Incorporating CEFR bands and ICT-competences in grammar syllabuses of English Language Education Study Program in Indonesia

Siti Drivoka Sulistyaningrum^{1*}, Purnawati²

¹ Master Program of English Education, Language and Art Faculty, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Jakarta, Indonesia

² English Language Education Department, Teacher Training and Education Faculty, Universitas Islam Syekh-Yusuf Tangerang, Banten, Indonesia

* Email: drivoka@unj.ac.id (corresponding author)

Article history: Received: 10 May 2021

Available online: 8 September 2021

Accepted: 31 August 2021

Published regularly: September 2021

Abstract

The incorporation of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) into the educational field has been widely implemented as 21st century skill. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) is one of the global standard languages required for global standard. However, in Indonesian context, there is lack of syllabuses incorporating CEFR bands and ICT-competences. This study explores the CEFR levels and ICT-competences incorporating in grammar syllabuses of ELESF in Indonesian universities. A content analysis method is used. Fifteen syllabuses of the grammar of the ELESF from 8 universities in Indonesia were selected purposely based on the proportion of private and public universities. All the grammar syllabuses are identified as Basic, Intermediate, and Advanced grammar. The findings revealed that: basic grammar, the CEFR level was A1-B1, intermediate grammar, the CEFR level was A1-B2, while the advanced grammar showed that CEFR level was B2-C2. In addition, the ICT-competences in entire syllabuses showed insufficient utilization which dominated Knowledge Acquisition and less intended for Knowledge Deepening and Knowledge Creation. These findings contribute as a reference to adjust and re-align the existing syllabuses to be in line with the CEFR bands framework and enriched with ICT-competencies.

Keywords: CEFR; ELESF; grammar syllabus; ICT-competences

To cite this article: Sulistyaningrum, S. D., & Purnawati. (2021). Incorporating CEFR bands and ICT-competences in grammar syllabuses of English Language Education Study Program in Indonesia. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 11(2), 335-357. <https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v11i2.2863>

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v11i2.2863>

Copyright © 2021 THE AUTHOR(S). This article is distributed under a *Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International* license.

Introduction

Recently, there has been wide interest in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), which by 2019 more than 40 countries around the world employed the framework, and ICT-competencies incorporation in the curriculum. CEFR has become a very significant framework for the design of language curricula and the assessment of language learning outcomes not only in its home continent, but around the world, in the last 15 years (Read, 2019). However, the evidence revealed that CEFR Framework and ICT competencies were explored without focusing on grammar syllabuses. This research was conducted in CEFR incorporated in language skills, language learning, and assessment. Schmidt and Head (2020) examined the incorporation of the CEFR into oral communication, reading, writing, team-taught CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning), and assessment courses. In addition, Little (2018) revealed that CEFR was significantly influenced language testing and certification. However, Read (2019) found that it was difficult to achieve a balance between the desirability of setting international standards in language learning and the need to represent the social and educational contexts of particular countries. Whereas, McCarthy (2016) applied the CEFR framework to assess students' grammar competence which he found to be applicable. In brief, the researchers above only explored the incorporation of CEFR in language learning and assessment.

About the concern to grammar, the following studies were conducted. Keck and Kim (2014), Harmer as cited in Ahmed (2017) and Larsen-Freeman and Celce-Murcia (2016) claimed that grammar is a description how words can change forms and be combined into sentences in that language which govern how words and morphemes can be joined to form sentences. Furthermore, Saaristo (2015), Kusumawardani and Mardiyani (2018), Phuwarat and

Boonchukusol (2020) found that Grammar is language awareness, which influences the four language skills by shaping students' appropriateness in writing and speaking, as well as students' comprehension when capturing meaning in reading and listening activities. According to Kurniawan et al. (2021), the Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) was more effective in improving students' reading comprehension and motivation than traditional reading instruction. In brief, although there is wide interest in examining grammar there is no researcher concerned about incorporating the CEFR bands framework in the grammar syllabus in Indonesia.

Council of Europe (2011) divides the language ability into six levels they are A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, and C2 which represent ascending language ability from the lower to advanced. According to Ying Zheng, Zhang, and Yan (2016), the CEFR levels are grouped into three proficiency ranks: A1 and A2 are belong to the beginner which is called as Basic User, B1 and B2 are attributed to the intermediate level that called as Independent User while C1 and C2 levels are classified as advanced levels and called as Proficient User. Harrison as cited in O'Keeffe and Mark (2017) claimed that these ranks are in detailed operation thus understanding the lower level is critical before continuing to the further ones. To summing up the above studies, grammar involves three ascending levels of mastery, namely basic, intermediate, and advanced level which are learnt sequentially.

Beside embracing CEFR standard for grammar, incorporating ICT competences in grammar courses complements the learning goals as it is generally accepted that the students' attitude toward the use of ICT is strongly affected by the usefulness of ICT and the ease of use of ICT (Ammanni & Aparanjani, 2016; Semerci & Aydin, 2018; Vronska, 2016). Therefore, in ELESPP, ICT must be used in the learning and teaching process. UNESCO (2011) also supports ICT incorporation in syllabuses, stating that ICT-competencies can be incorporated into curricula, teaching and learning activities, and assessment. In addition, Goh and Sigala (2020) encouraged teachers and other education practitioners to use ICT not only for personal and administrative purposes, but also for a variety of instructional goals that aid the learning and teaching process and outcome. Combining these studies, the ICT integration in the syllabuses could be embraced in various learning activities and syllabuses' components.

