guided by the CEFR, can enhance reading and critical thinking skills. According to the Council of Europe (2017), the CEFR was developed as a continuation of the organization's efforts in language education during the 1970s and 1980s. Its 'action-oriented approach' builds upon and extends the communicative approach introduced in the mid-1970s through The Threshold Level, the first functional/notional specification of language needs (Margonis-Pasinetti & Hunter, 2023). CEFR as the standardized indicator of English proficiency was clearly able to measure student level of English skill. As it was shown by (Zhiqing, et al, 2024) that a positive correlation was found between students' CEFR levels and their mastery of receptive aural vocabulary levels ( $\rho = 0.409$ ,  $p = 0.009$ ).

The first research question this study seeks to address is whether the coursework adopted by the department aligns with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). This question stems from two key considerations. First, there is an underlying assumption that even a well-designed curriculum may not be effectively implemented in practice. While the curriculum may offer clear and detailed guidelines, the actual teaching process can diverge significantly from these plans. Second, the broad geographical reach that Universitas Terbuka (UT) must accommodate presents logistical challenges that may hinder consistent delivery of instruction, thereby affecting the implementation of the learning plan. Geographical location is therefore considered a potential factor influencing the transfer of language knowledge as defined by the CEFR.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Several studies have explored this particular area. One example is a case study by Ratnasari (2020) which highlights some of the challenges faced by Mechanical Engineering students in improving their speaking abilities. Another study, conducted by Dewi & Jimmi (2018), demonstrates the impact of speaking ability on children who have acquired vocabulary. Additionally, Juhana's (2012) research examines the psychological factors that influence students' ability to develop

speaking abilities. Although many studies have focused on speaking as a research interest, there is limited research specifically addressing the relationship between speaking and curriculum design, which is the focus of this study. Some research, however, has touched on the curriculum and CEFR. For instance, Rifiyanti (2023) explored the effectiveness of the CEFR's action-oriented approach in teaching English.

### **Curriculum**

The term "curriculum" is used to convey various ideas and signify different concepts (Al-Ghazo, 2015). It is not a new term, as it originates from the Latin verb *currere*, meaning "to run" (Olubiyo, 2022). This etymological connection highlights the notion that a curriculum represents a learning journey rather than a static list of subjects or courses. As a diminutive noun, "currere" evolved to signify a "race track" or "racing chariot." According to (Wahlström, 2023), the term "curriculum" can also be understood as a product of diverse of the relationship between schools, the state, and society.

McConlogue (2020) emphasized that the widening participation agenda in higher education has brought more diverse groups of learners into the system. The urgency for curriculum reform or evaluation is similarly highlighted in Scott's (2018) study, which curriculum, pedagogic, and assessment reforms in the Mexican education system. Scott identified several general issues with curricula, one of which is the lack of connection between what is learned in schools and real-life experiences.

### **Speaking Skill**

Speaking is one of the most important skills particularly for communication. In the context of English subjects, it is widely perceived that teaching English often misses its intended target. According to Pido & Dewi (2019), the primary goal of English learning, as stated by the government, is for students to communicate effectively in English, both orally and in writing. Speaking is one of the most important skills, particularly for communication. However, while formal assessments often neglect speaking skills, it is widely acknowledged that proficiency in speaking is a critical indicator of a student's overall success in learning English (Ngu et al., 2021).

### **Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR)**

The CEFR serves as a common reference framework for discussion and collaboration among various stakeholders in the field, including those engaged in teacher training, syllabus design, curriculum development, textbook production, and language assessment across Council of Europe member states. It functions as a descriptive tool that enables users to evaluate their choices and practices while aligning and coordinating their efforts to support language learners within their specific contexts (CEFR website).

The main objectives of the CEFR include promoting plurilingualism and encouraging a diverse selection of languages in educational curricula. It aims to support the development and recognition of learners' plurilingual profiles while also assisting in the design and revision of language curricula through positive "can-do" descriptors tailored to learners' ages, interests, and needs. Additionally, the CEFR guides the creation of textbooks and teaching materials, fosters teacher education and collaboration among language educators, and enhances the overall quality and effectiveness of language learning, teaching, and assessment. Furthermore, it promotes transparency in language testing and ensures the comparability of language certifications across different contexts.

