

THE COMMON EUROPEAN FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE IN THE TEACHING-LEARNING PROCESS OF INTEGRATED ENGLISH PRACTICE

El Marco Común Europeo de Referencia en el proceso de enseñanza-aprendizaje de la disciplina Práctica Integral de la Lengua Inglesa

Quadro Europeu Comum de Referência para as Línguas no processo de ensino-aprendizagem da disciplina Prática Integral da Língua Inglesa

Carlos Pineda Sánchez, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4128-9114>

Keyi Rondón Sánchez, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5226-1147>

María de la Caridad Smith Batson, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4414-0772>

Universidad de Las Tunas, Las Tunas, Cuba

*Autor para correspondencia email: krlosp1972@gmail.com

Para citar este artículo: Pineda Sánchez, C., Rondón Sánchez, K y Smith Batson, M. (2026). The Common European Framework of Reference in the Teaching-Learning Process of Integrated English Practice. *Maestro y Sociedad*, 23(1), 797-804. <https://maestrosociedad.uo.edu.cu>

ABSTRACT

Introduction: This research addressed the implementation of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) didactic perspective in the Integrated English Language Practice (IEP) course within the Foreign Languages program at the University of Las Tunas, Cuba. The study stems from the contradiction between the curriculum's theoretical alignment with the CEFR and persistently traditional classroom practices, which limit the development of students' comprehensive communicative competence. Materials and methods: A mixed-methods approach was employed. At the theoretical level, historical-logical analysis was used to examine the evolution of CEFR implementation in three periods (2001–2010, 2010–2016, and 2016–present). At the empirical level, a two-year formative pedagogical experiment was conducted with 30 students and 7 professors, supplemented by participant observation, questionnaires, critical thinking workshops, and document analysis. Results: The diagnostic assessment revealed that, although teachers reported being familiar with the CEFR, their practices focused on repetition exercises and summative assessment, without designing authentic tasks or using rubrics aligned with the action-oriented approach. Based on these findings, a four-stage theoretical-practical methodology was designed and implemented: critical adoption, contextualized adaptation, practical application, and reflective validation. Post-experiment results showed a significant improvement in students' language proficiency (most reached level B2) and a transformation in teachers' conceptions and practices toward the systematic use of authentic tasks and formative assessment. Discussion: The results confirm that the effective implementation of the CEFR requires a process of critical and contextualized pedagogical reinterpretation, moving beyond uncritical technical adoption. This approach engages with Cuban pedagogical traditions and addresses the limitations identified in previous studies on the mechanical application of the framework. Conclusions: The proposed methodology proves viable and effective in harmonizing international standards with national pedagogical sovereignty, transforming language teaching into a more coherent, reflective, and culturally relevant process. Further study of ideological and resource barriers is recommended to ensure its long-term sustainability.

Keywords: CEFR, overall language proficiency, teacher education, didactics

RESUMEN

Introducción: La investigación abordó la implementación de la perspectiva didáctica del Marco Común Europeo de Referencia para las Lenguas (MCER) en la disciplina Práctica Integral de la Lengua Inglesa (PILI) de la carrera Lenguas Extranjeras en la Universidad de Las Tunas, Cuba. El estudio parte de la contradicción entre la alineación teórica del

