

# CEFR Journal

## Research and Practice



Japan Association for Language Teaching (JALT)  
CEFR & Language Portfolio SIG (CEFR & LP SIG)

Volume 2 (June 2020)

ISSN 2434-849X

Title: CEFR Journal – Research and Practice

Type: Online Journal

URL: <https://cefrjapan.net/publications/journal>

Contact: [journal@cefrjapan.net](mailto:journal@cefrjapan.net)

Copyright:



Edited by: Japan Association for Language Teaching (JALT)  
CEFR & Language Portfolio SIG  
Maria Gabriela Schmidt (coordinator, editor)  
Morten Hunke (chief liaison officer, editor)  
Alexander Imig (treasurer, website editor)  
Fergus O'Dwyer (editor)

ISSN: 2434-849X  
J-STAGE, SCOPUS & Web of Science

---

# CEFR JOURNAL—RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

## VOLUME 2

---

### Table of Contents

Mission statement. . . . . 2

Editorial. . . . . 4

*Maria Gabriela Schmidt & Morten Hunke*

In memory of Tim Goodier . . . . . 7

### Articles

Trolls, unicorns and the CEFR: Precision and professionalism in criticism of the CEFR . . . . . 8

*Brian North* . . . . . 8

Developing classroom mediation awareness and skills in pre-service language teacher education . 25

*Marina Perevertkina, Alexey Korenev, & Maria Zolotareva*

### Reports

The new CEFR descriptors for the assessment of written mediation: Exploring their applicability in a local context in an effort towards multilingual testing . . . . . 40

*Maria Stathopoulou*

Promoting reflection in initial foreign language teacher education: The use of the EPOSTL revisited. 79

*Charis-Olga Papadopoulou*

### News

Introducing the Association of Language Testers in Europe (ALTE) CEFR SIG . . . . . 84

*Carmen Peresich*

The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages CEFR SIG . . . . . 85

*Neus Figueras*

JALT CEFR & LP SIG . . . . . 87

*Maria Gabriela Schmidt & Morten Hunke*

The EALTA UKALTA 'Roadmap' conference—The CEFR: a road map for future research and development—meeting overview . . . . . 89

*Fergus O'Dwyer, Morten Hunke, & Maria Gabriela Schmidt*

Submissions (Call for Abstracts), guidelines . . . . . 98

# The EALTA UKALTA ‘Roadmap’ conference— The CEFR: a road map for future research and development—meeting overview

Fergus O’Dwyer, Marino Institute of Education

Morten Hunke, g.a.s.t. | TestDaF-Institut

Maria Gabriela Schmidt, Nihon University

The “Roadmap” meeting (<https://uk.live.solas.britishcouncil.digital/exam/aptis/research/ealta-ukalta-conference>) was held in central London on 7-8 February, and jointly hosted by EALTA and UKALTA. The central organizing committee was comprised of **Barry O’Sullivan** and **Jamie Dunlea** (British Council), **Neus Figueras** (University of Barcelona), **Vincent Foiny** (France Education International), **David Little** (Trinity College Dublin), with contributions from international experts like Brian North, John de Jong, Meg Malone, Masashi Negishi, Constant Leung, Peter Lenz et al. The first day featured two sessions by Brian North and David Little respectively that opened up the topics of the meeting. The second day was comprised of three symposia that expanded on some of these topics, ending with a final session that attempted to draw threads together and sketch out future plans.

This article introduces the meeting and the roadmap generally, and discusses possible future CEFR-related initiatives. A more comprehensive, official report is available at: [http://www.ealta.eu.org/documents/EALTA\\_UKALTA\\_CEFR\\_report\\_final.pdf](http://www.ealta.eu.org/documents/EALTA_UKALTA_CEFR_report_final.pdf).