## **METHOD**

### **Design and Samples**

This study employed a mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative and quantitative data to reveal the findings. According to Creswell & Creswell (2018), mixed methods research integrates these two types of data to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the research questions. For the sampling technique, the researchers used purposive sampling, which is 'used to select respondents that are most likely to yield appropriate and useful information' (Campbell et al., 2020). The participants consisted of students who took part in three speaking courses, particularly those in practicum classes during the 2020/2021 academic year. However, not all participants were interviewed or observed, as only selected participants were chosen for these activities.

### **Instrument and Procedure**

The questionnaire was distributed to every respondent who had taken a speaking class, specifically the three speaking courses. It was developed based on the B2-level indicators of the CEFR. Respondents received the questionnaire online via the Google form application. The questions were designed to address three aspects of oral English skills: comprehension, production, and interaction. After analyzing the questionnaire data, the researcher selected participants for a semi-structured interview. According to Adeoye-olatunde & Olenik (2021), semi-structured interviews are an ideal data collection method when the goal is to gain a deeper understanding of participants' unique perspectives rather than a generalized understanding of a phenomenon.

### **Data Analysis**

After conducting the questionnaire, the researcher collects and analyzes the data. The results indicate whether the curriculum aligns with the CEFR at the implementation level. This assessment is based on students' perspectives, as they are the central focus of the learning process.

Once the first research question is addressed, the study proceeds to the second stage, which involves qualitative analysis. In this stage, the researcher focuses on answering the second research question: "How helpful are the speaking skills that students have learned in their role as English teachers?" To explore this question, two data collection techniques are employed with the same group of participants: observation and interviews. The interviews are conducted using a semi-structured format. According to Lambert, as cited in Suryaningsih (2014), "A semi-structured interview is a type of interview where the researcher is allowed to ask additional questions and discuss topics related to the issue under discussion."

The questionnaire is distributed to all respondents who have taken the Speaking Three course. It is administered online via Google Forms. After analyzing the questionnaire data, the researcher determines the participants for interviews and field observations, which are conducted offline.

PROFICIENT USER	C2	Can understand with ease virtually everything heard or read. Can summarise information from different spoken and written sources, reconstructing arguments and accounts in a coherent presentation. Can express him/herself spontaneously, very fluently and precisely, differentiating finer shades of meaning even in more complex situations.
	C1	Can understand a wide range of demanding, longer texts, and recognise implicit meaning. Can express him/herself fluently and spontaneously without much obvious searching for expressions. Can use language flexibly and effectively for social, academic and professional purposes. Can produce clear, well-structured, detailed text on complex subjects, showing controlled use of organisational patterns, connectors and cohesive devices.
INDEPENDENT USER	B2	Can understand the main ideas of complex text on both concrete and abstract topics, including technical discussions in his/her field of specialisation. Can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with native speakers quite possible without strain for either party. Can produce clear, detailed text on a wide range of subjects and explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various options.
	B1	Can understand the main points of clear standard input on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc. Can deal with most situations likely to arise whilst travelling in an area where the language is spoken. Can produce simple connected text on topics which are familiar or of personal interest. Can describe experiences and events, dreams, hopes & ambitions and briefly give reasons and explanations for opinions and plans.
BASIC USER	A2	Can understand sentences and frequently used expressions related to areas of most immediate relevance (e.g. very basic personal and family information, shopping, local geography, employment). Can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar and routine matters. Can describe in simple terms aspects of his/her background, immediate environment and matters in areas of immediate need.
	A1	Can understand and use familiar everyday expressions and very basic phrases aimed at the satisfaction of needs of a concrete type. Can introduce him/herself and others and can ask and answer questions about personal details such as where he/she lives, people he/she knows and things he/she has. Can interact in a simple way provided the other person talks slowly and clearly and is prepared to help.

*Figure 1. Common Reference Levels*

Source: <https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/table-1-cefr-3.3-common-reference-levels-global-scale>

In the analysis, NVivo was used. The commonly used terms shed light on how students felt about the CEFR-based speaking course. The responses were categorized into thematic areas with the aid of the NVivo analysis. From there, researchers concluded one by one.