currículo con el MCER y las prácticas de aula persistentemente tradicionales, lo que limita el desarrollo de la competencia comunicativa integral de los estudiantes. Materiales y métodos: Se empleó un enfoque de métodos mixtos. A nivel teórico, se utilizó el análisis histórico-lógico para examinar la evolución de la implementación del MCER en tres períodos (2001-2010, 2010-2016, 2016-presente). A nivel empírico, se realizó un experimento pedagógico formativo durante dos años con 30 estudiantes y 7 profesores, complementado con observación participante, cuestionarios, talleres de opinión crítica y análisis documental. Resultados: El diagnóstico evidenció que, aunque los profesores declaraban conocer el MCER, sus prácticas se centraban en ejercicios de repetición y evaluación sumativa, sin diseñar tareas auténticas ni utilizar rúbricas alineadas con el enfoque orientado a la acción. A partir de estos hallazgos, se diseñó e implementó una metodología teórico-práctica de cuatro etapas: adopción crítica, adaptación contextualizada, aplicación práctica y validación reflexiva. Los resultados post-experimento mostraron una mejora significativa en el dominio del idioma de los estudiantes (la mayoría alcanzó el nivel B2) y una transformación en las concepciones y prácticas docentes hacia un uso sistemático de tareas auténticas y evaluación formativa. Discusión: Los resultados confirman que la implementación efectiva del MCER requiere un proceso de resignificación pedagógica crítica y contextualizada, superando la adopción técnica acrítica. Este enfoque dialoga con las tradiciones pedagógicas cubanas y aborda las limitaciones identificadas en estudios previos sobre la aplicación mecánica del marco. Conclusiones: La metodología propuesta demuestra ser viable y efectiva para armonizar estándares internacionales con la soberanía pedagógica nacional, transformando la enseñanza de lenguas en un proceso más coherente, reflexivo y culturalmente pertinente. Se recomienda profundizar en el estudio de las barreras ideológicas y de recursos para su sostenibilidad a largo plazo.

Palabras clave: MCER, dominio integral de la lengua, formación docente, didáctica.

RESUMO

Introdução: This research addressed the implementation of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) didactic perspective in the Integrated English Language Practice (IEP) course within the Foreign Languages program at the University of Las Tunas, Cuba. The study stems from the contradiction between the curriculum's theoretical alignment with the CEFR and persistently traditional classroom practices, which limit the development of students' comprehensive communicative competence. Materials and methods: A mixed-methods approach was employed. At the theoretical level, historical-logical analysis was used to examine the evolution of CEFR implementation in three periods (2001–2010, 2010–2016, and 2016–present). At the empirical level, a two-year formative pedagogical experiment was conducted with 30 students and 7 professors, supplemented by participant observation, questionnaires, critical thinking workshops, and document analysis. Results: The diagnostic assessment revealed that, although teachers reported being familiar with the CEFR, their practices focused on repetition exercises and summative assessment, without designing authentic tasks or using rubrics aligned with the action-oriented approach. Based on these findings, a four-stage theoretical-practical methodology was designed and implemented: critical adoption, contextualized adaptation, practical application, and reflective validation. Post-experiment results showed a significant improvement in students' language proficiency (most reached level B2) and a transformation in teachers' conceptions and practices toward the systematic use of authentic tasks and formative assessment. Discussion: The results confirm that the effective implementation of the CEFR requires a process of critical and contextualized pedagogical reinterpretation, moving beyond uncritical technical adoption. This approach engages with Cuban pedagogical traditions and addresses the limitations identified in previous studies on the mechanical application of the framework. Conclusions: The proposed methodology proves viable and effective in harmonizing international standards with national pedagogical sovereignty, transforming language teaching into a more coherent, reflective, and culturally relevant process. Further study of ideological and resource barriers is recommended to ensure its long-term sustainability.

Palavras-chave: QECR, domínio integral da língua, formação docente, didática.

Recibido: 15/1/2025 Aprobado: 5/2/2026

INTRODUCTION

The global educational landscape increasingly recognizes the strategic importance of English language proficiency not merely as a communication tool but as a cornerstone of pedagogical formation. Within Cuba's educational framework, this recognition is embedded in the constitutional guarantee of universal access to quality education and reinforced through the 2021-2026 Economic and Social Guidelines, which emphasize strengthening overall English language proficiency as essential for international cooperation, technological transfer, and cultural sovereignty preservation. This imperative finds concrete expression in higher education, particularly within the Foreign Languages degree program, which aims to develop professionals capable of teaching English with "correction, property, and fluency, evidencing a level of communicative competence equivalent to B2 professional pedagogical, as an essential minimum to achieve" (MES, 2016).

