

# THE EFFECTS OF COMMON EUROPEAN FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE (CEFR) TOWARDS ENGLISH LINUS YEAR 2 STUDENTS IN KENINGAU SABAH

Tracey Ang 1<sup>a,b</sup>, Maslawati Mohamad 2<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Keningau District Education Office

<sup>b</sup> Education Faculty, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia

traceymzang@gmail.com

The Literacy and Numeracy Screening (LINUS) Programme was introduced in primary schools in Malaysia since 2010. It was introduced to help teachers to reduce the number of pupils who have very limited basic skills in reading, writing and arithmetic. In addition, it is also to achieve the aspirations outlined in Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013-2025. Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) was introduced in order to strengthen English language subjects, both in primary and secondary schools in Malaysia by raising the local English syllabus to international benchmarks. CEFR is very new in the Malaysia education system. It is also new to the LINUS programme especially LINUS Bahasa Inggeris (LBI). Hence, it is important for the officers who serve the Ministry of Education to evaluate the suitability of CEFR content towards Malaysian culture especially in Sabah. This research is aimed to identify the effects of CEFR towards the LBI Year 2 students in Keningau, Sabah. The analysis was carried out by making a comparison of 2017 and 2018 data. The analysis utilized the LINUS first screening result of all Keningau district schools, provided by the Keningau District Education. The findings of this study demonstrate that culture and environment play important roles for LBI pupils to grasp basic English language. It is hoped that the findings could help local education authority to take necessary measures to further assist Year 2 LBI pupils in learning English using CEFR materials.

**Keywords:** English language, LINUS LBI, CEFR, LINUS Programme, lower primary school students

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Common European Frameworks of Reference (CEFR) has been implemented in 2018. The Malaysian Education Ministry chooses CEFR in the “English Language Roadmap 2015-2025 which is part of the implementation of the Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013-2025 to reform English Language education in the country” (Chin & Rajaendram, 2017). The introduction of the CEFR in English subject for pre-school, primary year 1 and 2, and secondary 1 and 2, involve an “imported CEFR-aligned English textbooks” (Chin, 2018) which is the replacement for the KSSR system which stands for *Kurikulum Standard Sekolah Rendah* that was introduced by the Ministry of Education in 2011. These changes are made in order to create future generations that have the “English language proficiency levels that will enable them to compete in a globalised world where trade and commerce are mostly carried out in English and academic research findings are largely authored in the language” (Sani, 2018).

With the introduction of the CEFR in primary school, the matter indirectly affecting the implementations of The Literacy and Numeracy Screening (LINUS) programme. LINUS is “an educational intervention programme aims to enhance the rate of literacy” (Bokhari, Rashid, & Heng, 2015)<sup>1</sup> and “ensuring that all Malaysia children acquire basic literacy and numeracy skills after three years of mainstream primary education” (Chen, 2012). School in Malaysia acquires their students to learn more than one language since pre-school. Also, Bahasa Malaysia is taught in every school and this has an effect on the English language (Ghazali, 2017). Because of that, LINUS 2.0 was introduced as the “extension of the previous LINUS programme introduced in 2013 with the addition of English Literacy (LBI)” (Hadzir, Alias, Kamaruzaman, & Yusof, 2016) because “English, as a subject or as a medium of instruction stays a very important role in Malaysia education” (Eng & Muuk, 2015).

The awareness towards the importance of English as a second language and international language in Malaysia plays a considerable role. With “a striking increase in the number of universities in the Asian Pacific region that are moving to offer courses and programmes through English as a medium on instruction” (Fenton-Smith, Humphreys, & Walkinshaw, 2017), Malaysians have to master the English language starting from school with a strong basic English knowledge. That is why LINUS 2.0 was introduced in the first place because “early literacy skills are crucial for children as these skills can help the learning progress of children in future” (Luyee, Roselan, Anwardee, & Mustapa, 2015). With the implementation of CEFR this year in 2018, the Minister of

Education would hope that it would strengthen the pupils' ability to master English language, especially starting from the foundation of it with the help of imported textbook especially for the primary 1 and primary 2.