The purpose of this overview is to raise awareness of the meeting in general (for those who could not attend): as mentioned a more comprehensive report is available at the link above. The text offers an introduction and attempts to feed forward to the EALTA CEFR SIG workshop on 11 June, 2020 at 03:00 pm BST. You can register at: [https://us02web.zoom.us/meeting/register/tZMvd-iurDspHt1WG8ru\\_yrw6NIAGDI0YaQ1](https://us02web.zoom.us/meeting/register/tZMvd-iurDspHt1WG8ru_yrw6NIAGDI0YaQ1). Please be aware, to register, you need to be an EALTA member—it is free—and you will have to join the EALTA CEFR SIG to keep abreast of developments and to attend the CEFR SIG online workshop.

Please note, for the sake of brevity, the text may omit describing certain discussions that took place in detail. This text does not aim to be a comprehensive representation of the entire conference. Also, this text reflects the impressions of members of the CEFR Journal editorial team present at the conference. Were you to find topical issues or important discussion points omitted in this text, or were you to wish to add contradicting or complementary views of how to progress the roadmap, for example, we warmly welcome such contributions to the CEFR Journal. Please, contact us at: [journal@cafrjapan.net](mailto:journal@cafrjapan.net). We would love to hear from you and get the debate going.

The brief for the conference was as follows: In the two decades since its publication, the CEFR has established itself as an indispensable reference point for all aspects of second and foreign language education—a position that was reinforced by the publication of the Companion Volume (CV) in 2018. Used worldwide by individuals, institutions and policy makers in different contexts, with different aims and with varying degrees of rigor, the CEFR has become de facto an open source apparatus that is a great deal more than a collection of documents. EALTA (European Association for Language Testing and

Assessment) and UKALTA (United Kingdom Association for Language Testing and Assessment), both open associations of professionals in language testing and assessment, recognize the need to explore ways of developing research methodologies and projects of various kinds that can help to extend and further develop the CEFR and its implementation. Accordingly, they have decided to organize a meeting that will consider the possibility of creating a road map for future engagement with the CEFR, taking account of what has been learnt so far and of new developments in applied linguistics and related disciplines. The meeting will comprise a series of symposia and discussion panels in which invited professionals from different contexts will report on and discuss existing policies and research and express their views on future development.

For the full program, please see the appendix. Starting with the end in mind, a roadmap was presented by David Little:

### Text of slide 1 by David Little:

Steps towards a road map of future research development	
<p><b>Assessment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Language testing and assessment professionals and associations are already fully involved</li> </ul> <p>Alignment of curriculum, teaching/ learning and assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify examples of established and evolving practice                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Universities</li> <li>• The semi-state and private sectors</li> <li>• Deaf Studies / sign language teachers</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Action-oriented and plurilingual approaches</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify varieties of implementation</li> <li>• Research classroom practice</li> </ul>	<p><b>Engaging the profession</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish a network of associations and agencies to                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• share experience</li> <li>• encourage CEFR-related activities</li> <li>• organize events</li> <li>• coordinate publications</li> </ul> </li> <li>• launch research projects, e.g., to update the manual</li> <li>• Promote awareness of the CEFR and its ethos                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Founded on Council of Europe values</li> <li>• Learning before teaching before assessment</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Draw on CEFR-related and other research to clarify and amplify the theoretical underpinning and practical implementation of key concepts</li> </ul>

## Day 1

### *Opening session The CEFR: Learning, teaching, assessment in Europe and beyond*

**Brian North** The CEFR Companion Volume Project: what has been achieved

The opening session *The CEFR: Learning, teaching, assessment in Europe and beyond* began with a talk by **Brian North** *The CEFR Companion Volume Project: what has been achieved*. Brian discussed some important concepts of the Companion Volume (CV), such as how it outlines the action-oriented approach (also see Picardo & North 2019), how it importantly conceptualizes mediation. This makes the mediation elements of the 2001 publication more explicit and adding scales for mediating texts across and within languages. It aimed to make a more complete descriptor scheme, that is also readable for purposes like teacher education (a central theme that emerged throughout the meeting). It was emphasized that the

mediation scales were designed to be used as a reference scale for curriculum development, but not necessarily as scales for classroom task-, and test item-assessment. Many of the descriptors from the original 2001 document were made modality-inclusive and gender neutral. One point that emerged in a later discussion is that it is important to look at scales transversally when choosing the correct scale for assessment (see Constant Leung presentation on Saturday). This is one area of future work which stakeholders would benefit from accessible resources.