The importance of ICT employment in education was explored by previous researchers. Iskandar and Purnawati (2019) examined the designing ICT—competence integrated in the grammar syllabuses. Meanwhile, according to

Hamid and Sulistyaningrum (2019), ICT competencies are usually integrated in the component of Teaching Method, Classroom Activities and Learning Media in the syllabuses and mostly utilized at the Knowledge Deepening level. The findings were in line with previous researches by Marcial and De La Rama (2015) and Khashkhuu (2018) which claimed that teachers' ICT competency in higher education was in the level of knowledge deepening. In addition, the recent study by Amini and Oluyide (2020) revealed the students' ICT competency was in the area of knowledge deepening as well. However, there are challenges in ICT competency implementation, as Shabbir and Khan (2020) found that English language teaching (ELT) teachers faced power and connectivity obstacles, as well as lack of trained technical support. In spite of the challenges, ICT skill, as one of 21st century skill, needs to be maintained and developed in the curriculum not only for Knowledge Acquisition and knowledge deepening but also for Knowledge Creation (Sumiati et al., 2020). In short, Using ICT requires rigorous preparation and well-defined goals. On the whole, ICT competencies have been integrated in the syllabuses or learning process such as speaking, grammar, ELT and EFL performances.

The studies by Iskandar and Purnawati (2019), Hamid and Sulistyaningrum (2019), Shabbir and Khan (2020), Marcial and De La Rama (2015), Amini and Oluyide (2020) as well as Sumiati et al. (2020) indicated that CEFR frameworks and ICT competencies were investigated separately and there is less attention in integrating both CEFR framework and ICT competences in grammar syllabuses. Therefore, this research intended to fill the above knowledge gap. The current research is significant because it provides the CEFR bands framework and ICT-competencies incorporated in grammar syllabuses and delivers several important suggestions for the improvements of the syllabuses design, content, and typical of CEFR band and ICT competencies incorporation that need to be addressed in the curriculum. In brief, this research intended to analyze the extent of CEFR bands and ICT competencies integration in existing grammar syllabuses at ELESP. Therefore, the research questions for this study were formulated as follow:

- (1) To what extent are CEFR bands grammar competencies incorporated in the existing grammar syllabuses for ELESP?
- (2) To what extent are the ICT competencies incorporated in the existing grammar syllabuses for ELESP?

Method

Research design

This study employed a content analysis method (Trilling & Jonkman, 2018). This content analysis depicts the representation of the CEFR Bands framework and UNESCO ICT-competency framework in the Grammar Syllabuses of the English Language Education Study Program in Indonesia. The content analysis is critical for interpreting the detailed content of official documents.

Research context and data sources

The data sources of the research were the Grammar Syllabuses of the English Language Education Study Program in Indonesia. The data of the research were the statements (words, phrases, sentences) of the CEFR Bands framework and UNESCO ICT-competency framework in Grammar Syllabuses. Fifteen syllabuses of grammar from 8 universities were selected randomly based on a proportion of 12 syllabuses from private universities and 3 syllabuses from public universities in Indonesia, referring the ratio of public to private universities is 1 to 10 (Kemenristekdikti, 2019) (see Table 1).

Data collection

After collecting 15 syllabuses of Grammar courses, the researchers, first, classifying the syllabuses to basic, intermediate, or advanced grammar. Secondly, codifying the syllabuses by the university and courses. Thirdly, assorting the syllabus' content by grammar topics and ICT—competences as the research data that ready to be analyzed. Regarding the research ethic, the researchers coded the 8 universities as University A, B, C, D, E, F, and H. The syllabuses gained from university A are 3 syllabuses namely *Grammar for Interpersonal and Social Communication* which is intended for basic level and coded as UA1, *Grammar for Academic Communication* which is intended for intermediate level and coded as UA2, and *Introduction to Functional Grammar* for advanced level and coded as UA3. University B contributes 3 syllabuses namely *Basic Grammar* coded as UB1, *Intermediate Grammar* coded as UB2, and *Advanced Grammar* which is coded as UB3. As many as 3 syllabuses are gained from university C, they are *Basic Grammar* which is coded as UC1, *Intermediate*

Grammar coded as UC2, and *Advanced Grammar* coded as UC3. University D provides a grammar syllabus namely *Basic Structure* and coded as UD1. One grammar syllabus namely *Intermediate Structure* is gained from university E and coded as UE2. Another grammar syllabus namely *Structure 2* which is intended for intermediate level is acquired from university F. *Advanced English Grammar* is gathered from university G which belong to advanced level, while *Structure 1* as basic grammar syllabus and *Structure 2* as intermediate level are gathered from University H. In a summary, these syllabuses are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. The data sources

No	Private university code	Public university code	Course syllabus	Syllabus code
1		University A	Grammar for Interpersonal and Social Communication	UA1
2			Grammar for Academic Communication	UA2
3			Introduction to Functional Grammar	UA3
4	University B		Basic Grammar	UB1
5			Intermediate Grammar	UB2
6			Advanced Grammar	UB3
7	University C		Basic Grammar	UC1
8			Intermediate Grammar	UC2
9			Advanced Grammar	UC3
10	University D		Basic Structure	UD1
11	University E		Intermediate Structure	UE2
12	University F		Structure 2	UF2
13	University G		Advanced English Grammar	UG3
14		University H	Structure I	UH1
15			Structure II	UH2