The qualitative data was also extracted from Classroom observations and semi-structured interviews. Three teachers in three different regions—Purwokerto, Malang, and Cianjur were the participants. For analysis, these sessions were videotaped and transcribed. Teachers discussed their experiences, difficulties, and opinions about how teaching was affected by the existence of the curriculum and finally, researchers summarized important relevant findings.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This study found that the curriculum for speaking in online learning at UT aligns with the CEFR B2 standards. This conclusion is supported by the fact that a significant number of students reported feeling competent in both oral interaction and production, having been taught skills in three key areas: oral comprehension, production, and interaction. This perception was consistently expressed by students from both Java Island and several provinces outside it. Fifty-six participants from Java completed a 15-questions questionnaire, reflecting their agreement with these claims. Students from outside Java Island provided similar responses. The results are presented below:

*Table 2. Percentage of Questionnaire Result Regarding CEFR*

No	Questions	UT STUDENTS IN JAVA ISLAND		UT STUDENTS OUTSIDE JAVA ISLAND	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
1	Can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction, and sustained relationships with users of the target language, quite possible without imposing strain on either party.	63,53	2,35	32,94	1,18
2	Can understand in detail what is said to them in the standard language or a familiar variety even in a [audially/visually] noisy environment.	55,29	10,59	30,59	3,53
3	Can engage in extended conversation on most general topics in a clearly participatory fashion, even in a [audially/visually] noisy environment.	54,12	11,76	29,41	4,71
4	Can sustain relationships with users of the target language without unintentionally amusing or irritating them or requiring them to behave other than they would with another proficient language user.	58,82	7,06	24,71	9,41
5	Can convey degrees of emotion and highlight the personal significance of events and experiences.	63,53	2,35	32,94	1,18
6	Can give clear, detailed descriptions and presentations on a wide range of subjects related to their field of interest, expanding and supporting ideas with subsidiary points and relevant examples.	57,65	8,24	30,59	3,53

7	Can describe the personal significance of events and experiences in detail.	63,53	2,35	27,06	7,06
8	Can communicate detailed information reliably.	60	5,88	29,41	4,71
9	Can give a clear, detailed description of how to carry out a procedure.	61,18	4,71	29,41	4,71
10	Can develop a clear argument, expanding and supporting their points of view at some length with subsidiary points and relevant examples.	62,35	3,53	30,59	3,53
11	Have you been taught how to understand the main ideas of propositionally and linguistically complex discourse on both concrete and abstract topics delivered in standard language or a familiar variety, including technical discussions in their field of specialization?	54,12	11,76	32,94	1,18
12	Have you been taught how to follow extended discourse and complex lines of argument, provided the topic is reasonably familiar, and the direction of the argument is signposted by explicit markers?	54,12	11,76	30,59	3,53
13	Have you been taught how to identify the main reasons for and against an argument or idea in a discussion conducted in clear standard language or a familiar variety?	58,82	7,06	31,76	2,35
14	Can follow the chronological sequence in extended informal discourse, e.g. in a story or anecdote.	61,18	4,71	29,41	4,71
15	Can follow complex lines of argument in an articulated lecture, provided the topic is reasonably familiar.	61,18	4,71	31,76	2,35

The majority of respondents indicated that the curriculum in the speaking class is aligned with the CEFR. More than 80% of responses reflected approval, while less than 20% showed disapproval for each question. The 15 questions, adapted from the CEFR descriptors, included five initial questions from each of the three components. Each component corresponds to an oral skill at the B2 level. This finding addresses the first research question: whether the curriculum for teaching speaking at UT aligns with the CEFR. The comparison solely relied on the existing quantitative data due to the limited manpower and accessibility despite the fact we just want to answer the first (yes or no) research question. However, it adds more possibility to develop more meticulous research related to that concern in more rigorous methods and data in the near future.



Regarding the second question the skills learned in the English department, which implements the CEFR, have provided advantages for their profession as teachers-responses were elaborated as follows. The researcher did not rely solely on quantitative data; qualitative data was also utilized. The data was gathered from 85 respondents. All of whom participated in a speaking course designed using the CEFR. After analyzing the data using NVivo, six words appeared most frequently. These included terms such as “learning”, “course”, “English”, “tutoring”, and “experience” with “speaking” being the most significant.