The replacement of the phonology scales in the CV was mentioned (the development of a new *Phonological Control* scale, and the process of removing the “native-speaker ghost” in revising descriptors of the 2001 document, with intelligibility and proficient users of the language now the focus (e.g., “sustained relationships with native speakers” has been replaced with “sustained relationships with speakers of the target language” in the Overall Spoken Interaction B2 descriptor).

The plenary was followed by a panel discussion, chaired by **Jamie Dunlea** (British Council), which focused on how the 2001 publication was meant to be an international document that could be localized, to reflect situations on the ground.

**Meg Malone** of the American Association discussed collaboration and building of relationships between ACTFL and the CEFR community, with **Masashi Negishi** (Tokyo University of Foreign Studies) outlining the development of the CEFR-J emphasizing the bilateral impact of the CEFR-J (i.e., not only the impact of CEFR in Japan, but the impact of the CEFR-J research on the development of the CEFR). Some points raised by Negishi included the importance of proper attention of stakeholders toward the action-oriented approach (AoA), and the proper procedure to align tests to the CEFR.

**Barry O'Sullivan** (British Council) discussed how the CEFR is used everywhere but differently in and across contexts, with various levels of understanding. Many exams claim alignment with the CEFR, the reality may be questionable. He asked broad questions like what impact has the CEFR has on assessment? And is the original 2001 publication fit for purpose? This ended in a suggestion to combine the 2001 publication with the CV in an accessible way for use in teacher training. O'Sullivan introduced an underlying theme: the equal and constructive alignment of curriculum, assessment and teaching.

## *II The CEFR: challenges and critical perspective—David Little*

The first day continued with *The CEFR: challenges and critical perspective* talk which generally discussed the impact of the CEFR, with a heavy impact on assessment, and impact on curriculum patchy (the school sector, in particular, needs to be developed further). In terms of teaching and learning Little expressed disappointment that the European Language Portfolio (ELP) is not used on a large scale, and seems to have “sunk without a trace”. It is not necessary to be too pessimistic as the ELP is/was a tool to integrate the AoA into curricula. This has happened, and is continuing to progress: we just need to clearly outline and harness the positive progressions, while addressing the situations and contexts that would benefit from the greater integration of the AoA and other underlying principles of the CEFR.

Little outlined 3 challenges: the AoA, Plurilingual approach to language education and use descriptors, described in the text from his slide reproduced below:

## Slide 2 by David Little

Three areas of challenge	
<p><b>The action-oriented approach</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learners are individual and social agents</li> <li>• Language learning via language use</li> <li>• Learner involvement</li> </ul> <p><b>The plurilingual approach to language education</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integrated linguistic repertoires =&gt; pedagogical implications</li> <li>• All languages in the learner's repertoire implicated in his/her (language) education</li> </ul> <p><b>Descriptors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A means of integrating curriculum, teaching/ learning and assessment =&gt; constructive alignment as necessary support for pedagogical implementation of action-oriented and plurilingual approaches</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For most teachers (and learners) this is still a novel view of the language learning process and the role of the learner</li> <li>• How widely has it been understood, adopted and successfully implemented?</li> <li>• Entails a profound modification of the aim of language education (CEFR 1.3, p. 9)</li> <li>• But what exactly does it mean for curriculum, classroom practice and assessment?</li> <li>• In how many different ways can it be implemented?</li> </ul> <p>The widespread practice of claiming <b>general</b> and <b>undocumented</b> alignment with the CEFR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How many examples of <b>thoroughgoing</b> constructive alignment can we identify?</li> </ul>

In terms of descriptors, David emphasized that the CEFR ideally is a system of constructive alignment, with the role of Can Do statements as a tool for constructive alignment often mis- or under-used. He also outlined steps in CEFR/CV-based curriculum design (see text in slide 3 below), emphasizing the need to define content in terms of learner needs (e.g., page 37 of the Companion Volume). Importantly he emphasized the need to engage the profession, and classroom practice (e.g., Kirwan Scoil Bhríde Cailíní example below) of the AoA and plurilingual approach, and update for aligning materials to CEFR.