The implementation of CEFR is to “ensure that the standardisation and integration for all English language learning aspects, including curriculum, classroom learning and teaching process, assessment, and teacher training” (Zulkefli, 2017), there is a need to find out whether this implementation of CEFR has positive or negative impact towards the English LINUS students because there are “some children without learning disabilities are still unable to acquire the basic literacy skills of English during their lower primary school level” (Bokhari, Rashid, & Heng, 2015)<sup>2</sup>. Hopefully, this research would be able to help to bridge the gap of information related to the CEFR and its effectiveness towards English LINUS pupils which would provide a significant evaluation and significant insight that would help to strengthen the programme to achieve the primary objective of its implementation.

Considering the current situation which very few studies conducted in Malaysia on the effects of the CEFR towards lower primary school students, thus this study aims to:

1. Identify whether CEFR cause difference in the result of Year 2 first English LINUS screening result
2. Find out the achievement of Year 2 students in English LINUS during the implementation of KSSR.

### 1.1 Background of LINUS

The Literacy and Numeracy Screening 2.0 (LINUS2.0) program introduced by the Ministry of Education (MOE) involves the screening of basic knowledge of Bahasa Malaysia (LBM), English (LBI) and Numeracy (NUM). The LINUS screening programme is carried out twice a year which consists of the screening for students essential reading and writing skills. Pupils will be screened twice a year (March and September) to identify their progress in literacy learning (Luyee, Roselan, Anwardeen, & Mustapa, 2013).

The process of the LINUS screening process involves two different assessment which is reading and writing assessment. Each assessment for reading and writing contain twelve constructs that assess the students accordingly. The assessment criteria which taken from the LINUS official guide LINUS2.0 2018, are shown in Table 1.

**Table 1: The English LINUS 12 Construct Assessment Guidance**

Construct	Construct Statement	Description
1	Able to identify and distinguish letters of the alphabet.	The ability to identify and distinguish the shapes of letters.
2	Able to associate sounds with the letters of the alphabet.	The ability to say aloud the phonemes.
3	Able to blend phonemes into recognisable words.	The ability to blend phonemes into recognisable words.
4	Able to segment words into phonemes.	The ability to segment words into phonemes.
5	Able to understand and use the language at word level.	The ability to understand and use the language at word level.
6	Able to participate in daily conversations using appropriate phrases.	The ability to read, answer or participate with appropriate phrases in daily conversations.
7	The ability to read, answer or participate with appropriate phrases in daily conversations.	The ability to understand and use the language at phrase level in linear texts.
8	Able to understand and use the language at phrase level in non-linear texts.	The ability to show comprehension of the language at phrase level in non-linear texts through answering questions or pointing to the answers.
9	Able to read and understand sentences with guidance.	The ability to read and understand sentences in a paragraph with prompts or guidance by the teacher.
10	Able to understand and use the language sentence level in non-linear texts.	Pupils are able to show their understanding through the use of the language at sentence level in non-linear texts through reading aloud and pointing to the correct pictures.
11	Able to understand and use the language at	The ability to read and understand sentences in

	paragraph level in linear texts.	a paragraph.
12	Able to construct sentences with guidance.	The ability to connect words given into sentences and read them aloud.

(Panduan Pentadbiran Saringan LINUS2.0 2018, 2018)

Each construct contains 3 to 4 different assessment according to the description given where students must answer all correctly or can only make one mistake on each construct for them to pass the given constructs for the reading and writing assessment. If either one in any construct did not pass, then the students will not pass on the construct even though they pass either reading or writing. Because, in order for them to pass the given construct, they must pass both reading and writing assessment of each construct.

## 2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

Since CEFR is very new to Malaysia education system mainly English LINUS, there are limited studies on the outcomes from CEFR towards English LINUS. However, because CEFR already been implemented in many different countries, most literature reviews were taken from outside Malaysia. Hopefully, the findings of these international studies could be the indicator of what CEFR could result according to implementation in Malaysia especially in Keningau, Sabah.