Figure 2. Most Frequently Repeated Words from NVivo

If we delve deeper into each word, particularly “speaking,” which was the most frequently mentioned, we can see that it signifies several things. First, it boosts students’ confidence, making them feel braver in speaking up and expressing their thoughts, as demonstrated in the expressions below:

*My experience during the tutor module and other learning activities was very satisfying because the tutors were very friendly and the learning was very easy to understand, and it made me more confident in speaking English.*

Second, the learning experience proves to be an effective way to enrich vocabulary, communication, and interaction skills, as expected from the CEFR curriculum's learning outcomes. This is reflected in the expressions below:

*By studying speaking courses, I can practice my speaking skills, get to know a lot of new vocabulary. By taking part in this speaking tutoring program, it was easier for me to interact and communicate with lecturers and other speaking students*

Regarding the result, most findings expressed similar positive feedback. The teacher (speaking tutor) was described as good, supportive, interactive, and

providing valuable feedback. However, the findings indicate that while the learning process generally aligns with expectations, it improves students' speaking skills, the question of whether it helps them enhance their abilities as teachers remains unanswered. Furthermore, the role of the teacher is significant. The tutor or speaking instructor was the second most mentioned, with positive feedback.

speaking	learning	learn	skills	dan	easy	new	confid	interaf	first	some	still	thing	topic	well	bisa
				fun	tutors	practic	make	made	friend	conv	learn	like	onlin	provi	struc
	experience	students	unders			able	many	tidak	friend	effec	stud	corr	dal	den	disc
			module	good					group	lelea	taug	enj	lect	lect	less
		material	speak			also	study	time	lot	ever	than	exp	mak	pers	pror
tutor	course		saya	help		always	course	face	over	aget		inter	mate	skill	use
		module	really	class	impro	better	feedba	feel	semehapp	com	knov	pers	tuwe	acti	ass

Figure 2. Most Mentioned Words from the Questionnaire

For the second research question, the researcher aims to investigate whether the speaking skills acquired through CEFR guidelines impact students' teaching performance as educators. This was examined using both observations and interviews. Due to limitations in manpower and time, the researchers selected three regions: Purwokerto, Malang, and Cianjur. These regions were chosen as they represent different provinces in Java, collectively accounting for over half of Indonesia's population. Additionally, these areas are noted for their high population density.

The first observation was conducted in Purwokerto, focusing on a participant referred to as Teacher A. She demonstrated sufficient speaking skills, and the learning process proceeded smoothly, though some adjustments were necessary as the students appeared uneasy with the researcher's presence. Furthermore, while students occasionally used a mix of English, they were not fully able to interact with the language. Despite this language barrier, the students seemed to enjoy the class. Teacher A successfully incorporated the 15 CEFR components, including oral comprehension, production, and interaction, into her teaching. These components proved helpful in facilitating in teaching and learning process. They were integrated into three key stages of the lesson: the ice-breaking activity, the main instructional session (where she explained the concept of recount text), and the final evaluation phase.

A similar observation was conducted for the second participant, referred to as Teacher B, who works in an Islamic boarding school. Although Teacher B used English during the lesson, her performance was somewhat limited because most students lacked sufficient skills to respond effectively. As a result, the majority of the lesson was delivered in Bahasa Indonesia. Despite this challenge, Teacher B demonstrated her English skills, particularly in two aspects: oral production and

interaction. However, a significant amount of Bahasa Indonesia was required to help students understand the material and bridge the language gap.

Another observation was conducted in Malang, a popular tourist destination in East Java where English is expected to be taught seriously by formal educational institutions. Two schools and their respective English teachers agreed to participate in the observation. Both teachers referred to as Teacher C and Teacher D, are not only experienced English teachers at the elementary school level but also former students of the speaking class at UT. Each teacher has been teaching for several years and shared with the researcher some of the challenges they face in the classrooms before the observation. These challenges reflect the complexities of teaching English in elementary schools in the region.

Teacher C from Malang brought energy and enthusiasm to her classroom, warmly welcoming her students and creating an engaging atmosphere. She emphasized that even the most complex subjects could be made accessible by incorporating gestures and varying her tone. Recognizing that most of her students were not familiar with English, she utilized additional gestures to capture their attention and aid understanding. Her lessons were enriched with real-world examples and stories, which helped students internalize challenging concepts more easily. Teacher C also demonstrated a skilful ability to craft questions that encouraged thought and analysis, allowing her students to express their ideas. To ensure every student felt included, she maintained eye contact and moved around the classroom, fostering an inclusive and dynamic learning environment.

On the other side, Teacher D fostered positive classroom interaction by incorporating strategies like group discussions, even though traditional lecture-based methods could have been used in this context. When introducing a new concept, she guided her students through it step by step, starting with a clear explanation and using a concept map as a visual aid. Although the students were initially unsure and struggled to articulate their thoughts, Teacher D's approach encouraged them to engage with the material. Her arguments were well-developed, supported by engaging activities and examples that made it easier for students to connect concepts to real-world situations.