The discipline Integrated Practice of the English Language (from now on, PILI) serves as the capstone experience in this program, designed to operationalize the ideal professional model by integrating academic, labor, and research components. Its primary objective is the development of communicative competence in English, encompassing the expression, interpretation, and negotiation of meanings through interaction between individuals or between a person and written or oral texts. As Enríquez et al. (2016) emphasized, this discipline promotes “the development of its dimensions” and integrates the “academic, labor, and research components.” This emphasis on effective skills and orientation toward overall language proficiency relative to a continuum of capabilities reveals an implicit alignment with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), positioning PILI as the strategic space for implementing its principles, approaches, and methods.

The CEFR, developed by the Council of Europe and first published in 2001, represents more than merely a scale of language proficiency levels. It establishes a comprehensive system describing what language learners should be able to do to use a language for communicative purposes and what knowledge, skills, and values they must develop to act effectively. Its didactic perspective transcends the descriptive framework to embody the practical implementation of principles, theories, and methods guiding foreign language teaching-learning processes. However, classroom observations, document analyses, and teacher interviews reveal persistent contradictions between these ideals and actual practices. Students demonstrate insufficient effective use of English as both a communication medium and instructional tool, while professors struggle to direct the teaching-learning process according to CEFR standards.

These contradictions reflect a broader epistemological tension between the CEFR’s global, functionalist perspective and Cuba’s pedagogical tradition, which prioritizes language learning embedded within cultural, social, and political values. This tension potentially leads to uncritical adoption of CEFR’s pedagogical perspective divorced from deep reflection on their ideological implications and adaptation to national educational objectives. While international scholars like Piccardo (2017), Byram (2021), and North (2020) have advanced our understanding of plurilingualism, intercultural competence, and empirical validation of descriptors, contextual implementation remains challenging. Similarly, Cuban researchers including Enríquez (2018), Camacho (2021), and Acosta (2022) have emphasized the need to integrate CEFR alignment with sociocultural and critical pedagogical approaches, yet methodological operationalization specific to PILI remains underdeveloped.

In this context, the contributions of Orlando Alberteris (2018, 2019) provide crucial insights for understanding the challenges of CEFR implementation in Cuban teacher education. Alberteris has consistently argued that CEFR’s pedagogical perspective cannot be applied as a universal template but must be critically contextualized within national pedagogical traditions. As he states, “the CEFR must be resignified through the dialectical materialist perspective, which conceives education as transformation of consciousness through the appropriation of culture in its social and historical dimensions” (Alberteris & Rodríguez, 2019, p. 23). His research highlights the importance of addressing the “dialectical tension between the global nature of the framework and the specific historical-cultural conditions of Cuban education” (Alberteris, 2018, p. 45).

The discipline PILI has been extensively studied by Cuban researchers seeking to understand its role in teacher formation. Mijares and Gómez (2012) conducted one of the first comprehensive analyses of PILI, noting that its design “transcends the traditional separation of linguistic skills to create a space for the practical application of theoretical knowledge in authentic communication contexts” (p. 57). However, they also identified persistent challenges in implementation, particularly the “mechanical application of communicative tasks without a critical understanding of their pedagogical purpose” (p. 60). This critique resonates with Enríquez et al. (2016), who observed that “while PILI syllabus incorporates the metalanguage of the CEFR, it lacks systematic resignification of its principles in practice” (p. 12).

These studies collectively point to a central problem in CEFR implementation in PILI: the lack of methodological frameworks that can effectively bridge CEFR principles, approaches and methods with Cuban pedagogical traditions. As Alberteris (2019) argues, “simply adopting CEFR descriptors without transforming teaching practices leads to what we call ‘symbolic compliance’—superficial alignment that maintains traditional methodologies” (p. 18). This analysis aligns with recent international scholarship. Coste and Moore (2020) emphasize that framework implementation requires “not just technical adaptation but epistemological transformation,” while Little (2020) stresses the importance of “learner agency and teacher autonomy in contextualizing framework principles” (p. 352).

The research problem can be formulated as follows: Insufficient implementation of CEFR's pedagogical perspective in PILI limits overall English language proficiency. This investigation aims to design a theoretical-practical methodology that strengthens conceptual-methodological command of CEFR's pedagogical perspective to foster overall English language proficiency. The central thesis defends that a holistic, multidimensional, and interconnected approach (viable, pertinent, and contextualized) provides methodological coherence to the complex relationships occurring in the teaching-learning process among the three poles of the didactic triangle, reinterpreting them to contribute to overall English language proficiency.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This research employed a mixed-methods approach consistent with dialectical materialism's emphasis on the unity of theory and practice. The methodological design integrated theoretical and empirical levels, creating a comprehensive framework for investigating CEFR implementation in PILI.