Data analysis

This study employs a systematic data analysis technique (Trilling & Jonkman, 2018). CEFR Bands framework and UNESCO ICT-competency framework were used to analyze the content of the documents. In data analysis procedures, there were two steps of analysis namely analyzing the CEFR Bands and Analyzing

the ICT—competencies in the existing grammar syllabuses. The data analysis procedure conducted in this research are as follows; Analyzing existing grammar syllabuses referring the descriptors of CEFR Bands framework in Table 2. Calculating the percentage of the CEFR grammar descriptors by dividing each level of CEFR Bands to all level of CEFR Bands stated in the existing syllabuses. To analyze the grammar items in the existing syllabuses, the researchers employed an analysis table which covers information about Syllabus Code, Course Name, Grammar Content and Topics in the existing syllabuses, and Coverage of the Existing Grammar items to be compared to CEFR profile both by its Scope and CEFR Level. Analyzing the framework of ICT-Competences in existing grammar syllabuses referring to ICT—competence indicators. Analyzing the incorporation of ICT—competences in the existing syllabus components namely course description, course learning outcomes, lesson learning outcomes, indicators, materials, teaching methods, media of learning, assessment, course policy, and references. Interpreting and concluding the data analysis result.

The analysis of ICT competencies covered in the existing syllabuses refers to the UNESCO framework indicators. Table 3 is used as a standard to analyze and find the gap from the existing grammar syllabuses in university x compared with the ideal global standard of ICT—competences. Each of the indicator item is assigned to Knowledge Acquisition (KA) means that ICT is used as a basic tools and digital content, Knowledge Deepening (KD) indicated the use of ICT as complex tools for solving the educational problems, and/or Knowledge Creation (KC) that indicated the use of ICT as pervasive tools to solve problems as well as creating new knowledge. The classification of each level is represented by 87 indicators which partly illustrated in Table 3.

Findings

After formulating and analyzing the data descriptively, the analysis result of existing grammar syllabuses to investigate the CEFR Bands and ICT-competences was incorporated into the syllabuses.

Table 2. CEFR band descriptors

Level	Some key features	Examples from the CLC at the appropriate level
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simple sentences Sentences with clauses joined by <i>that</i> Descriptive phrases introduced by a past participle Simple direct <i>wh</i>- questions Simple sentences using infinitives Other infinitives Some modals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>We came back and went to bed</i> <i>I know that you have a new house too</i> <i>There are beautiful paintings painted by famous Iranian painters</i> <i>What are you going to wear?</i> <i>I want to buy a coat</i> <i>... something to eat</i> <i>We must be there at 7 o'clock in the morning.</i>
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>-ing</i> clauses <i>Whose</i> relative clauses Indirect questions Clauses with <i>what</i> as subject/object Verb+object+infinitive <i>easy</i> + infinitive Some complex auxiliaries Additional modal uses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Maria saw him taking a taxi</i> <i>... this famous painter whose pictures I like so much</i> <i>Guess where it is?</i> <i>This is what I think</i> <i>I ordered him to gather my men.</i> <i>The train station is easy to find.</i> <i>would rather, had better</i> <i>I have invited all his friends, so we should be 28 people.</i>
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>-ing</i> clause before the main clause <i>It</i> + verb + infinitive phrase <i>WH</i>-clause as subject of main clause Reported speech Lexically-specific verbs/adjectives + infinitive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Talking about spare time, I think we could go to the Art Museum</i> <i>It would be helpful to work in your group as well.</i> <i>What came after was what really changed my summer!</i> <i>I told him I loved his songs.</i> <i>... proved to be wrong, turned out to be ..., expected to ...</i>
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lexically-specific verbs + object + infinitive <i>Might</i> for permission Fewer grammatical errors with agreement, countability or word formation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>I believe her to be this country's best representative.</i> <i>Might I tell you what we [should/will] discuss?</i>
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some new lexically-specific verbs + object + infinitive Longer utterances with greater accuracy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>They declare some products to be the hits of the season</i>

Sources: English profile, CEFR grammar descriptors adopted from CEFR (Council of Europe, 2011).

Table 3. ICT-competence indicators

ICT-competence indicators	UNESCO's approach		
	Knowledge Acquisition (KA)	Knowledge Deepening (KD)	Knowledge Creation (KC)
Identify the Internet and the World Wide Web	KA		
Use online technology to deliver instructional or support material	KA		
Use ICT resources to support teachers' own acquisition of subject matter and pedagogical knowledge.	KA		
Use ICT to access and share resources to support students' activities.	KA	KD	
Train students to use any available classroom digital equipment	KA	KD	
Create a resource that allows students to locate and retrieve materials.			KC
Structure unit plans and classroom activities to solve complex problems.	KA	KD	
Use a network and appropriate software for managing, monitoring, and assessment	KA	KD	
Implement the relevant application in teaching and learning process	KA		
Implement virtual learning environment	KA	KD	
Design online collaborative problem-solving materials and activities	KA	KD	KC

Sources: Adapted from UNESCO ICT-Competences Framework (UNESCO, 2018)

The extent of CEFR bands grammar competencies in existing grammar syllabuses for ELESP

The extent of CEFR bands grammar competencies incorporated in the existing grammar syllabuses for ELESP is divided into three levels, which are Basic Grammar, Intermediate Grammar, and Advanced Grammar.