In a recent observation conducted at a secondary-level Islamic school in the Cianjur region of West Java, a teacher identified as Teacher E was selected for analysis. The Islamic school system provides a unique teaching and learning environment where students study both common subjects and religious topics. During the observation, it became evident that Teacher E employed a variety of communication skills when interacting with her learners. While her spoken English was generally good, a few grammatical errors were noticeable. In terms of oral comprehension, she demonstrated a solid ability to engage in extended conversations on most general topics in a participatory manner, particularly when conversing with the observers in English.

Teacher E mentioned that her training helped her involve all students in discussions (B2 oral comprehension) while maintaining classroom order, ensuring that no disruptions-whether auditory or visual-interfered with the learning process. Furthermore, she effectively linked course material to students' daily lives and described the personal and cultural relevance of the topics discussed (B2 oral production). These skills have proven highly beneficial in advancing her teaching career.

Finally, the findings of this study added the discourse related to CEFR, curriculum, and speaking skills. The existence of more quantitative and qualitative data might affect the interpretation, but researchers have tried to ignore unnecessary information and focus on the research questions only. There are lots of studies as it was mentioned in the introduction, literature, and literature review such as Margonis-Pasinetti & Hunter (2023), Zhiqing, et al (2024), Rais & Awwalia (2025), and Goundar (2023). Furthermore, several researches on speaking were also been done like Ratnasari (2020), Dewi & Jimmi (2018), and Juhana's (2012). However, rarely study has been dedicated to the integration of CEFR, Curriculum, and the English-speaking course itself. The findings have answered whether the curriculum in UT has been aligned or not with CEFR and how it influences student teaching ability, particularly in speaking skills something that former mentioned studies above are not concerned on. Moreover, the fact that this research was focussing on distance learning where the learning process was not similar with the conventional university learning process has added the significance as well as the novelty of it.

## CONCLUSION

The study confirms that the curriculum for speaking classes is aligned with the CEFR at the B2 level. In response to the study's questions, 80% of the respondents provided approving responses, while only 19% expressed disapproval. The 15-item questionnaire, based on the CEFR descriptors of oral skills, covered three key aspects of the B2 level. These findings substantiate the alignment of the curriculum with CEFR standards, effectively addressing the first research question regarding curriculum alignment. Additionally, despite the hybrid nature of the teaching and learning process conducted through e-learning and virtual meetings curriculum ensures consistent integration of CEFR standards across all levels, as outlined by the department. Observations and interviews, conducted with teachers from Malang, Purwokerto, and Cianjur further revealed that the B2 CEFR-based curriculum positively influenced teaching practices in speaking classes. there are at least 3 additional worth noting.

First, the fact that the curriculum was proven in line with CEFR means that it needs to be carried on in the process. Several improvements might need to be made such as the socialization of the CEFR toward the tutor who teaches the course, yet it must not change the existence and substance of it. Thus, the objective

was not hindered. The curriculum design in the future needs to highlight the CEFR As the clear indicator for English teaching practically speaking since it was the worldwide indicator for English proficiency. The second positive finding might also be useful to support the existence of hybrid learning despite the challenge of teaching speaking online, the result is still positive. Students still gain what they need to be earned. The last is the fact that the CEFR-based curriculum helps candidate English teachers (UT students) in teaching speaking presumably a sign that the curriculum was achieving its purpose. However, it does not neglect that an improvement here and there was needed.