At the theoretical level, historical-logical analysis examined the evolution of overall English language proficiency in the teaching-learning process of PILI. This approach revealed contextual patterns and contradictions across three historical periods: initial reception and limited diffusion (2001-2010), normative incorporation and decontextualization (2010-2016), and critical appropriation and pedagogical resignification (2016-present). The analysis drew on primary sources including Plans C, D, and E of the Foreign Languages major, PILI syllabuses, ministerial resolutions, department meeting minutes, and semi-structured interviews with veteran professors. Bibliographic analysis established the theoretical foundations of CEFR's pedagogical perspective implementation, drawing on international scholars including North (2020), Piccardo (2019), Byram (2021), and Little (2020), alongside Cuban researchers such as Enríquez (2018), Mijares (2012), Camacho (2021), and notably Alberteris (2018, 2019), whose work on didactic contextualization provided essential theoretical grounding.

At the empirical level, a formative pedagogical experiment was designed to test the methodology's effectiveness over two academic years (2023-2025). The experiment involved thirty Foreign Languages students and seven PILI professors at the University of Las Tunas. This intentional sampling aligned with the action-research character of the study, with the primary researcher serving as discipline coordinator and professor.

Participatory observation documented methodology validation in authentic classroom settings. Two structured observations were conducted for each professor, using a validated guide focused on the presence of authentic tasks, use of authentic materials, formative feedback, and error treatment. Questionnaires gathered information about persistent challenges in CEFR implementation. A validated Likert-scale questionnaire was administered to professors exploring knowledge, attitudes, and self-perception regarding CEFR implementation. Critical opinion workshops and collective construction sessions enriched theory and refined pedagogical practice. These workshops involved collaborative analysis of CEFR Companion Volume (2020), comparison with PILI syllabus foundations, and co-design of curricular materials. Data triangulation across multiple sources and moments ensured reliability and scientific rigor in contrasting criteria, arguments, and process characterizations.

The theoretical contribution manifests in a holistic, multidimensional, and interconnected approach that provides methodological coherence to complex relationships in the teaching-learning process. The practical contribution materializes in a theoretical-practical methodology that redefines and transforms student and professor roles, competencies, and characteristics to achieve effective implementation of CEFR's pedagogical perspective in the teaching-learning process of PILI. The innovation lies in reinterpreting it through articulating a holistic perspective of overall English language proficiency with theoretical-methodological mastery of the CEFR's pedagogical perspective.

RESULTS

The research revealed significant gaps between formal CEFR alignment and actual classroom practices. During the historical-logical analysis, three distinct periods emerged in CEFR implementation in PILI. The initial period (2001-2010) was characterized by the framework's practical invisibility in curricular designs and teaching practices, despite Plan C's (1992-2010) promotion of communicative competence. During this time, English teaching remained anchored in traditional approaches with limited methodological innovation. Mijares and

Gómez (2012) observed that “classes were predominantly focused on grammatical structures and functional vocabulary, with scarce attention to language action or interculturality. Communicative tasks, when used, were exercises of linguistic pattern reproduction, not simulations of authentic professional contexts” (p. 55).

The second period (2010-2016) marked a turning point with Plan D’s implementation, introducing explicit references to CEFR’s metalanguage. This period witnessed initial innovations including digital portfolios and formative evaluation using rubrics based on CEFR descriptors. However, significant dissatisfaction remained regarding content essentiality, repetition across disciplines, and weak connections between general formation and specialty areas. As Alberteris (2018) noted in his analysis of this period, “professors recognized the utility of the CEFR but lacked solid formation in its didactic perspective. The tasks remained centered on linguistic correction, and interculturality was limited to knowledge of Anglo-Saxon customs” (p. 47).

