PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology

AN EVALUATION OF VOCABULARY OF ENGLISH TEXTBOOKS OF PAKISTAN AND SAUDI ARABIA THROUGH CEFR

Muhammad Taimoor A.A Gurmani[1] , Zailin Shah Yusoff[2] , Choudhry Shahid[3]

gw180068@siswa.uthm.edu.my[1] , zailin@uitm.edu.my[2] ,
chshahid.mahmood@superior.edu.pk[3]

Abstract.

The study's objective was to evaluate the vocabulary of the English textbooks of Pakistan and Saudi Arabia at the Intermediate level (11th and 12th year) of education. Corpus linguistics is the primary domain of the present study. The corpus of the books was analysed through the Range software (2005). The corpus of CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages) was deducted with Frequency software. The vocabulary of the textbooks was evaluated in terms of Corporal size, Word types, and CEFR vocabulary standards. The availability and unavailability of the word types and the CEFR vocabulary were examined. The data were compared in terms of vocabulary size, types, and CEFR corpus. The analysis showed a deficiency in the vocabulary introduced by both books of English in Saudi Arabia and Pakistan. The word types and the vocabulary of the CEFR corpus were deficient than the standard they are needed. Comparatively, the textbooks of English of Pakistan were found to havea greater corporal size, word types, and CEFR corpus vocabulary than that available in the textbooks of Saudi Arabia.

Introduction

English is not only a compulsory subject in the curriculum but also a vital determination for the university entrance exam and a good factor for well-paid jobs (Adamson, 2004). English language textbooks are also the most important source of English input to learners (Hu, 2002). Curriculum documents are the essential guide for selecting vocabulary, grammar, and other learning materials to include in textbooks (Yu &Renandya, 2021).

After the publication of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) in 2001, several studies have been conducted to explore the application and impact of CEFR in various contexts. It also offers a common basis for planning language prospectuses, instructional curriculum guides, exams, and textbooks (Council of Europe, 2001). CEFR has taken on an influential role in language teaching around Europe as well as around the globe. By surveying and instructional interviews in Sweden, Oscarson and Oscarson (2010) noticed that using CEFR in teaching could enhance the understanding of both languages and their learning motivation and could help make the evaluations more transparent. CEFR has been commonly used and understood and implemented in European countries. Little attention has been on CEFR outside Europe (Buckland, 2010). There is less debate about how CEFR is used in other countries, especially Asian-language environments. CEFR developers have drawn attention to the fact that framework users may want to consider the vocabulary size the learner will need in trying to achieve a certain degree of performance (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 150). Each project of the CEFR is within the English vocabulary Profile program, offered by Cambridge Learner Corpus (Little, 2007). The relationship between vocabulary size and the CEFR levels is sufficiently strong, notwithstanding some individual variation, for figures for vocabulary size to be attached to the CEFR level (Milton, 2010). The CEFR has profoundly influenced the design of teaching materials, curriculum planning, and language proficiency testing in several European countries (Hulstijn, 2007).

Given the worldwide interest, the issue of whether and how the CEFR can be employed to language curriculum and assessment becomes of paramount importance. Researchers and educators in foreign or second language education pointed several advantages of CEFR when it was employed in EFL (English as a Foreign Language) or ESL countries (e.g., Jeon and Kim 2018, Lee and Kim 2009). CEFR has been recognized as a language curriculum and standard-setting tool with high validity, which guided EFL countries to implement CEFR (Lee, 2020) widely. The English curriculum was revised in Korea, employing CEFR in the Korean context (Lee & Kim 2009). Among CEFR research, Jeon and Kim (2020) presented the rationale for employing CEFR based on the research results by analyzing curriculum content such as communication activities and strategies in the 2015-revised national curriculum and CEFR. However, the previous studies were limited to a specific theme in curriculum areas such as communication activities, strategies, vocabulary, achievement standards, or descriptors.

Literature Review

A textbook is a reference chart and key guide used by a certain subject to be learned. The basic part of the instructional method is a textbook that serves as a standard model for classroom instruction (Nunan, 1989). EFL textbook analysis has been an important

partEnglish's teaching and learning phase as a foreign language (Richards, 2014). Harwood (2010) highlights two main important features of the EFL textbook analysis: the validity of the vocabulary and its description used in the textbooks. In the background of Pakistan, English language learning and teaching is very significant. English has a strong influence on Pakistan's literature and economy (Channa, 2014 & 2015; Azim, et al., 2020). Lodhi and Akash (2019) attempted to measure the language proficiency of 12th-grade students and correlated the results for these intermediate-level language users with the learning standards established by the CEFR. The study of Lodhi and Akash (2019) aimed to define and investigate the language learning differences of (Grade 12) students set out by the CEFR what students are being learned in classrooms. The results provide clear suggestions in Pakistani English classrooms to revise the pedagogical plans.