A study related to the effectiveness of CEFR was conducted at an Australian university by McNamara, Morton, Storch, & Thompson (2018). The researcher evaluated the suitability of CEFR to identify the undergraduates' readiness to participate in the academic writing tasks. The findings of this research indicate that CEFR does not have enough definitions to determine the right scales on students' performance especially on evaluating academic writing. Therefore, the researchers suggested that a new or probably a different perspective would be introduced on the assessments to help the students' preparations for academic writing.

Another study related to teacher's judgement accuracy for English as the foreign language (EFL) standardised test for European universities by Fleckenstein, Leucht and Koller (2018) had shown that with the CEFR-based criteria it lead higher accuracy in terms of grading the students instead of using the conventional grading. This research is using CEFR criteria to find out the students' score in the English language as their higher education entrance. The findings of the study have proven that instead of locating students according to the traditional grading system, the students were placed according to the CEFR level which them to be able to select students more accurately. It is because, through standard grading, some teachers evaluated students highly even though they do not achieve the high band according to CEFR standard.

A study by Franz & Teo (2017) was conducted in the South of Thailand related to the implementation of CEFR and combination of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) because the research was analysed on teachers who teach the English language in Thailand's school. From the findings, many Thailand English teachers do not reach the proficiency level of B2. Based on the research, CEFR was targeted as an assessment scale for the teachers instead of the students. They had also found out the CEFR assessment does not imply the teachers and students because it was not applied either in the teaching and learning process.

Zheng, Zhang, & Yan (2016) researched the practice of CEFR in China. They had found out that even though CEFR has been translated into their language and published in China for English lesson, CEFR is not their choice of framework and indeed it is not their favourite even for the professor for assessment of writing English. Due to that, CEFR itself had not much influence towards the China English teaching and learning of writing activity because they do not know what CEFR is. Nevertheless, after an introduction of CEFR through workshops, they had identified that the teachers show their interest and the desire to try out CEFR into their English writing activity and assessments. Besides, the teachers also confirm the difference in evaluation standard between CEFR and The College English Test (CET). They perceived that CEFR is much more rational and scientific.

As the conclusion of this literature review, it is clearly shown that CEFR serves the purpose of what to learn and as a guideline for how a curricular or a teaching or learning model should be created to suit the assessment process and standard. Many of the research before mostly focused on CEFR as the assessment guidelines because from the guidelines, there is no limit to how and what can be or should be taught to the students as long as they achieve the CEFR scale of achievement in language learning. And from the previous research, it is clearly shown that the success effect of CEFR towards the students learning is mostly affected by the teacher itself which involves the process of teaching and assessment together.

### 3.0 METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1 Research Design

This study was aimed to identify the effects of Common European Frameworks of Reference (CEFR) towards the Year 2 students LINUS 2.0 English literacy (LBI) result in Keningau, Sabah. This research has collected the data obtained at Keningau District Education Office. Keningau District Education Office carried out quantitative analysis in early May 2018 after the LINUS screening was at the end. Each subject teacher from each school first recorded the data after the individual screening was done. Then, teachers were responsible for key-in the data into the website - Ministry of Education's LINUS NKRA website. These data could be accessed by the officer from Keningau District Education Office. A total number of 72 data was collected which is equal to the total number of school in Keningau District.

#### 3.2 Population of the study

The population of this study is all the Year 2 students from 72 schools in the district of Keningau. Most of these schools are located between the suburban and rural area in Keningau. Many of students in Keningau also learning English as the third or fourth language because they were influenced by their native language which is either Dusun, Murut, Bajau or Mandarin.

#### 3.3 Research Tools

The research tools to get the data of students passing the English LINUS assessment is confidential as it was stated by the Ministry of Education (MOE). As an insight, the research tools divided into two parts for reading and writing assessment. The reading part contained 12 constructs and was conducted orally by the teacher either individual or in a group of students. While for the writing part, each student will receive an assessment sheet which will then will be guided together minimum during the writing assessment. Their ability to identify the given evaluation orally and in written form was later stated by the teacher on the assessment form which is known as the *Borang Pelaporan Penguasaan Individu* (BPPI). From the BPPI, the students who passed the or did not pass the English LINUS screening assessment can be identified.