Little gave a good definition of levels, with the first levels focusing on survival (A1), leading to interaction and transaction (A2-B1), followed by academic, professional, vocational engagement (B2+). The levels can be viewed as concentric circles that widen in their scope from level A1 to C2.

## Slide 3 by David Little

### Steps in CEFR/CV-based curriculum design

- Define the program in terms of content the knowledge that learners are required to engage with and master the skills they are required to develop while doing so
- Use the levels and scales of the CV to determine what the language activities learners should be able to perform by the end of the program (reception, production, interaction, mediation)
- Use the levels and scales of communicative language competence to describe the linguistic resources learners need to acquire
- Develop a program of teaching and learning, bearing in mind
  - the status of the learner as an individual and a social agent
  - the action-oriented approach (AoA) and its pedagogical implications
  - the descriptive scheme in Chapters 4 and 5
  - the discussion of learning and teaching in Chapter 6
  - the discussion of tasks in Chapter 7
- Provide learners with a version of the ELP to help them manage their own learning documentation, reflection, self-assessment (“I can” descriptors derived from a curriculum establish continuity with teacher and institutional/external assessment)

The day ended with a discussion of the roadmap, as mentioned above.

## Day 2

### *Change of paradigm?*

*III The second day opened with a symposium on the topic of The action-oriented approach in the CEFR and the CV: a change of paradigm(s)?.*

**Constant Leung** (King’s College London) came from the perspective of English as a Lingua Franca (Global Englishes) and mediation, in particular mediating communication in flexible multilingualism.

One point that emerged later in the discussion is that it is important to look at scales transversally (i.e., look across the available scales) when choosing correct scale for assessment (Brian North noted he could use the “Acting as an intermediary in informal situation with friends and colleagues” scales when viewing communication amongst multilinguals). He focused on agency, fluidity, contingency and context-shift in multilingually-mediated communication.

**Mark Levy** (British Council, Spain) discussed how it was decided that mediation must be included in language curriculum and tasks, as part of royal decree. It seemed to be imposed on teachers, without enough time to prepare. (In reality, the government minister was a member of the 2014 CV working group). There is a hint here for measured and collaborative implementation of top-down initiatives.

**John de Jong** (Language Testing Services) offered perspectives from a testing/assessment perspective, noting that the CV offers a necessary elaboration of notions that were clearly signalled in the CEFR original document. Considerations of principles like measuring mastery of a level and modelling mediation were also outlined.



The following discussion, chaired by Barry O'Sullivan, highlighted some important questions, such as:

- What are you going to do to help teachers teach in an AoA-informed way? Important to understand plurilingual citizens. It is possible to turn the question around: What can be done to further help learners/plurilingual citizens learn in an AoA-informed way? It is very important to map out current situations, and gaps to address, possibly identifying where the biggest difference can be made.
- When mediating with government officials, an effective approach may be to present a 1-pager with a graphic, and 3 bullet points.
- It is a mistake to standardize everything in the CEFR/CV but should be thinking how to assess classroom-based activities. As an aside, a way of viewing a standardized test is that it is an objective measure of things that can be objectively measured.

There were many discussions around these presentations, with 100+ language professionals in attendance. One such individual was Glyn Jones, who is looking for help with a PhD study, see <https://cefrreplication.jimdo.com>.

## **Symposium 2: Plurilingualism**

*IV The second symposium Plurilingualism, plurilingual education and mediation featured four speakers.*

**Bessie Dendrinou** (National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece) outlined a project which aimed to make the CEFR levels explicit in terms of linguistic data. This involved the development of a curriculum, suite of exams, curriculum language database, and language learner profile, all which were linked to the Kratiko Pistopiitiko Glossomathias (KPG) learner corpora (see [www.rcel.enl.uoa.gr](http://www.rcel.enl.uoa.gr)).