The term "breadth of vocabulary" is normally used to refer to the number of words known by the learners. It refers to 'the number of words for which the person knows at least some of the significant aspects of meaning' (Anderson & Freebody, 1981, p. 93). The breadth of vocabulary is frequently investigated with "coverage,"which means the percentage of vocabulary the learners know in a text. In the present study, breadth and coverage refer to the number of English words required by the 2017 English Curriculum Standard, which are covered in the English language textbooks. According to Webster's Third New International Dictionary, English contains approximately 114,000-word families, excluding proper names (Nation, 2001). Educated monolingual native speakers know approximately 20,000-word families (Nation, 2001; Schmitt, 2010). However, acquiring 20,000-word families are a very ambitious goal for second or foreign language learners. Researchers have found that words are not created equal.Some are more frequently used, and therefore more useful. These words appear much more frequently and account for a large proportion of daily language use. These words should be given a higher priority in L2 classroom learning since knowing them enables the learners to know a large part of the text and, therefore, promotes comprehension in reading and communication. A classic list of such words is the General Service List of English Words, which contains 2,000-word families and accounts for 80% of words found in most written texts (West, 1953). Another list generated from academic texts is the Academic Word List (Coxhead, 1998), which contains 570 headwords and accounts for 10% of written academic texts in arts, commerce, law, and science. These 570 headwords are outside of A General Service List of English Words. These two sets of wordlists are often used to guide the choice of vocabulary words in Basic English curricula. Liu and Zhang (2015) and Zhou (2012) found that the textbooks they studied covered, on average, only about 75% of the lemmas required by the College English Curriculum Requirements.

At the secondary education level, similar problems were found. Insufficient coverage of words required by curriculum documents has been a common phenomenon in English language textbooks. However, there is a lack of research on the words required by the 2017 English Curriculum Standard, the latest version of the English language curriculum, which may be in effect and guidance of English teaching and learning in general senior secondary education in the coming 10 years. To find out how the words required by English Curriculum Standard are presented in English language textbooks is important to teachers, learners, and other relevant people.

Kusseling (2012) states that the CEFR profiles have been commonly used to teach and test language instruction for the past decade. The profiles were vocabulary requirements,

which from a corpus-based, analytical viewpoint, were essentially untested. The purpose of his study was to evaluate the CEFR profiles by comparing their content with two sizable contemporary corpora. Nordlund(2016) suggests that English textbook writers should benefit from the corpus data in word frequencies and introduce the high-frequency words with controlled Frequency and dispersion. This can help the learners learn a meaningful and purposeful language. This aspect of high-frequency words and word frequencies within the textbook and across different textbooks (introduction, practice, and recycling) was also not explored in English textbooks previously. This research focused on this aspect to fill this existing research gap also.

Saudi EFL Textbooks and Culture

A textbook (or coursebook) is a reference chart used by a certain subject to be learned. The basic part of the instructional method is a textbook that serves as a standard model for classroom instruction (Nunan, 1988). The coursebook was often regarded by Richards (2014) as the key guide utilised by multiple language teachers worldwide, with textbook reviews presenting teachers with the ability to judge acceptable and unacceptable content. In order to meet their instructional and linguistic aims, English as a foreign language (EFL) textbooks guide L2/FL teachers through different stages of pedagogy. As far as the tasks in textbooks are concerned, Granger (1998) notes that authentic native English should be focused on textbooks. A textbook that contains a teacher's guide and a student's workbook saves time for both students and teachers since both materials include different suggestions for incorporating the text into lessons and the forms of extra assignments or research that may be done, as well as a sample of tests and quizzes (Nordlund, 2016).

EFL textbook analysis has been an important part of English's teaching and learning phase as a foreign language. Effective textbooks include distinct features such as capturing learners' attention, summarising information, preparing for study, introducing new content, giving easy and suitable learning approaches, providing learning activities, and assisting learners in tracking their progress (Richards, 2014).In addition, Harwood (2010) highlights two main problems about EFL textbook analysis: the validity of the vocabulary used and its description.