Basic grammar

Five existing syllabuses were belonging to Basic Grammar which is assigned as UA1, UB1, UC1, UD1, and UH1. They were being analyzed. The summary of the analysis result is shown in Tables 4 and 5.

Table 4. Grammar in the existing syllabuses of basic grammar

Course level	Basic		
Syllabus code	UA1	UB1	UC1
CEFR Level	A1 (14%), A2 (86%)	A1 (50%), A2 (50%)	A1 (55%), A2 (45%)
Scope/ Topics	Simple sentences, WH-question in simple sentence, modals, part of speech, comparative and superlative and simple sentence, noun as part of speech, gerund, phrase, conditional-if	Auxiliaries, basic concept of grammar, causative form, class of words, conditional if, direct and indirect speech, passive voice, pronoun, simple sentence	Part of speech, adjective and adverbs, preposition and conjunction, determiners (article), demonstrative, possessive, quantifier, simple sentence, simple sentence (future tense), complex sentence, present continuous tense, present perfect continuous tense

Table 5. Grammar in the existing syllabuses of basic grammar

Course level	Basic	
Syllabus code	UD1	UH1
CEFR level	A1(22%), A2(44%), B1 (33%)	A1 (75%), A2 (25%)
Scope/topics	Part of speech, simple sentence, future and progressive sentence, past and future progressive sentence, complex sentence: present and past perfect tense, complex sentence: future and perfect tense complex/compound sentence: past and future perfect progressive tenses	Part of speech: noun, pronouns, pronouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, prepositions and determiners, <i>phrases</i> , present tenses, past tenses, future tenses

From Tables 4 and 5, it could be explained that the CEFR levels in the existing basic grammar syllabuses were in the range of A1 and A2. This distribution was in line with the CEFR standards. Meanwhile, UD1 which is assigned as basic grammar has already covered the CEFR Band of B1. The B1 in the syllabus is represented by the Complex Sentences areas which based on the

CEFR standard is intended to intermediate level. Whereas, the grammar topics in basic grammar were mostly part of speech, phrase, modals, clauses and simple sentences. The percentage distribution of the A1 and A2 bands were varied. Two syllabuses, UB1 and UC1, were balanced (around 50% of each level). While, UA1 and UD1 were dominated by A2 Level and UH1 was dominated by A1 level (75%). It inferred that the Basic Grammar band among universities was various.

Intermediate grammar

The existing syllabuses belong to the intermediate level were gathered from six universities and represented by six syllabuses. These six syllabuses which were coded as UA2, UB2, UC2, UE2, UF2, and UH2 span from the ability to understand and construct simple to complex/compound sentences. Therefore, the ideal CEFR level for intermediate was between B1 and B2. In brief, the data is shown in Tables 6 and 7.

Table 6. Grammar in the existing syllabuses of intermediate level

Course level	Intermediate		
Syllabus code	UA2	UB2	UC2
CEFR level	A2 (9%) B1(64%) B2(27%)	A1 (33%) A2 (45%) B1 (22%)	A2(38%) B1(54%) B2(8%)
Scope/topics	Clauses, gerund and infinitives, relative clause, reported speech, subjunctives, parallel structures, compound sentences, complex sentences, conjunctive adverbs, conditional sentences, clauses using participle phrases	Sentence punctuation, capital letter, articles, relative pronoun, constructing sentence, comparison degree, word formation, compound and complex sentence, preposition	Gerund, comparison degree, preference, conditional sentence, noun clause, adjective clause, reported speech, question tag, elliptical parallel structure, grammar analysis

Tables 6 and 7 explained that the CEFR level of existing Intermediate Grammar syllabuses were A2 and B1. Unsurprisingly, the A1 level was still found. For example, the syllabus of UB2 incorporated A1 level for 33% and UE2 utilized A1 for more than 30%. The band of A2 was found in UA2, UB2, UC2, UE2, and UF2. Having a high percentage of band A1 and A2 which referred to a

basic level, it means that these syllabuses were below the standard level of intermediate grammar which based on the CEFR standard is in the range of B1-B2. The majority of grammar topics in the intermediate level were complex clauses, complex sentences, conjunction, and conditional if. Moreover, no language function was found in the existing intermediate grammar syllabuses.

Table 7. Grammar in the existing syllabuses of intermediate level

Course level	Intermediate		
Syllabus code	UE2	UF2	UH2
CEFR level	A1(31%) A2(54%) B1(15%)	A2 (50%) B1 (40%) B2 (10%)	B1 (58%) B2 (42%)
Scope/topics	Explaining the course objectives, learning methods and the course outline, part of speech, phrases, personal pronoun, simple sentence in present time, simple sentence in past time, simple sentence in future time, simple sentence in present progressive time, simple sentence in past progressive, simple sentence in present future progressive complex sentence in present perfect tense, simple sentence with WH-Question, comparative and superlative degree, modal auxiliaries	sentence connector, coordinating, conjunctions count and non-count nouns, future tense, modal auxiliaries, compound sentence: perfect tense, gerunds, passive voice, yes/no and question, word-questions	Conjunction and transitions simple, compound and complex sentence clause (dependent-independent) questions, passive sentence, infinitives, gerunds, comparison, reported speech, noun clause, adverbial clause

Advanced grammar

The researchers managed to gather 4 grammar syllabuses of the advanced level, which were US3, UB3, UC3, and UG3. Referring to the CEFR standard, the intermediate level called independent users should acquire C1 and C2 Levels. The analysis summary of the data is shown in Tables 8 and 9.