The third period (2016-present) represents a historical opportunity for pedagogical resignification of the CEFR in Cuba. Plan E (2016) explicitly introduces critical interculturality and autonomy as graduate profile axes, creating space for dialogue between the European framework and Cuban pedagogy. Despite these advances, PILI syllabus for Plan E does not explicitly mention the CEFR, and while incorporating its metalanguage as a reference, still lacks systematic resignification of its principles. This observation aligns with Enríquez et al. (2016), who noted that “although the program incorporates CEFR’s metalanguage, there is insufficient guidance on how to translate its principles into concrete teaching practices” (p. 14).

Diagnostic assessment confirmed these historical trends. Although most professors declared agreement with CEFR utility, classroom observations revealed only a small minority designed authentic tasks aligned with the action-oriented approach. Predominant activities remained controlled practice exercises (grammatical drills, repetition) with summative evaluation based on written tests. Furthermore, an overwhelming majority of analyzed rubrics followed the traditional “four skills” model without distinguishing between interaction and expression, comprehension, and mediation—contradicting CEFR’s descriptive scheme (Council of Europe, 2020).

The theoretical-practical methodology developed through this research addresses these gaps through four interdependent stages. The first stage, critical adoption and participatory diagnosis, establishes shared understanding through collaborative analysis of the CEFR Complementary Volume (2020) and comparison with PILI syllabus guidelines. Alberteris (2019) emphasizes the importance of this stage: “Critical adoption is not about rejecting international standards but about dialoguing with them from our pedagogical tradition, questioning which elements serve our educational purposes and which require transformation” (p. 21).

The second stage, contextualized adaptation and curricular redesign, translates CEFR principles, approaches and methods into operational designs through authentic task sequences aligned with B1-B2 levels and differentiated rubrics. This adaptation process drew significantly on Alberteris’s (2018) framework for “contextualizing global standards within national pedagogical traditions,” particularly his emphasis on “maintaining the epistemological coherence between international frameworks and Cuban educational principles” (p. 49). The redesign specifically addressed the critique by Mijares and Gómez (2012) regarding the “mechanical application of communicative tasks without pedagogical purpose” (p. 60) by developing tasks with authentic communicative purposes connected to future teaching contexts.

The third stage, practical implementation and in-service training, combines new curricular designs with pedagogical workshops focused on CEFR interpretation, authentic materials design, and formative assessment. The fourth stage, reflective evaluation and impact validation, analyzes implementation results through pre-post comparison using identical instruments, triangulating quantitative and qualitative data, and collectively discussing findings to adjust components for continuous improvement.

Formative experiment results demonstrated the methodology’s effectiveness. Student performance showed significant improvement across all overall English language proficiency dimensions, with most reaching B2 level competencies according to CEFR descriptors. Professor capacity increased substantially, with nearly all implementing authentic tasks and CEFR-aligned rubrics after participating in the methodology’s implementation cycle. Most significantly, teacher conceptions shifted from instrumental views of the CEFR toward methodological perspectives that were contextualized, multidimensional, and transformative. This shift resonates with Alberteris’s (2019) argument that “effective CEFR implementation requires transforming professors from technical implementers to critical pedagogues who can resignify framework principles within

their specific contexts” (p. 24).

DISCUSSION

The findings reveal that effective CEFR implementation in PILI requires transcending technical adoption toward critical pedagogical resignification. This perspective aligns with Little’s (2020) emphasis on learner agency and Piccardo’s (2019) advocacy for plurilingual approaches, while integrating Cuba’s educational principles as articulated by Enríquez (2018) and Addine (2004). The research confirms that overall English language proficiency cannot be reduced to grammatical correctness but must manifest through the capacity to act with language in authentic contexts with communicative purposes and sociocultural awareness.

The methodology’s success demonstrates that the tension between global standards and national pedagogical sovereignty can be resolved through critical appropriation rather than uncritical adoption or rejection. This approach echoes Byram’s (2021) model of intercultural citizenship education, adapted to Cuba’s specific context. The findings challenge Richards and Rodgers’ (2014) assumption that methodology implementation requires stable resource environments, showing instead that contextualized approaches can succeed despite material limitations through creative adaptation and collective teacher development.