Al-Seghayer (2014) discusses difficulties teaching and studying English in Saudi Arabia due to under-prepared learners and insufficient curriculum constraints. Similar characteristics have been found in Tuan and Mai (2015), which have shown that lack of relevant knowledge, the usage of L1 native language affects learners' language skills. This is aligned with Gani et al.(2015), which showed that successful students placed the most focus on four language skills to improve their communication skills.

Pakistani ESL Textbooks

In the background of Pakistan, English language learning and teaching is very significant. English has a strong influence on Pakistan's literature and economy (Channa, 2014 & 2015; Manan,Dumanig& David, 2017; Azim et al., 2020). English language education plays a vital position in culture. Even though the government of Punjab has begun English language instruction from grade one, several students did not excel in learning English skills before high school. There is still insufficient study into the causes of this deficit in Pakistan. Researchers until now attributed this loss of English language proficiency to the lack of

motivation (Shahbaz& Liu, 2011), language policies (Mansoor, 2005)English language
teaching activities.

Lodhi and Akash (2019) attempted to measure the language proficiency of 12th-grade
students and correlated the results for these intermediate-level language users with the
learning standards established by the CEFR. They quantitatively obtained and evaluated data
from college students in Pakistan. As data collecting methods, a language proficiency exam,
checklist, and questionnaire were administered. The study's results represented immense
learning differences between language learners' acquired and expected proficiency levels.
They concluded that most of the students were graded at the initial stage of basic users in all
seven language-learning capacities, i.e., reading, writing, listening, chatting, vocabulary,
grammar, and sociolinguistic appropriateness. Relevant and effective instructional initiatives
are highly recommended to be introduced to increase the degree of language competence to
the necessary standards. Language learning differences affect the capacity of students to
comprehend textbooks, interact, and communicate successfully. In the sense of our study in
Pakistan, they proposed that these language differences move ahead with many students
when they reach high school and feel frustrated by the challenges of growing academic
standards and increasingly challenging vocabulary. These language gaps can have
devastating effects on students (Hirsch, 2007).

Heinemann et al., (2018) suggest that expectations cannot be fulfilled for children who
come to school speaking an unfamiliar language or without the school's instructional
language curriculum. They sometimes sound lost in the school. Research indicates that a lack
of language in academia can lead to language deficiencies and associated literacy deficits
and, eventually, overall school performance differences by exploring the fundamental causes
of students' school difficulties. Perhaps the most important factor in individual academic
achievement is state academic language expertise (Flores, 2020). The future success of
students thus depends on their academic mastery.

Statement of the problem

Textbooks are the only source of input in the public sector schools in Pakistan; they need to
be produced according to the lexical standards. These textbooks are planned, developed, and
distributed by the Punjab Curriculum and Textbook Board under the supervision of (PCTB).
Textbooks are the only Language resource for students enrolled in schools in the public
sector. Therefore, in the students' teaching and learning process, they play a critical and
distinguishing function. A significant purpose of teaching English in school is to help
learners develop sufficient vocabulary that can be useful and efficient for good
communication. However, the issue is how much guidance and aid English learners get from
a textbook to create a set of vocabulary (Nordlund, 2016).

The research in the field of in-depth analysis of textbooks from the lexical viewpoint is
very limited, even in international circles. It is extremely limited in the context of Pakistan
and almost nil in the context of Punjab. This research is supposed to fill this big gap. The
researchers declare vocabulary development as a synonym of language acquisition (Moody et
al., 2018). Unfortunately, the study of English textbooks in vocabulary analysis is scarce
internationally and almost non-existent in Pakistan. No comprehensive study of the
vocabulary component has been conducted in the Pakistani context in textbooks analysed

with the CEFR corpus.Therefore the objective of this study is to explore the subject of vocabulary in textbooks in detail in light of the considerations indicated above.The researchers decided to do a lexical corpus analysis of the English language textbooks to see if the researchers' claims were true for the PCTB textbooks, keeping in mind the development in vocabulary teaching and learning. Did the authors of the English textbooks of the PCTB follow some sound theoretical basis while dealing with the textbook vocabulary component? In PCTB's English textbooks, this aspect of high-frequency terms and word frequencies inside and through numerous textbooks was also not previously discussed. Neither of these textbooks was compared with other international English textbooks for the same grades.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study were:

a) To computeand compare the size of the corpus of vocabulary items introduced in English textbooks in Punjab, Pakistan, and National textbooks of Saudi Arabia at an intermediate level.
b) To compute and comparethe token of the word types introduced in English textbooks of Pakistan and Saudi Arabia at the intermediate level for the availability of CEFR corpus vocabulary.
c) To identify the vocabulary level introduced in English textbooks in Pakistan and Saudi Arabia in terms of CEFR Corpus vocabulary.