Table 8. Grammar in the existing syllabuses of advanced level

Course level	Advanced	
Syllabus code	UA3	UB3
CEFR level	B2 (14%), C1 (43%), C2(43%)	C1 (100%)
Scope/topics	Compound-complex sentences, text analysis, spoken constructions with highly accurate structure, theme and rheme, logical coherence and cohesion, text genre	Grammatical error in composition, grammatical error in research report, incorrect punctuation in text, grammatical error in slogan, grammatical error in business letter, error analysis in TOEFL/TOEIC

Table 9. Grammar in the existing syllabuses of advanced level

Course level	Advanced	
Syllabus code	UG3	UC3
CEFR level	B2 (53%), C1 (47%)	B1(8%), B2(61%), C1(31%)
Scope/topics	Adjectival clauses in complex sentences – clauses, causative of verbs, relative pronoun, adjectival phrase, restricted – non-restricted clause, noun clauses in complex sentence, direct-reported speech, subjunctive, analyzing clause in authentic resources, adverbial clauses, specific words, prepositional idioms, present and past participles as adjective, analyzing TOEFL	Introducing the course simple sentence, complex sentence, sentence with reduced clauses, subject/verb agreement, parallel structure, form/use of verb, passive voice, part of speech, specific words, analyzing TOEFL

Tables 8 and 9 highlight that the CEFR level that appeared in existing advanced grammar syllabuses was from B1 to C2. The coverage of each CEFR band (B1, B2, C1, and C2) in the existing advanced grammar syllabuses was indifferent portion or percentage. The majority of the topics in the advanced grammar syllabus were: complex/compound sentences, TOEFL analysis as well as various text and genre constructions.

The extent of ICT competencies incorporated in the existing grammar syllabuses

The 15 syllabuses identification of ICT incorporation in the existing syllabuses found that ICT was integrated into some of the syllabus' components, i.e., the Course Description, Learning Objectives, Materials, Teaching Methods, and Assessments which are shown in Table 10. It shows the type of ICT tools and competences in the component of the syllabuses and associated to UNESCO's ICT-competences.

Table 10 shows that the existing syllabuses explicitly incorporated the ICT utilization in Course Description, Learning Outcomes, Learning Media, Learning Materials, Teaching Method, Assessment, Course Policy, and Reference. The ICT utilization also appeared in Teaching Method; Teachers' presentations, online tutorials, and on-air tutorials on television. While the Assessment appeared to be in the students' presentation of academic papers. The dominant uses of ICT tools incorporation were the use of LCD and PowerPoint for presentation. Surprisingly, UA3 and UD1 did not incorporate any ICT tools and competences. To conclude, the use of ICT in the grammar syllabuses was mainly for Knowledge Acquisition.

Discussion

With regard to the first research question, the extent of CEFR bands grammar descriptors incorporated in the existing grammar syllabuses for ELESP showed that grammar learning consisted of three levels which are basic, intermediate, and advanced level. These findings confirmed the previous studies by Zheng et al. (2016) and CEFR (2011). Furthermore, the result also revealed that the basic grammar syllabuses are mostly in level A1-A2 from universities A, B, C, D, and H, represented by syllabuses UA1, UB1, UC1, UD1, and UH1. While for intermediate level, it is found that the level covered A1 – B2 from UA2, UB2, UC2, UE2, UF2, UH2, and the advanced level covered CEFR bands B1-C2 from UA3, UB3, UG3, UC3. Related to the evidence of CEFR bands covered in the existing syllabuses, the result showed disproportionally accordance with the CEFR standard. Thus, the result of the present study is compatible with a previous study by Read (2019) which claimed that it was difficult of following the desired international standard level of grammar.