#### 3.4 Data Analysis

The data from the study were analysed using percentages and presented in Table 2. Table 2 shows the percentage of 2017 and 2018 first LBI screening result on students who passed all the 12 constructs in LBI screening assessment. A code was used to replace the name of the school because the information school information including school name from the Keningau District Education office is bound to the privacy policy.

### 4.0 FINDINGS

**Table 2: The 2017 and 2018 Year 2 First LBI All Passed Screening Result From 72 Schools in Keningau, Sabah.**

No	School Code	2017 Year 2 LBI result		2018 Year 2 LBI result		Difference in %
		Total no students	Total Pass (%)	Total no of students	Total Pass (%)	
1	SK1	25	20 (80%)	18	10 (55.55%)	-24.45
2	SK2	30	19 (63.33%)	20	13 (65%)	1.67
3	SK3	89	49 (55.05%)	86	37 (43.02%)	-12.03
4	SK4	12	9 (75%)	16	7 (43.45%)	-31.55
5	SK5	34	12 (35.29%)	26	11 (42.30%)	7.01
6	SK6	39	28 (71.79%)	56	30 (53.57%)	-18.22
7	SK7	69	51 (73.91%)	73	57 (78.08%)	4.17
8	SK8	18	6 (33.33%)	12	0 (0%)	-33.33
9	SK9	61	46 (75.40%)	37	10 (27.02%)	-48.38
10	SK10	30	26 (86.66%)	25	14 (56%)	-30.66
11	SK11	28	13 (46.42%)	34	12 (35.29%)	-11.13

12	SK12	27	22 (81.48%)	31	19 (61.29%)	-20.19
13	SK13	23	6 (26.08%)	24	6 (25%)	-1.08
14	SK14	20	11 (55%)	29	9 (31.03%)	-23.97
15	SK15	22	8 (36.36%)	29	2 (10.52%)	-25.84
16	SK16	17	0 (0%)	36	1 (2.7%)	2.7
17	SK17	20	8 (40%)	29	15 (55.17%)	15.17
18	SK18	68	41 (60.29%)	55	29 (52.72%)	-7.57
19	SK19	58	45 (77.58%)	79	37 (46.83%)	-30.75
20	SK20	37	15 (40.54%)	37	24 (64.86%)	24.32
21	SK21	38	21 (55.26%)	45	20 (44.44%)	-10.82
22	SK22	135	44 (32.59%)	126	63 (50%)	17.41
23	SK23	13	0 (0%)	14	1 (7.14%)	7.14
24	SK24	17	11 (64.70%)	12	8 (66.66%)	1.96
25	SK25	30	25 (83.33%)	30	24 (80%)	-3.33
26	SK26	32	23 (71.87%)	28	19 (67.85%)	-4.02
27	SK27	29	7 (24.13%)	25	8 (32%)	7.87
28	SK28	110	49 (44.54%)	130	59 (45.38%)	0.84
29	SK29	32	9 (28.15%)	32	18 (56.25%)	28.1
30	SK30	14	2 (14.28%)	19	3 (15.78%)	1.5
31	SK31	43	35 (81.39%)	36	27 (75%)	-6.39
32	SK32	39	25 (64.10%)	44	29 (65.90%)	1.8
33	SK33	55	38 (69.09%)	63	52 (82.53%)	13.44
34	SK34	6	0 (0%)	5	0 (0%)	0
35	SK35	101	83 (82.17%)	98	74 (75.51%)	-6.66
36	SK36	6	1 (16.66%)	5	0 (0%)	-16.66
37	SK37	11	11 (100%)	10	10 (100%)	100
38	SK38	36	24 (66.66%)	22	15 (68.18%)	1.52
39	SK39	14	13 (92.85%)	16	13 (81.25%)	-1.16
40	SK40	27	6 (22.22%)	28	19 (67.85%)	45.63
41	SK41	77	40 (51.94%)	91	46 (50.54%)	-1.4
42	SK42	29	20 (68.96%)	26	13 (50%)	-18.96
43	SK43	65	50 (76.92%)	89	59 (66.29%)	-10.63
44	SK44	19	7 (36.84%)	27	22 (81.48%)	44.64
45	SK45	16	5 (31.25%)	18	1 (5.55%)	-25.7
46	SK46	31	22 (70.96%)	48	21 (43.75%)	-27.21
47	SK47	21	15 (71.42%)	27	19 (70.37%)	-1.05
48	SK48	32	23 (71.87%)	37	30 (81.08%)	9.21
49	SK49	45	21 (46.66%)	18	13 (72.22%)	25.56
50	SK50	28	10 (35.71%)	29	9 (31.03%)	-4.68
51	SK51	6	1 (16.66%)	10	1 (10%)	-6.66
52	SK52	47	38 (80.85%)	55	37 (67.27%)	-13.58
53	SK53	40	25 (62.5%)	34	24 (70.58%)	8.08
54	SK54	26	15 (57.69%)	16	9 (56.25%)	-1.44
55	SK55	25	16 (64%)	14	8 (57.14%)	-6.86
56	SK56	11	5 (45.45%)	17	5 (29.41%)	-16.04
57	SK57	33	13 (39.39%)	37	25 (67.56%)	28.17
58	SK58	17	11 (65.70%)	16	12 (75%)	9.3
59	SK59	29	15 (51.72%)	26	17 (65.38%)	13.66
60	SK60	23	8 (34.78%)	19	4 (21.05%)	-13.73
61	SK61	19	16 (84.21%)	20	8 (40%)	-44.21
62	SK62	18	7 (38.88%)	14	3 (21.42%)	-17.46
63	SK63	4	0 (0%)	8	0 (0%)	0
64	SK64	16	8 (50%)	19	9 (47.36%)	-2.64
65	SK65	8	0 (0%)	12	3 (25%)	25
66	SK66	3	1 (33.33%)	1	1 (100%)	66.67
67	SK67	68	43 (63.23%)	58	41 (70.68%)	7.45
68	SJK68	31	23 (74.19%)	34	28 (82.35%)	8.16
69	SK69	162	145 (95.06%)	187	151 (80.74%)	-14.32