Research Questions

1. What is the size of the corpus of intermediate English textbooks of Pakistan and Saudi Arabia?
2. How many word types areavailable comparatively in the English Textbooks of Pakistan and Saudi Arabia at the intermediate level?
3. How much do the English textbooks of Pakistan and Saudi Arabia of intermediate level meet with the word types of CEFR corpus?

Research Method

This is evaluative research in its nature. The vocabulary of the English language in the textbooks (11th and 12th year of education) of Pakistan and Saudi Arabia is evaluated. The books were converted into .txt format for the preparation of the corpus analysis. To answer the research questions, lexical information was calculated from the textbooks. The corpus of CEFR wordlists A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, and C2 was prepared through the Frequency Software of Paul Nation (Range, 2005). The CEFR corpus was used as a base wordlist to know the range of the vocabulary items of textbooks.Computer softwarewas used to know the lexical density and tokens of the English textbooks ((Thawarom&Singhasiri, 2020).

The program of Range, (2005), prescribed by Victoria university New Zealand (Paul Nation) was used to analyse the corpus of the textbooks. The same tool also provided the Frequency of words and tokens available in the books. Finally, the results of the analysis were tabulated and compared with one another. Analysis of research was based on the matching comparisons of the base wordlist of the CEFR. The base wordlist (BASEWRD.txt) of the CEFR corpus was developed to analyze the English textbooks. This base wordlist

(BASEWRD.txt) was used in Range software for analysis. The analysis and Range output files of data can be accessed on the following

link:https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1iY4iVaUAAzESOzzhbp5pChuqj1Jlh262?usp =sharing

Both the books were compared with the base wordlist of the CEFR. Both the books were also compared with one another. The results revealed total tokens, available tokens, unavailable tokens, and available and unavailable vocabulary of the basewordlist of CEFR.This evaluation had provided the actual worth of the vocabulary available in the textbooks.This study indicates the level ofvocabulary in the textbooks in comparison to international standards of English language vocabulary.

Results And Discussion

The procedure of this search was used to analyse English textbooks at the Intermediate level in Punjab, Pakistan, and Saudi Arabia. The following results were obtained:

Table 1: Corpus Analysis of Punjab Textbook board Pakistan for Vocabulary

	$\sum$		Available	Unavailable
Tokens	83486	#	69261	14225
		%	83%	17%
Types	8884	#	3483	5401
		%	39.2%	60.8%
CEFR	6234	#	3483	2751
		%	55.87	44.13

Table 1 represents the data about the textbooks of English in Punjab, Pakistan. The corpus shows that English books consist of 83,486 tokens of words. Out of these total tokens, the available tokens in the CEFR corpus are 83%, which is a good number, while 17% of vocabulary items are not available.Atotal of 8884 families of words were found;39.2% were from the corpus of CEFR, while 60.8% did not match the CEFR corpus. The data show that the Punjab textbook board has 55.87% of the CEFR corpus tokens, while 44.13% of the CEFR corpus tokens are missing in the textbooks.

Table 2: Corpus Analysis of Mega 3 and Maga 4 Textbook Saudi Arabia for Vocabulary

	$\sum$		Available	Unavailable
Tokens	68393	#	55127	13266
		%	80.6%	19.4%
Types	6778	#	3065	3713
		%	45.2%	54.8%
CEFR	6234	#	3065	3,169
		%	49.16	50.84

Table 2 represents the data about the textbooks of English in Saudi Arabia. The corpus shows that English books consist of 68393 tokens of words. Out of these total tokens, the available tokens in the CEFR corpus are 80.6%, while 19.4% of vocabulary items are not available. Atotal of 67778 families of words were found;45.2% of the families were from the corpus of CEFR, while 54.8% did not match the CEFR corpus. The data show that the Omega3 and Omega4 books have49.16% of the CEFR corpus tokens in them while 50.84% of the CEFR corpus tokens are missing in the textbooks.

Table 3: Corpus-based Comparison Between Pakistani and Saudi Arabian for total Vocabulary Items.

	$\sum$	
	SA	Pak
Tokens	68393	83486
Types	6778	8884

Table 3 represents the data about both the textbooks of English in Punjab, Pakistan, and Saudi Arabia. The corpus shows that Pakistani English Textbooks have a greater number of total tokens in comparison to that of Saudi Arabian Textbooks. The same tendency is apparent regarding Families of the word types; Pakistani textbooks have more word types than the types available in the Saudi Arabian Textbooks.