Table 10. ICT-competences incorporated in the existing grammar syllabuses

Code	Name of component	Names of ICT tools and competence	UNESCO's ICT competences
UA1	Assessment	Presentation	KA KD
UA2	Teaching Method	Presentation (teacher)	KA
	Teaching Media	PPT Slides (teacher)	KA
	Course Policy	Name of a website	KA KD
UA3	-	-	-
UB1	Assessment,	Presentation and academic paper	KA, KD, KC
	Teaching Media	Computer and LCD.	KA
UB2	Outcomes	Develop an Academic Writing	KA, KD, KC
	Assessment	students' presentation	KA, KD
	Teaching Media	Computer and LCD.	KA
UB3	Assessment	Doing presentation and developing academic paper	KA, KD, KC
UC1	Teaching Method	Presentation	KA KD
	Teaching Media	PowerPoint software and LCD.	KA KD
UC2	Course Description	E-Learning apps: Schoology	KA KD
	Teaching Media	PowerPoint software, Schoology Apps and LCD.	KA
UC3	Course Description	Explicit (E-Learning apps: Schoology)	KA KD
	Teaching Method	Presentation	KA
	Teaching Media	PowerPoint software, Schoology Apps and LCD.	KA KD
UD1	-	-	-
UE2	Teaching Methods	Presentation	KA
	Teaching Media	Video, Soft copy and PowerPoint, E-learning of University E, and overhead projector.	KA
	Reference	name of website for the learning source	KD
UF2	Teaching Media	Microsoft Offices, Movies, Electronic Longman Dictionary, Laptop, Laser Pointer and Speaker.	KA KD
UG3	Materials	Authentic resources	KD
	Learning Outcomes	project-based learning	KA KD KC
UH1	Teaching Method.	Online tutorials and on-air tutorial on television	KA KD
	Sources		
	Materials	Soft File (E-books)	KA KD
UH2	Teaching Method	Online tutorials	KA KD

From the findings, it also appeared that one of the existing grammar syllabuses incorporated CEFR bands are covered and appropriated based on CEFR Bands; to illustrate, the Basic Grammar syllabus of UB1 from university B which covers the range of A1 (50%) and A2 (50%) and the Intermediate syllabus of UH2 from University H which covered B1 and B2. These findings partially disconfirm Read's (2019) argument that there is possibility of designing grammar syllabuses based on international standards, namely the CEFR framework. Unsurprisingly, there are some inappropriate levels incorporated in grammar syllabuses. First, in the Basic Grammar syllabus, the CEFR level of B1 was found where the B1 level is considered as the intermediate level. In addition, in the intermediate level, there was a CEFR level of A2 which might belong to the basic level; meanwhile, in advanced grammar syllabuses, there was B1 found which might belong to intermediate level. In short, those findings showed that the incorporation of CEFR bands in existing grammar syllabuses was not proportionally covered by each level. These findings are in line with Zheng et al. (2016) that CEFR framework is remarkable in Europe but less recognized by many educators in Asian countries.

Overall, it is found that at the lower level, some of the grammar items are in the area of phrase and clause which are simpler than *simple sentences* described in A2 grammar descriptors; therefore, the researchers categorize the grammar items into A1 despite A1 is not described in CEFR bands for grammar, A1 presents in CEFR global descriptor. However, the categorization of A1 in grammar items in the existing syllabus is supported by Keck and Kim (2014), Harmer as cited in Ahmed (2017) and Larsen-Freeman and Celce-Murcia (2016) viewed that grammar was started from the structure of words or phrases that were simpler than simple sentences provided by A2 of CEFR bands for grammar.

Meanwhile, it is found that the majority of the advanced grammar items in the existing syllabus are in the CEFR band of C1. This level is one level below C2 provided by the CEFR grammar as well as the global descriptors. This finding confirmed research found by Renandya et al. (2018) that the English proficiency of teachers and in-service teachers in Indonesia fell under the 'low proficiency level' category. Thus, it explained the C2 level of CEFR bands of grammar was only found in one university (UA3) out of 4 examined universities.

The wide range of CEFR band distribution in the existing advanced grammar syllabuses, B1 to C2, shows the deviation between the existing state and the expected profiles. It was discovered that the grammar competence in

the existing syllabus is different from one and another syllabus in terms of its level and proportion. Some syllabuses were found to be structurally simpler, while some syllabuses were structurally complex referring to the CEFR framework. Therefore, there were gaps in grammar competence in the existing syllabuses to be addressed. This state might be a result of educators' unawareness of CEFR bands as been pointed out by Zheng et al. (2016) as well as the criticism argued by Alderson (2007) and Galaczi (2014) that CEFR standard provides ambiguity and contradictions, such as whether the descriptors can distinguish between different levels of competency. To conclude, the CEFR Framework of grammar that has not entirely been covered in the existing grammar syllabuses is caused by several reasons.

Two researchers, Little (2018) and McCarthy (2016) focused on Assessment. McCarthy (2016) explored the CEFR framework to assess students' grammar competence which he found to be applicable. On the other hand, this research focuses on incorporating CEFR bands in grammar syllabuses. It is supported by Iskandar and Purnawati (2019). It is in contrast with the research result conducted by Hamid and Sulistyaningrum (2019) which focused on incorporating CEFR bands in language skills: reading and speaking. It means that if teachers intend to assess students' grammar with CEFR bands, ideally the plan and the process of learning are in line with the CEFR profile. Thus, this research finding can be referred to address as the plan and the process in designing a curriculum.

In further investigation, the distribution of grammar items in the existing syllabus each of grammar level; basic, intermediate, and advanced, was revealed to be various. Despite having similar names, e.g., Basic Grammar, the syllabuses from different universities mostly contain different CEFR levels. University B and C in the basic grammar contain almost similar proportion levels, which are university B containing A1 (50%), A2 (50%) and University C A1 (55%), A2 (45%). However, the basic grammar in university A, D, and H covered different bands of CEFR as basic grammar in university A which accommodated the level of A1 (14%) and A2 (86%), while university D accommodated A1(22%), A2(44%), and B1 (33%) moreover, university H contained level A1 (75%) and A2 (25%). It is shown that the basic grammar in almost all universities is in a different distribution of the level. This state promoted the overall deviation finding explained in previous paragraphs. Not only in basic grammar, the deviations of CEFR band distribution in the syllabuses of intermediate and advanced grammars have also occurred.