70	SK70	37	33 (89.18%)	45	32 (77.77%)	-11.41
71	SJK71	103	63 (61.16%)	99	78 (78.78%)	17.62
72	SJK72	244	203 (83.19%)	231	180 (77.92%)	-5.27
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>2828</b>	<b>1764(62.37%)</b>	<b>2920</b>	<b>1714 (58.69%)</b>	

From Table 2, 40 schools show a decrease in the percentage of year two students from passing the LINUS LBI screening assessment where only 30 out of 72 schools shows an increase of the percentage of students passing the LINUS LBI screening assessment. The other two schools which are SK34 and SK63 show 0% decrease nor increase in the number of students passing the first LINUS LBI screening assessment.

In total view, for 2017, 1764 (62.37%) students out of 2828 students from 72 schools pass the LINUS LBI screening programme. In contrast, for 2018, 1714 (58.69%) students out of 2920 students in 72 school pass the LINUS LBI screening assessment. When the data was converted to the percentage, it shows that -3.68% of students pass the LINUS LBI screening assessment when compare between 2018 and 2017. Generally, the results indicate a decrease in the number of students passes in the LINUS LBI screening assessment among Year 2 students in all schools in Keningau district.

Also, the number of schools which achieved more than 50% of passing rate in 2017 and 2018 is the same which is 43 (59.72%) school. According to the table, only 35 schools maintained the percentage of more than 50% pass in the English LINUS screening assessment for in 2017 and 2018, which equals 48.61%. The table also shows that the English LINUS screening assessment shows only 29 (40.27%) schools had an increase in the number of students pass the English LINUS screening assessment. The percentage which shows less than 50% increase indicates that the number of Year 2 students had a decreased number of passing the English LINUS screening assessment.

From the table, we can conclude that even though the number of school scoring more than 50% of students passing the English LINUS screening assessment in 2017 and 2018 are maintained, but if compared each number of students passing from each school from both years show that the number of students had decreased. The result could also be proven by looking at the percentage of students passing in 2017 which is 62.37% and in 2018 which is 58.69%, where the difference between the two is -3.68% which indicated a decrease in the number of students passing the English LINUS screening assessment.