Table 4: Corpus based Comparison Between Pakistani and Saudi Arabian Books for Available Vocabulary Items

		Available	
		SA	PAK
Tokens	#	55127	69261
	%	80.6%	83%
Types	#	3065	3483
	%	45.2%	39.2%
CEFR	#	3065	3483
	%	49.16	55.87

Table 4 represents the vocabulary items in conformity with the CEFR corpus and their comparison between English books of Pakistan and Saudi Arabia. The available tokens in both books are almost equal and more than 80%. A great number of families and word types are available in Saudi Arabian textbooks than that of Pakistani books. However, the availability of the tokens of the CEFR corpus represents a contradictory picture. The availability of CEFR tokens is a bit greater available in Pakistani books than that of Saudi Arabian Books.

Table 5: Corpus-based Comparison between Pakistani and Saudi Arabian Books for Unavailable Vocabulary Items.

	Unavailable	
SA		PAK

Tokens	13266	14225
	19.4%	17%
Types	3713	5401
	54.8%	60.8%
CEFR	3,169	2751
	50.84	44.13

Table 5 represents the vocabulary items that are not in conformity with the CEFR corpus. The data show that 19.4% of tokens were those, which were not in the CEFR corpus in Saudi Arabian Textbooks, while 17% of tokens were not in the CEFR corpus in Pakistani English books that did not match the CEFR corpus. The word family types other than CEFR tokens, were 54.8% in the Saudi Arabian books, while the family types other than CEFR in the Pakistani English textbooks were 60.8%. The data show that 50.8% of CEFR corpus in Saudi Arabian books and 44.13% of CEFR corpus in Pakistani books wereunavailable.

Table 6: Corpus-based Cumulative Comparison Between Pakistani and Saudi Arabian Books for Vocabulary

	∑			Available		Unavailable	
	SA	Pak		SA	PAK	SA	PAK
Tokens	68393	83486*	#	55127	69261*	13266	14225*
			%	80.6%	83%	19.4%	17%
Types	6778	8884*	#	3065	3483*	3713	5401*
			%	45.2%	39.2%	54.8%	60.8%
CEFR			#	3065	3483*	3,169*	2751
			%	49.16	55.87	50.84	44.13

The asterisk sign * shows a comparative higher quantity.

Table 6 represents the cumulative data and comparison between the vocabulary of English textbooks of Pakistan and Saudi Arabia. Vocabulary data show that cumulatively Pakistani corpus of English textbooks is greater in terms of tokens and family word types than that of Saudi Arabia.

The second dynamics of availability of the vocabulary items reveal that the available vocabulary items and word families regarding CEFR corpus the Pakistani vocabulary items and word families do match greater than that of Saudi Arabia. The data also reveal that the CEFR corpus has matched greater in Pakistani books than the matches available in the English textbooks of Saudi Arabia.

The third dynamics of the comparison reveal the unavailability of the vocabulary items within the CEFR corpus. There were more vocabulary items as tokens and word types other than CEFR corpus in Pakistani English Textbooks than in Saudi Arabia. CEFR corpus shows that almost half of its tokens were missing in both Pakistani and Saudi Arabian English textbooks.

The above-stated data show that both the English textbooks have a considerable size of vocabulary in them. However, the tokens of words represent a smaller range of word familytypes, ranging from three thousand to almost three thousand and five hundred. The

families available are not enough to have a good level of understanding of the target language. If we analyse the tokens concerning the CEFR corpus, we find the more darkside of the availability of the vocabulary in both textbooks. The data reveal that the CEFR Corpus has almost six thousand three hundred and thirty-two families in it, while the analysis shows that almost half of the family types are missing in the textbooks. This unavailability shows that the textbooks may be an insufficient source to the students for the vocabulary needed by proficient language learners proficient language learner. The findings indicate a deficiency in both the books of Pakistan and Saudi Arabia.

The comparative data revealed that the Pakistani English books bear a bigger corpus than Saudi Arabian textbooks. More family types of vocabulary are introduced in the Pakistani English textbooks than the Textbooks of Saudi Arabia. The same positivity is also revealed in Pakistani English textbooks. They introduce more family-type vocabulary items of CEFR corpus to the learners than those vocabulary items introduced in Saudi Arabian Textbooks.