**Déirdre Kirwan**, former principal of Scoil Bhríde Cailíní, Blanchardstown, Dublin, gave an exciting report on a whole school language policy for a primary school with 50 home languages, and learners bringing their own languages to school as a resource. The CEFR was used to facilitate a common metalanguage across languages (see Kirwan & Little 2019 for details). The school was unprepared for the rapid change in its student body, and had to develop its policy as time went on. An important take out however was that every school should not have to do this, if an easy to follow guidelines for the implementation of the whole school approach to language where made available.

Overall Kirwan suggested it would be greatly beneficial to create a guide to a whole school approach, where language learning is conducted incidentally by doing what they want to do (a great example given was an 8-year-old of Filipino heritage writing a diary about her dog in the Irish language). The examples and learnings outlined by Kirwan is a great example of learner-centred AoA, and a learner interpretation of AoA.

**Peter Lenz** (Institute of Multilingualism, University of Fribourg) discussed the Occupational English Test (<https://www.occupationalenglishtest.org/>), which examined five clinical communications criteria.

The follow-on discussions featured the need to constructively align teachers and learners. In order to understand learning, there is often a difference between how learners assess and teachers assess. Exploding descriptors is one solution, and other practices to develop learner agency.

Symposium 3: Descriptors in curriculum, classroom and assessment, include many important perspectives which are found in the report linked above.

Elif Kantarcioğlu (Bilkent University, Ankara), for example, discussed matters such as the renewal of content analysis grids to integrate CV components like mediation, and the need for speaking samples. The other presenters were Armin Berger and Elaine Boyd.

### ***Meeting recommendations***

The meeting ended with an open discussion, focusing on recommendations for future actions: we list these in note form.

**Neus Figueras** emphasized less is more for proposals: Need accessible compilation of all CEFR-related documents, to improve usage by professionals.

**Mike Byram**: need to educate plurilingual democratic citizens, whole school approaches etc. Need bigger picture, and synergies between CEFR CV, and OECD scales etc.

**Gudrun Erickson**: There is a need from relevant organizations to hold collaborative events, alongside less traditional, descriptive reports on websites of organizations etc.

**Joe Siegel, Joe Sheils** (formerly Council of Europe director of the Language Policy Division): need to realize where Roadmap fits in with democratic ethos of CoE, and organizations with participatory status (UKALTA, ALTE, EAQUALS).

There was a final address by presidents of EALTA and UKALTA, who agreed to bring the recommendations of the meeting forward.

### **What follows are some-views on possible progressions on foot of the meeting**

How well is the CEFR used and understood by learners? To what extent is the CEFR used alongside/facilitates learning-oriented assessment and assessment for learning? How can we help teachers teach in an action-oriented approach (AoA)?<sup>1</sup> It is important to understand plurilingual citizens: it is necessary to ask what can be done to further help learners/plurilingual citizens learn in an AoA? In our opinion, it is important to map out the current situation, and gaps to address, possibly identifying where the biggest difference can be made. This should tie in with the Languages Connect initiatives in secondary and tertiary education in Ireland (<https://languagesconnect.ie/>), for example, and initiatives like the Higher Education Language Educator Competences project (<https://www.teachingandlearning.ie/project/a-profile-of-skills-for-teachers-of-language-in-higher-education/>).

In fact, it would be desirable for a panel of relevant organizations—ALTE, EALTA, UKALTA, EAQUALS, etc.—to spearhead efforts to produce both a real roadmap for further actions as well as an overview of successes, gaps and to-dos. In fact, an up-to-date resource providing an overview of all such projects past and present would be ideal. However, this resource would only be useful if it is well-maintained and created with the prospective users in mind. The CEFR Journal could also play an important role in this respect as well. It could provide a bottom up platform for facilitation of results like a roadmap agenda, providing insights into running and finalized projects.

What is important here is the equal and constructive alignment of curriculum, assessment and teaching/learning (while understanding that this triangle is embedded in a wider system). An emerging research interest is the need to constructively align teachers and learners. The CEFR is ideally a system of constructive alignment facilitated by use of the illustrative scales and 'Can do' statements. It is a mistake to standardize everything in the CEFR/CV, but should be thinking how to assess classroom-based activities. The development of accessible resources for educators viewing scales transversally when developing assessment criteria for classroom-based activities could be one particular focus.