## 5.0 DISCUSSION

Based on the study, it had been identified that there are a decrease number in year 2 students passing the LINUS LBI screening assessment in 2018 which is related to the implementation of the CEFR in the year 1 and year 2 English subject in the primary schools this year. A survey had been conducted by the Keningau District Office during a CEFR strengthening course and a few reasons towards the decreased number of students passing the English LINUS screening assessment are related.

Firstly, the primary contributing factor to the low performance of passing rate for year 2 LINUS LBI screening assessment in Keningau is due to the use of the new English textbook which is the Super Minds English Textbook. The CEFR Super Minds textbook is an imported textbook. Most of its content is not related to the culture in Sabah, especially in Keningau. It is challenging to teach English to Malaysian students, particularly in the rural and semi-urban areas, without having to explain cultural and contemporary foreign practices that are alien to both teachers and students (Let's have our own textbooks, 2018). According to the teacher responses, they are having difficulties to teach using the textbook even though they can modify the content because the textbook is compulsory during the English subject session. When the pupils do not have prior knowledge, they also found it harder to remember the words in English.

Secondly, English language itself serves very limited purpose in the pupils' daily life except for school's examination causing the students' lack of motivation in learning English (Cheng, Yunus, & Mohamad, 2016). Many teachers voice out that they have to use the mother-tongue or Bahasa Malaysia to teach English to the students. With the introduction of CEFR, the teacher even had to make more explanation towards the use of some words in the CEFR Super Minds Textbook such as rubber which also means eraser, but to the student, rubber implies something that is related to rubber tapping. Therefore, it causes a lot of confusing understanding towards the students.

Thirdly, Keningau district is huge. Geographically, there are many parts of the rural areas that are hilly and remote, with dense forest, making it inaccessible by road (Karim, Mariappan, & Peters, 2016). Due to that, it

effects the learning experience because of the lack of connection between their life experience and the school curricula (Espinoza-Herold & González-Carriedo, 2017) especially towards the use of the CEFR imported English textbook. A teacher who taught in a very rural area school mention that, students ask what is pasta and it doesn't apply to their understanding because they have no exposure towards pasta as they know what noodles is but they cannot understand the concept of pasta.

Finally, the imported CEFR textbook requires the use of Information Technology devices to play music and probably some videos that could be downloaded from the internet. Generally, the “development of new technologies enables learners to learn more effectively, efficiently, flexibly and comfortably” (Zhu, Yu, & Riezebos, 2016). Nevertheless, until now, the installation of any infrastructure or facilities needed for education in rural area is still not available because “the cost of installing ICT in rural areas can be expected to be even higher mainly due to transportation and other logistic costs” (Dzansi & Amedzo, 2014). Many schools in Keningau are in rural areas. These schools are without the internet connection and suitable IT devices. As a result, the CEFR materials could not be fully utilised (Source). Many teachers from the suburban also mentioned that the internet access provided by the government is also insufficient and not user-friendly as it blocked out many useful websites that the teacher needed for their English lessons.

## **6.0 IMPLICATIONS TO TEACHING AND LEARNING**

From the findings and the discussion of the research, it has been identified that the use of CEFR does give an impact towards the teachers teaching and the pupils learning process and result. Related to the reasons given by English teachers through the survey that was conducted by the Keningau District Education Office, CEFR does generate both positive and negative impact towards the teaching and learning of teachers and students in Keningau Sabah.

The slight decrease in the percentage of -3.68% in primary two pupils passing the LINUS LBI screening assessment was caused by the recent implementation of CEFR in the teaching and learning activities in Keningau's school. According to teacher's responses during the CEFR strengthening course, they need to calibrate themselves towards the implementation of CEFR. The use of CEFR textbook also requires to suit the students' knowledge. The reaction towards the new CEFR Super Minds Textbook which causing the result of the student is not that encouraging due to the adjustment period in the beginning. Thus, the implementation of CEFR in the first place should be started with enough courses for all the teachers before it is executed in schools.

The content of CEFR imported textbook involves a lot of active learning. According to Shaaruddin and Mohamad (2017), active learning approach involves activities such as group discussions, presentations, simulations and tutoring. Teachers mention that students were having problem understanding the concept of European culture that was introduced in the CEFR Super Minds textbook, because of that many of the activities did not work out successfully because teachers spend a lot of time explaining the concept that was introduced in the CEFR textbook. The reason is that, when the content from the CEFR is not familiarised by the students even though the teacher acquaints it, the process of discussion and presentation among the students will not be as exciting as compared to discussing something that they are familiar to.