Particularly significant is the transformation in evaluation practices. Moving beyond summative testing toward formative assessment using CEFR-aligned rubrics created a virtuous cycle where evaluation became a learning tool rather than merely a measurement instrument. This shift resonates with Oxford’s (2017) emphasis on assessment as integral to language teaching methodology and Harmer’s (2019) advocacy for student-centered evaluation approaches.

The research also addresses a critical gap identified by Coste and Moore (2020): the insufficient attention to teacher formation in CEFR implementation. By positioning professors as co-investigators and curriculum designers rather than mere implementers, the methodology fostered ownership and sustainability. This approach aligns with Vygotskian principles of social mediation in learning, as articulated in Cuban pedagogy through Zilberstein’s (2005) developmental teaching approach.

The contributions of Orlando Alberteris prove particularly valuable in understanding the transformative potential of this methodology. Alberteris (2018) has argued that “CEFR’s pedagogical perspective must confront Cuban educational reality, not as an external imposition but as a tool for didactic reconstruction” (p. 52). Our findings demonstrate how this confrontation can be productive when structured through critical dialogue and collective reflection. The methodology’s emphasis on collaborative curriculum redesign directly responds to Alberteris’s critique of “symbolic compliance” in CEFR implementation.

Furthermore, the research engages critically with previous studies on PILI implementation. While Mijares and Gómez (2012) identified the mechanical application of communicative tasks as a persistent problem, our methodology provides concrete strategies for transforming this reality through authentic task design and formative assessment. Similarly, Enríquez et al. (2016) noted the gap between CEFR references in PILI syllabus and their practical implementation; our research demonstrates how this gap can be bridged through systematic teacher development and contextualized adaptation.

However, challenges persist. Digital resource limitations affected material authenticity despite creative offline solutions. Some professors demonstrated resistance to abandoning traditional grammar-focused approaches, revealing deeper epistemological tensions between structural and functional language teaching paradigms. These findings suggest that CEFR implementation requires not only methodological tools but also sustained ideological work addressing teachers’ conceptions of language, learning, and their own professional identities.

The research contributes to international discussions on framework implementation by demonstrating that effective contextualization requires neither rejecting global standards nor surrendering educational sovereignty. Instead, it demands dialectical engagement where universal principles are resignified through local pedagogical traditions. This perspective offers a model for other contexts facing similar tensions between international frameworks and national educational identities.

CONCLUSIONES

This research confirms that implementing CEFR’s pedagogical perspective in PILI requires a holistic,

multidimensional approach that transcends technical alignment toward critical pedagogical resignification. The developed theoretical-practical methodology effectively bridges international standards with Cuba's educational principles, transforming both students' overall English language proficiency and professors' methodological skills.

The historical analysis reveals an evolution from CEFR invisibility to normative incorporation and finally toward critical appropriation, though systematic implementation remains incomplete. Diagnostic assessment confirmed significant gaps between theoretical alignment and classroom practices, particularly in evaluation methodologies and conceptualizations of overall English language proficiency.

The four-stage methodology—critical adoption, contextualized adaptation, practical implementation, and reflective validation—proved effective in addressing these gaps. Results demonstrate improved overall English language proficiency among most students achieving B2 level competencies, alongside transformed professor practices with nearly all implementing authentic tasks and CEFR-aligned rubrics. Most significantly, teacher conceptions evolved from instrumental to methodological perspectives that are contextualized, multidimensional, and transformative.

The research contributes theoretically through its holistic approach providing methodological coherence to complex didactic relationships, and practically through its transformative methodology redefining roles, competencies, and characteristics of students and professors. Its innovation lies in articulating overall English language proficiency with theoretical-methodological command of CEFR's pedagogical perspective, addressing the critiques articulated by scholars like Alberteris (2018, 2019) and Mijares and Gómez (2012).

Limitations include resource constraints affecting material authenticity and persistent resistance among some professors to abandoning traditional approaches. Future research should explore sustainability mechanisms, digital resource development within connectivity limitations, and deeper investigation of ideological barriers to methodology implementation.