## REFERENCES

- Adeoye-olatunde, O. A., & Olenik, N. (2021). *Research and Scholarly Methods: Semi-structured Interviews*. <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/phprpubs/6>
- Afriani, A., Pannen, P., Nirmala, S. D., Isfarudi, I., & Ramdhani, S. (2024). The development of student's soft skills in Tutorial Webinar (Tuweb) at Universitas Terbuka. *Inovasi Kurikulum*, 21(2), 661–680. <https://doi.org/10.17509/jik.v21i2.62881>
- Al-Ghazo, A. (2015). Vertical Integration of Grammatical Concepts According To the Spiral Curriculum Design. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 2(4).
- Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., Shearer, T., Walkem, K., Young, S., Bywaters, D., & Walker, K. (2020). Purposive sampling: complex or simple? Research case examples. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 25(8), 652–661. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987120927206>
- Council of Europe. Retrieved from <https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/home>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches Fifth Edition*.
- Dewi, N., & Jimmi, J. (2018). The Correlation Between Vocabulary Mastery And Self Esteem On Students' Speaking Skill. *Wanastra: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 10(1), 78–83. <https://doi.org/10.31294/w.v10i1.2998>
- Foley, J. (2019). Issues on the initial impact of CEFR in Thailand and the region. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(2), 359–370. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v9i2.20233>
- Gass, S. M., Behney, J., & Plonsky, L. (2020). *Second Language Acquisition*.
- Goundar, P. (2023). Examining Fijian first-year university students' English proficiency on CEFR levels. *Australian Journal of Applied Linguistics*. Melbourne, Australia, 6(2), pp. 73–93. doi: 10.29140/ajal.v6n2.1050.
- Gurr, D. (2023). *Background paper prepared for the Global Education Monitoring Report Technology in education – Southeast Asia*.
- Juhana. (2012). Psychological Factors That Hinder Students from Speaking in English Class A Case Study in a Senior High School in South Tangerang, Banten, Indonesia). *Journal of Education and Practice*, 3(12). [www.iiste.org](http://www.iiste.org)
- Loewen, S., & Sato, M. (2018). Interaction and instructed second language acquisition. *Language Teaching*, 51(3), 285–329.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444818000125>

- Margonis-Pasinetti, R., & Hunter, D. (2023). The CEFR Companion Volume: A Key Resource For Inclusive Plurilingual Education 2023 Webinar Series. [www.alte.org](http://www.alte.org)
- McConlogue, T. (2020). Assessment and Feedback in Higher Education. In *Assessment and Feedback in Higher Education*. UCL Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv13xprqb>
- Ngu, D. T., Huong, D. T., Ngoc Huy, D. T., Thanh, P. T., & Döngül, E. S. (2021). Language teaching application to English students at master's grade levels on history and macroeconomic-banking management courses in universities and colleges. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(3), 1457–1468. <https://doi.org/10.52462/jlls.105>
- North, B. (2021). The CEFR Companion Volume - What's new and what might it imply for teaching/learning and for assessment? *CEFR Journal - Research and Practice*, 4, 5–24. <https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTSIG.CEFR4-1>
- Olubiyo, P. O. (2022). *Review of Curriculum Development in Library and Information Science Education in Nigerian Universities: Issues and Prospects*. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac>
- Pido, N. W., & Dewi, E. (2019). English Teaching Method Applied by Teachers In MTs Negeri Model Limboto. *Al-Lisan. Journal Bahasa & Pengajarannya*, 4(1). <http://journal.iaingorontalo.ac.id/index.php/al>
- Rais, B., & Awwalia, L. What is the student's level? Analyzing Students' English Proficiency Levels in High Education Level. *SALEE: Study of Applied Linguistics and English Education*, 6(1), 305-316. <https://doi.org/10.35961/salee.v6i1.1762>
- Ratnasari, A. G. (2020). EFL Students' Challenges in Learning Speaking Skills: A Case Study in Mechanical Engineering Department. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Learning*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.18196/ftl.5145>
- Rifiyanti, H. (2023). Implementing Framework of CEFR for Teaching English Language In Non-English Study Program. In *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Proficiency* (Vol. 5, Issue 2).
- Scott, D. (2018). *Curriculum, Pedagogic and Assessment Reforms in the Mexican System*. <https://muse.jhu.edu/book/81930>.
- Simatupang, J. (2017). Communicating Across Borders: How Well Do Indonesians Speak English? Retrieved from <https://www.indonesia-investments.com/id/news/todays-headlines/communicating-across-borders-how-well-do-indonesians-speak-english/item8072>
- Suryaningsih, H. (2014). Students' Perceptions of International English Language Testing System (IELTS) and Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) Tests. Theses and Dissertations (All). 1235. <http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/etd/1235>
- Wahlström, N. (2023). Curriculum policy, teaching, and knowledge orientations. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 29(3), 259–275. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2022.2159364>

Zhiqing, L. Li, J. Z., Zhang, X., and Reynolds, B. l.. (2024). Mastery of Listening and Reading Vocabulary Levels in Relation to CEFR: Insights into Student Admissions and English as a Medium of Instruction. *Languages* 9: 239. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages9070239>