However, ICT-competence integration in the grammar syllabuses is in a very basic utilization which intends for delivering materials or students' assessment through a presentation. In the majority, the integration of ICT, referring to the ICT Competence framework by UNESCO (2011), is in the use of ICT for Knowledge Acquisition and less for Knowledge Deepening. It disconfirms the study conducted by Hamid and Sulistyaningrum (2019) as they argued that ICT-competence integration in existing syllabuses is reached in Knowledge Deepening, but confirms the finding of previous research examined by Iskandar and Purnawati (2019). Moreover, Knowledge creation is deficient. The majority of the research finding that ICT utilization at the university level was dominated by knowledge acquisition indicated that the exploration of ICT is still on the surface. It showed that not only the technology needs to be enhanced, the users, especially the educators, need to keep practicing and learning ICT utilization in education so that it could be far broader. ICT could support distance collaborative groups, peer review, online mini research, learning activity through online games, etc.

Moreover, ICT-competence is found to be implemented by 13 syllabuses out of 15. The incorporation is generally for delivering materials through the presentation as well as students' assessments. The incorporation of ICT-competences into grammar syllabus components is in the Course Description, Learning Outcomes, Learning Media, Learning Materials, Teaching Method, Assessment, Course Policy, and Reference. It confirmed the idea of Goh and Sigala (2020) that ICT competencies could be implemented in different various teaching and learning activities.

The CEFR bands as well as the ICT competencies integrations were already embraced by the existing grammar syllabuses. However, the integrations of CEFR bands and ICT competences were not completely proportional. Different content of grammar levels in the linear syllabuses, while they are called by similar names are found. This condition potentially leads scholars to face biases in interpreting the grammar level. On the other hand, the ICT incorporation in the syllabuses limited to Knowledge acquisition whereas could be advanced for knowledge deepening and knowledge creation. Thus, having standardized level of grammar items in the syllabuses by embracing standardized framework level of grammar and combined with the integration of ICT competencies for knowledge deepening and knowledge creation are recommended. Thus, the authors suggest the teachers and education stakeholders as well as syllabus developers to refer the CEFR band framework and ICT competencies when

designing grammar syllabuses for ELESP so that better grammar syllabuses could be designed.

Conclusion

This study aims to incorporate CEFR standards and ICT-competences framework in grammar syllabuses to promote the use of international standard and advantageous competences for students in current situations and needs. However, the evidence from this study revealed that CEFR bands and ICT-competences have not wholly incorporated in the current grammar syllabuses. For further research it is also suggested to re-aligning the syllabuses design to be in line with CEFR bands, as well as enriching the ICT-competences incorporated for Knowledge Deepening and Knowledge Creation by employing frameworks and indicators provided in this study. The adjustment is expected to standardize grammar courses and furnishing the students of ELESP with ICT-competences.

The research found some limitations. There are works to do for reaching an ideal state of CEFR-standard and ICT-competences based Grammar syllabuses. By this, qualified and standardized content of grammar syllabuses could be designed. The main obstacle of conducting this research was the process of gathering the existing syllabuses. This part was challenging for the researchers as there were many universities which refused to hand in their syllabuses. Therefore, the researchers suggest the universities to be more cooperative to syllabus designers and researchers in case the researchers hold the research ethics.

Acknowledgements

We would like to appreciate the Magister of English Language Education Study Programme, Language and Art Faculty, Universitas Negeri Jakarta and Islamic University of Syekh-Yusuf Tangerang that lead us to do fantastic and fruitful group discussion in completing this paper.

Funding

This work was supported by the Language and Art Faculty, Universitas Negeri Jakarta Fund (2018).

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

ORCID

Siti Drivoka Sulistyaningrum <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3620-3320>

Purnawati <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8399-3508>

References

- Ahmed, S. (2017). Authentic ELT materials in the language classroom: an overview. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 4(2), 181–202. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/315765820>
- Alderson, J. C. (2007). The CEFR and the need for more research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00627_4.x
- Amini, C. M., & Oluyide, O. P. (2020). Analysis of ICT competencies among distance learning students in selected study centres of the National Open University of Nigeria. *Journal of Learning for Development*, 7(1), 78–89. Retrieved from <https://jl4d.org/index.php/ejl4d/article/view/376>
- Ammanni, S., & Aparanjani, U. (2016). The role of ICT in English language teaching and learning. *International Journal of Scientific and Engineering Research*, 7(7), 1–7. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/33z74fD>
- Azmi, N. (2017). The benefits of using ICT in the EFL classroom: from perceived utility to potential challenges. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 7(1), 111–118. <https://doi.org/10.5901/jesr.2017.v7n1p111>
- Council-of-Europe. (2011). *Using the CEFR: Principles of good practice*. Cambridge University Press & Assessment. Retrieved from <http://www.cambridgeenglish.org/images/126011-using-cefr-principles-of-good-practice.pdf>