This research affirms that effective CEFR implementation in the Cuban context requires neither rejecting international standards nor surrendering educational sovereignty but rather dialectical engagement where universal principles are resignified through local pedagogical traditions. The methodology offers a model for contextualizing global frameworks while maintaining pedagogical integrity and cultural relevance, contributing to international discussions on language education reform.

REFERENCIAS BIBLIOGRÁFICAS

Acosta, R. (2022). La didáctica interactiva de lenguas en la formación de profesores de inglés. En 13er Congreso Internacional IDEICE. <https://doi.org/10.47554/cii.vol13.2022.pp180-185>

Addine, F. (2004). *Didáctica y currículo*. Editorial Pueblo y Educación.

Alberteris, O. (2018). El enfoque metodológico en la enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras: Fundamentos para la resignificación didáctica del MCER. *Revista Cubana de Lingüística Aplicada*, 15(2), 45-58.

Alberteris, O. (2019). Resignificación didáctica del Marco Común Europeo de Referencia para las Lenguas en el contexto educativo cubano. *Transformación*, 15(2), 18-29. <https://doi.org/10.29097/2019.453>

Alberteris, O., & Rodríguez, M. (2019). Desafíos didácticos de la enseñanza-aprendizaje de las lenguas extranjeras en el contexto universitario cubano actual. *Didáctica y Educación*, 9(6), 303-329.

Byram, M. (2021). Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence: Revisited. *Multilingual Matters*.

Camacho Delgado, A. (2021). La práctica laboral e investigativa en la Licenciatura en Educación en Lenguas Extranjeras en Villa Clara, Cuba: Logros y perspectivas de mejoramiento. *Transformación*, 17(2), 246-260.

Council of Europe. (2018). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment – Companion volume*. Council of Europe Publishing.

Council of Europe. (2020). *Marco Común Europeo de Referencia para las Lenguas: Aprendizaje, enseñanza, evaluación – Volumen complementario*. Council of Europe Publishing.

Coste, D., & Moore, D. (2020). The action-oriented approach. En S. Gieve & I. K. Neves (Eds.), *The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages across educational systems* (pp. 65-82). Equinox.

Enríquez, I. J. (2018). El papel del MCER en la formación de competencias interculturales en Cuba. *Revista*

Educación y Sociedad, 40(1), 12-28.

Enríquez, I., Mijares, L., Gómez, A. M., & otros. (2016). *Disciplina Práctica Integral de la Lengua Inglesa*. Ministerio de Educación Superior.

Harmer, J. (2019). *The practice of English language teaching* (6th ed.). Pearson.

Little, D. (2020). The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: A research agenda. *Language Teaching*, 53(3), 345-359. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000222>

Mijares, L., & Gómez, A. M. (2012). La clase de práctica integral de la lengua inglesa en la formación inicial para un nivel de desarrollo preintermedio. *Mendive. Revista de Educación*, 11(1), 53-60.

Ministerio de Educación Superior [MES]. (2016). Plan de Estudio "E" carrera Licenciatura en Educación. *Lenguas Extranjeras*. <https://www.mes.gob.cu/documentos>

North, B. (2020). Scaling descriptors of language proficiency: A procedure for achieving transparency and coherence. *Language Testing*, 37(1), 27-47. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532219861442>

Oxford, R. L. (2017). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies: Self-regulation in context* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Piccardo, E. (2019). Explorando la interconexión entre lenguas: Un enfoque plurilingüe basado en el MCER. *Revista de Investigación Educativa*, 13(1), 101-118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rie.2019.04.003>

Piccardo, E., & North, B. (2019). The action-oriented approach: A dynamic vision of language education. *Multilingual Matters*.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Zilberstein, T. (2005). *Hacia una didáctica desarrolladora*. Editorial Pueblo y Educación.

Los autores declaran no tener ningún conflicto de intereses.

Declaración de responsabilidad de autoría

Carlos Pineda Sánchez, Keyi Rondón Sánchez, Elvia Amalia Rondón Palmero y María de la Caridad Smith Batson: metodología, investigación, redacción de artículo