1. The AoA was clearly described in the CEFR in relation to language use and language learning (2001: 9), whereas Piccardo and North 2019 focus on the AoA as a way of teaching.

- In terms of teaching and learning Little expressed disappointment (that the ELP) is not used on a large scale. As mentioned above, the ELP was a tool to integrate the AoA into curricula which has happened, and is continuing to progress, to a certain extent. See for example the increased use of assessment for learning and learning-oriented assessment in language classrooms since the official publication of the CEFR in 2001. Future developments could aim to clearly outline and harness the positive progressions, while addressing the situations and contexts that would benefit from the greater integration of the AoA and other underlying principles of the CEFR. In particular, a point of interest is learners' perception of the CEFR in terms of the AoA and learning-oriented assessment etc. Readers may want to follow up such matters in Piccardo & North (2019).
- Engaging the profession and classroom practice. It is important to follow through to develop easy to follow guidelines for the implementation of the whole school approach to multilingual education: Kirwan & Little (2019) is an excellent starting point for those wishing to examine this more. Flipped learning will have a large role to play for learners of teenage years and older, particularly in post-COVID-19 times.
- Combining the original 2001 CEFR publication with the Companion Volume in an accessible way for use in teacher training, and to be accessed by a wider audience. It was mentioned that when engaging with new educational ministers, for example, you must present a one-page document with a graphic and 3 bullet points! One possible function of the roadmap panel could be to commission producing such resources.
- One view is that a steering group should devise an overarching plan, based on the roadmap of Little with addition of contributions from the Roadmap conference and follow-on consultation process. (This plan may be achieved over the course of 20+ years!) Less is often more, in this case what is required is a structured suite of collaborative projects which incrementally and iteratively achieve the aims of the roadmap. Ideally these projects would be funded (e.g., European Centre for Modern Languages medium-term programme; European Commission Marie Curie Innovative Training Network), interdisciplinary, multi-organizational and transnational.

There is capacity, opportunity, and desire for change!

## References

- Kirwan, Déirdre & David Little. 2019. *Engaging with Linguistic Diversity. A Study of Educational Inclusion in an Irish Primary School*. London: Bloomsbury Academic
- Piccardo, Enrica & Brian North. 2019. *The Action-oriented Approach: A Dynamic Vision of Language Education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

## Appendix

### **Friday 7<sup>th</sup> February**

#### **I The CEFR: Learning, teaching, assessment in Europe and beyond**

Brian North: The CEFR Companion Volume Project: what has been achieved

Panel discussion: Barry O'Sullivan (British Council), Masashi Negishi (Tokyo University of Foreign Studies), Meg Malone (ACTFL). Chair: Jamie Dunlea (British Council)

## ***Saturday 8<sup>th</sup> February***

### **III Symposium 1: The action-oriented approach in the CEFR and the CV: a change of paradigm(s)?**

Panel: Constant Leung (King's college London), Mark Levy (British Council, Spain), John de Jong (Language Testing Services). Chair: Barry O'Sullivan (British Council)

### **IV Symposium 2: Plurilingualism, plurilingual education and mediation**

Panel: Bessie Dendrinou (National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece), Déirdre Kirwan (Formerly principal of Scoil Bhríde Cailíní, Blanchardstown, Dublin), Peter Lenz (Institute of Multilingualism, University of Friburg). Chair: Vincent Folny (France Education International)

### **V Symposium 3: Descriptors in curriculum, classroom and assessment**

Panel: Elaine Boyd (University College London), Armin Berger – (University of Vienna), Elif Kantarcioğlu (Bilkent University, Ankara). Chair: Nick Savile (ALTE)

Followed by final discussion, with final addresses by invited Lynda Taylor (UKALTA president) and Peter Lenz (EALTA president).