Since English is a language that was seldom used by the students outside of school, teachers need to do a lot of translation from the content of the CEFR imported textbook during their teaching. According to teachers who taught English in the Murut community, they have to translate many English words especially the nouns in Murut language for the students to understand the meaning of the terms introduced because many of the names do not relate to the students' life. According to Mohamed, Omar and Omar (2015), translation per se was claimed an unnatural activity which could hinder the learning of four basic skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing. CEFR imported textbook might not be had the suitable content, but with lots of pictures in the book, the translations might need to be reduced so that the pupils can have an accurate and solid understanding of each English words that they learn.

## **7.0 CONCLUSION**

As the conclusion, the implementation of CEFR is good or very much functionable in terms of English language assessment because “the CEFR is a language policy document intended to define levels of language proficiency in terms of real-world practical ability” (Piccardo, North, & Maldina, 2017) where six band levels are distinguished in the CEFR, from entry level A1 to the highest level C2” (Chen & Baker, 2016). By using the band levels in the assessment, teachers could probably create a teaching and learning module that would suit the

needs, environment and culture of the children in primary school which is according to the framework guidelines that describes the language proficiency scale without using the CEFR Super Minds textbook.

In addition, the teachers should be given the opportunity to create a teaching and learning module according to the surrounding of the children because a language proficiency is assessed through how the language users use the language where the assessment happens through a type of “assessment system rather than a single assessment or even a series of assessments” (Hauck, Wolf, & Mislevy, 2016). With a systematic assessment, teachers are able to teach systematically according to the systematic assessment. Students are also able to identify themselves according to the systematic assessment.

Last but not least, the LINUS LBI screening assessment should be re-assessed to suit according to the CEFR defined level if CEFR will be permanently used as the English teaching module, because CEFR is very new in Malaysia and the implementation of CEFR in a multi-language and multi-cultural has not yet been implemented anywhere with research and enough evidence in any parts of the world. CEFR probably is affecting English LINUS if it could be further improvised. Thus, it would eventually help to bridge the gap of implementing CEFR in English subject for teachers and learners.