- English-Profile-team-members. (2011). *Introducing the CEFR for English*. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from <https://www.englishprofile.org/images/pdf/theenglishprofilebooklet.pdf>
- Galaczi, E. D. (2014). Interactional competence across proficiency levels: how do learners manage interaction in paired speaking tests? *Applied Linguistics*, 35(5), 553–574. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amt017>
- Goh, E., & Sigala, M. (2020). Integrating Information & Communication Technologies (ICT) into classroom instruction: teaching tips for hospitality educators from a diffusion of innovation approach. *Journal of Teaching in Travel and Tourism*, 20(2), 156–165. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15313220.2020.1740636>
- Hamid, syifa F., & Sulistyaningrum, S. D. (2019). Designing ICT competences – integrated syllabuses of speaking courses (design and development study of English Language Education Program syllabuses). *International Journal of Language Education and Culture Review*. <https://doi.org/10.21009/IJLECR.051.01>
- Keck, C., & Kim, Y. (2014). *Pedagogical grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company. Retrieved from https://works.bepress.com/casey_keck/8/
- Kemenristekdikti. (2019). *Statistik pendidikan tinggi 2019 [Higher education statistics 2019]*. Jakarta: Kementerian Riset, Teknologi, dan Pendidikan Tinggi. Retrieved from <https://pddikti.kemdikbud.go.id/asset/data/publikasi/Statistik%20Pendidikan%20Tinggi%20Indonesia%202019.pdf>
- Khashkhuu, A. (2018). ICT competency level of teacher in the MUST. In *Conference: IFOST 2017 (September)* (pp. 1-6).
- Kurniawan, R., Miftah, M. Z., & Qamariah, Z. (2021). Grammar-Translation Method affects students' reading comprehension and motivation. *International Journal of Research on English Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 7–15. <https://doi.org/10.30863/ijretal.v1i1.1194>
- Kusumawardani, S. A., & Mardiyani, E. (2018). The correlation between English grammar competence and speaking fluency. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 1(6), 724. <https://doi.org/10.22460/project.v1i6.p724-733>
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Celce-Murcia, M. (2016). *The Grammar book: Form, meaning use for english language teacher*. Boston: National Geographic Learning.
- Little, D. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for languages. *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*. Retrieved from

- <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0114.pub2>
- Marcial, D. E., & De La Rama, P. A. (2015). ICT competency level of teacher education professionals in the Central Visayas Region, Philippines. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 3(35), 28–38. Retrieved from www.apjmr.com
- McCarthy, M. (2016). Putting the CEFR to good use: designing grammars based on learner-corpus evidence. *Language Teaching*, 49(1). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444813000189>
- O’Keeffe, A., & Mark, G. (2017). The English grammar profile of learner competence: Methodology and key findings. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 22(4), 457–489. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.14086.oke>
- Phuwarat, C., & Boonchukusol, N. (2020). The role of grammar teaching in ESL writing. *Sripatum Chonbura Academic Journal*, 16(4), 1–9. Retrieved from <https://www.chonburi.spu.ac.th/journal/1926-01-Chonthita.pdf>
- Purnawati, & Iskandar, I. (2019). Designing ICT competences—integrated syllabuses of grammar courses for English language education study program. *International Journal of Language Education and Culture Review*, 5(2), 104–115. <https://doi.org/10.21009/IJLECR.052.12>
- Read, J. (2019). The influence of the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) in the Asia-Pacific Region. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 12(1), 12–18. Retrieved from <https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/article/view/168568>
- Renandya, W. A., Hamied, F. A., & Nurkamto, J. (2018). English language proficiency in Indonesia: Issues and prospects. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 15(3), 618–629. <https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2018.15.3.4.618>
- Saaristo, P. (2015). Grammar is the heart of language: grammar and its role in language learning among Finnish university students, (2015), 279–318. <https://doi.org/10.14705/rpnet.2015.000296>
- Schmidt, R., & Head, E. (2020). Initial stages of individual teacher CEFR-related classroom curriculum projects at Miyazaki International College. *Japan Association for Language Teaching*, (December). Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/346580955>
- Semerci, A., & Aydin, M. K. (2018). Examining high school teachers’ attitudes towards ICT use in education. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 14(2). <https://doi.org/10.29329/ijpe.2018.139.7>
- Shabbir, N., & Khan, N. (2020). Integrating ICT as a teaching tool in the ELT classroom at higher education level: a descriptive study. *Journal of Social Sciences and Media Studies*, 3(1), 37–46. Retrieved from

- <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/341254636>
- Sumiati, A., Lustiyantie, N., & Iskandar, I. (2020). Integrating 21st century skills into translation classroom: *International Journal of Language Education and Cultural Review (IJLECR)*, 6(2), 87–96.
- Trilling, D., & Jonkman, J. G. F. (2018). Scaling up content analysis. *Communication Methods and Measures*, 12(2–3), 158–174. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19312458.2018.1447655>
- UNESCO. (2011). *UNESCO ICT competency framework for teachers*. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Retrieved from <https://iite.unesco.org/pics/publications/en/files/3214694.pdf>
- UNESCO. (2018). *UNESCO ICT competency framework for teachers version 3. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization*. Retrieved from <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000265721>
- Vronska, N. (2016). ICT competences as a necessary part of professional qualities at the Latvia University of Agriculture. In *Rural Environment. Education. Personality. Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference* (pp. 122–127). Retrieved from <http://ej.uz/j7yw>
- 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. *British Council (ELT Research Papers)*. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/301684303>