---

# CEFR JOURNAL—RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

## VOLUME 2

---

**Title:** CEFR Journal – Research and Practice

**Type:** Online Journal

**URL:** <https://cefrjapan.net/publications/journal>

**Contact:** [journal@cefrjapan.net](mailto:journal@cefrjapan.net)

**Copyright:**



**Edited by:** Japan Association for Language Teaching (JALT)  
CEFR & Language Portfolio SIG  
Maria Gabriela Schmidt (coordinator, editor)  
Morten Hunke (chief liaison officer, editor)  
Alexander Imig (treasurer, website editor)  
Fergus O'Dwyer (editor)

**ISSN:** 2434-849X  
J-STAGE, SCOPUS & Web of Science

### Submission (Call for Abstracts)

This journal attempts to fall somewhere in between an inaccessible academic journal (long waiting times, fairly strict guidelines/criteria) and a newsletter (practical in nature but lacking in theoretical support/foundation), linking research of a practical nature with relevant research related to foreign language education, the CEFR, other language frameworks, and the European Language Portfolio. While the CEFR was introduced by the Council of Europe and intended for use, first and foremost, within Europe, the influence of the CEFR now has to be attested in many places beyond European borders. It has become a global framework, impacting a variety of aspects of language learning, teaching, and assessment across countries and continents beyond the context for which it was originally created. As such, there is a pressing need to create a quality forum for sharing research, experiences, and lessons learned from applying the CEFR in different contexts. This journal provides such a forum where people involved or interested in processes of applying the CEFR can share and learn from one another.

We are continuously seeking contributions related to foreign language education, the CEFR, other language frameworks, and the European Language Portfolio. We are particularly interested in specific contextual adaptations.

Currently, we have a new Call for Abstracts out. Due to current necessities and demand, we are looking to give your experiences with **online, remote, and e-learning in conjunction with the CEFR, the CEFR/CV, or portfolio work** the spotlight it deserves. In these months many practitioners are accruing valuable best and potentially also worst practice experience. We would like to offer a forum to share such valuable insights in future volumes. Until 30 November 2020 we are looking for abstracts at:

**[journal@cefrjapan.net](mailto:journal@cefrjapan.net)**

## Guidelines

<b>Submission:</b>	30 November 2020
<b>Contributions:</b>	Articles (research), reports (best practice), news (work in progress), research notes, book reviews
<b>Language(s):</b>	English (British, American, international) preferred, but not mandatory. Other languages by request, with an extended abstract in English.
<b>Review type:</b>	Peer review, double blind

### ***Peer review guidelines:***

We ask all peer reviewers to make every reasonable effort to adhere to the following ethical guidelines for the **CEFR Journal – Research and Practice** submissions that they have agreed to review:

1. Reviewers must give unbiased consideration to each manuscript submitted for consideration for publication, and should judge each on its merits. Since, we employ a double-blind review, the text you have been provided with ought to have no reference to race, religion, nationality, sex, gender, seniority, or institutional affiliation of the author(s). Please, notify us immediately were any such information still detectable in the anonymised text you received.
2. Reviewers should declare any potential conflict of interest prior to agreeing to review a manuscript, including any relationship with the author that may potentially bias their review.
3. Reviewers are strongly advised to keep the peer review process confidential; information or correspondence about a manuscript should not be shared with anyone outside the peer review process.
4. Reviewers should provide a constructive, comprehensive, evidenced, and appropriately substantial peer review report. For your convenience, we are providing you with a 'reviewing matrix' you may choose to use at your own discretion. We would also like to kindly ask you to provide us in the journal editorial team with a final overall assessment of the text's publication potential – please, see bottom of this document.
5. Reviewers must avoid making statements in their report, which might be construed as impugning any person's reputation.
6. Reviewers should make all reasonable effort to submit their report and recommendation in a timely manner, informing the editor if this is not possible.
7. Reviewers should call to the journal editor's attention any significant similarity between the manuscript under consideration and any published paper or submitted manuscripts of which they are aware.

### ***Author instructions:***

- Adapted version of deGruyter Mouton guidelines for Language Learning in Higher Education (CercleS) and style sheet.



Japan Association for Language Teaching (JALT)  
CEFR & Language Portfolio SIG (CEFR & LP SIG)