## REFERENCES

- Bokhari, R., Rashid, S. M., & Heng, C. S. (2015). Teacher's Perception on the Implementation of the Literacy, Numeracy and Screening (LINUS LBI 2.0) Programme among lower primary ESL Pupils. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, 1(11), 108-121.<sup>1,2</sup>
- Chen, K. S. (2012, September 5). *LINUS programme for early learning*. Retrieved 2018, from The Star Online: <https://www.thestar.com.my/news/nation/2012/09/05/linus-programme-for-early-learning/>
- Chen, Y.-H., & Baker, P. (2016). Investigating criterial discourse features across second language development: Lexical bundles in rated learner essays, CEFR B1, B2 and C1. *Applied Linguistics* (pp. 849-880). Oxford Academic.
- Cheng, L., Yunus, M. M., & Mohamad, M. (2016). Issues contributing to low performance of English in a national school in Song, Sarawak. *International Seminar on Generating Knowledge Through Research (ICECRS)* (pp. 499-510). Universiti Utara Malaysia.
- Chin, C. (2018, February 4). *Building on a benchmark*. Retrieved 2018, from The Star Online: <https://www.thestar.com.my/news/education/2018/02/04/building-on-a-benchmark/>
- Chin, C., & Rajaendram, R. (2017, October 5). *The Star Online*. Retrieved 2018, from thestar: <https://www.thestar.com.my/news/nation/2017/10/05/only-imported-english-textbooks-from-next-year-move-part-of-reform-to-ensure-international-proficien/>
- Dzansi, D. Y., & Amedzo, K. (2014). Integrating ICT into rural South African schools; Possible solutions for challenges. *International Journal of Education Sciences*, 6(2), 341-348.
- Eng, L. S., & Muuk, M. A. (2015). Blended learning in teaching secondary schools' English: a preparation for tertiary science education in Malaysia. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Science*, 167, 293-300.
- Espinoza-Herold, M., & González-Carriedo, R. (2017). *Issues in Latino Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Fenton-Smith, B., Humphreys, P., & Walkinshaw, I. (Eds.). (2017). *English Medium Instruction in Higher Education in Asia-Pacific: From Policy to Pedagogy*. Brisbane: Springer.
- Fleckenstein, J., Leucht, M., & Koller, O. (2018). Teachers' judgement accuracy concerning CEFR levels of prospective university students. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 15(1), 90-101.
- Franz, J., & Teo, A. (2017). 'A2 is Normal'- Thai secondary school English teachers' encounters with the CEFR. *RELC Journal*.
- Ghazali, N. R. (2017, February 3). *English language policy affects all*. Retrieved 2018, from New Straits Times: <https://www.nst.com.my/news/2017/02/209183/english-language-policy-affects-all>
- Hadzir, N. B., Alias, A. M., Kamaruzaman, A. L., & Yusof, H. M. (2016). Teachers' perception on literacy, numeracy and screening (LINUS 2.0) assessment features based on year 1 students' performance. *Research Journal of English Language and Literature (RJELAL)*, 4(1), 2395-2636.
- Hauck, M. C., Wolf, M. K., & Mislevy, R. (2016). *Creating a next-generation system of K-12 English learner language proficiency assessments*. Wiley Online Library.
- Karim, H. A., Mariappan, K., & Peters, D. (2016). Local-Global Media Images, Future Lives: Hybrid Identities Among Rural Sabahan Youths. *Malaysian Journal of Media Studies*, 18(2), 21-36.
- Panduan Pentadbiran Saringan LINUS2.0 2018. (2018). *Saringan 1*. Hak Cipta Kerajaan Malaysia 2018.
- Let's have our own textbooks*. (2018, February 4). Retrieved from The Star Online: <https://www.thestar.com.my/news/education/2018/02/04/lets-have-our-own-textbooks/>

- Luyee, E. O., Roselan, F. I., Anwardee, N. H., & Mustapa, F. H. (2015). Suitability of the Literacy and Numeracy Screening (Linus) 2.0 Programme in Assessing Children's Early Literacy. *The Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Science*, 3(2), 36-44.
- McNamara, T., Morton, J., Storch, N., & Thompson, C. (2018). Students' accounts of their first-year undergraduate academic writing experience; implication for the use of the CEFR. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 15(1), 16-28.
- Mohamed, N. Z., Omar, H. M., & Omar, S. (2015). Bridging the real world Englishes in the rural ESL classroom through translation. *Indonesian Journal of Educational Review*, 2(2), 76-93.
- Piccardo, E., North, B., & Maldina, E. (2017). QualiCEFR: A quality assurance template to achieve innovation and reform in language education through CEFR implementation. *Learning and Assessment: Making the Connections* (pp. 94-103). Bologna: Association of Language Testers In Europe.
- Sani, R. (2018, February 7). *New Straits Times*. Retrieved from nst.com: <https://www.nst.com.my/education/2018/02/332968/building-capacity-increase-english-proficiency>
- Shaaruddin, J., & Mohamad, M. (2017). Identifying the effectiveness of active learning strategies and benefits in curriculum and pedagogy course for undergraduates TESL students. *Creative Education*, 2312-2324.
- Zheng, Y., Zhang, Y., & Yan, Y. (2016). *Investigating the practice of The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) outside Europe: a case study on the assessment of writing in English in China*. Retrieved from <https://eprints.soton.ac.uk/393651/1/BC%2520ELTRA%2520article%2520Apr%25202016.pdf>
- Zhu, Z. T., Yu, M. H., & Riezebos, P. (2016). A research framework of smart education. *Smart Learning Environments*, 1-17.
- Zulkefli, A. S. (2017, November 4). *M'sian students, teachers show vast improvement in CEFR as per Cambridge Evaluation Study 2017*. Retrieved from New Straits Times: <https://www.nst.com.my/news/nation/2017/11/299126/msian-students-teachers-show-vast-improvement-cefr-cambridge-evaluation>