Conclusion

Conclusively, the analysis of results reveals deficient corpora of the vocabulary items in Saudi Arabia and Pakistan textbooks. Both the books are not aligned with the CEFR vocabulary in good terms. The deficiency may be addressed by adopting the CEFR vocabulary by revising or the content of the textbooks. However, if both the books are compared, the better will be English textbooks of Pakistan as it bears larger corpora, word types, and CEFR tokens. Overall, both books do not meet the standard of CEFR vocabulary profiles of a proficient learner. The present study indicates a significant vocabulary deficiency in both textbooks for a specific standard of proficiency in language learning.

References

Adamson, B. (2004). China's English: A history of English in Chinese education. Hong Kong University Press.

Al-Seghayer, K. (2014). The four most common constraints affecting English teaching in Saudi Arabia. International Journal of English Linguistics, 4(5), 17.

Anderson, R. C., & Freebody, P. (1981). Vocabulary knowledge. In J. T. Guthrie (Ed.), Comprehension and teaching: Research reviews (pp. 77-117). International Reading Association.

Azim, M. U., Hussain, Z., Bhatti, A. M., & Iqbal, M. (2020). Recycling of vocabulary in English Language Teaching: From theory to practice. Epistemology, 7(1), 88-102.

Buckland, S. (2010). Using the CEFR to benchmark learning outcomes: a case study. Mader, J and Urkun, Z (eds), 4-10.

Channa, L. A. (2014). English medium for the government primary school teachers of Sindh, Pakistan: An exploration of government primary school teachers' attitudes (Unpublished PhD Dissertation). University of Georgia, Georgia.

Channa, L. A. (2015). English in the language policy and planning of Pakistan. Kashmir Journal of Language Research, 18, 65–77.

Council of Europe. Council for Cultural Co-operation. Education Committee. Modern Languages Division. (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: learning, teaching, assessment. Cambridge University Press.

Coxhead, A. J. (1998). An academic word list (English Language Institute Publication No. 18). Victoria University.

Flores, N. (2020). From academic language to language architecture: Challenging raciolinguistic ideologies in research and practice. Theory Into Practice, 59(1), 22-31.

Gani, S. A., Fajrina, D., &Hanifa, R. (2015). Students' learning strategies for developing speaking ability. Studies in English Language and Education, 2(1), 16-28.

Granger, S. (1998). The computer learner corpus: a versatile new source of data for SLA research (pp. 3-18).

Harwood, N. (Ed.). (2010). English language teaching materials. Ernst KlettSprachen.

Heinemann, B., Opel, S., Budde, L., Schulte, C., Frischemeier, D., Biehler, R., ... &Wassong, T. (2018, November). Drafting a data science curriculum for secondary schools. In Proceedings of the 18th Koli calling international conference on computing education research (pp. 1-5).

Hirsch, D. (2007). Experiences of poverty and educational disadvantages. Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Hu, G. (2002). English language teaching in the People's Republic of China. In R., Silver, G., Hu, & M., Iino, English language education in China, Japan, and Singapore. Graduate Programmes and Research Office, National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University.

Hulstijn, J. H. (2007). The shaky ground beneath the CEFR: Quantitative and qualitative dimensions of language proficiency. The Modern Language Journal, 91(4), 663-667.

Jeon, J. and J. Kim. 2018. An analysis on the standard of language competence between 2015 Revised English Curriculum and CEFR Basic User level. Journal of Learner-Centered Curriculum and Instruction 16(7), 65-87.

Jeon, J. and J. Kim. 2020. An analysis of communication language function based on CEFR basic English communicative language activities and strategies. Journal of Learner-Centered Curriculum and Instruction 20(4), 93-116.

Kusseling, F. S. (2012). A corpus-based evaluation of the common European framework vocabulary for French teaching and learning.

Lee, B. C. (2020). Applicability of CEFR to National Curriculum and Assessment of English. Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics, 20, 496-516.

Lee, Y. and H. Kim. 2009. A comparative study of the achievement standards between the Revised Korean National Curriculum of English and Common European Framework of References (CEFR)). Modern English Education 10(2), 108-132.

Little, D. (2007). The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Perspectives on the making of supranational language education policy. Modern Language Journal, 91(4), 645–655. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00627_2.x.

Liu, Y. H., & Zhang, L. J. (2015). A corpus-based study of lexical coverage and density in college English textbooks. Foreign Language Education in China (Quarterly), 8(1), 42-50. Retrieved March 21, 2018, from www.cnki.cn.

Lodhi, M. A., & Akash, A. (2019). Identifying language learning gaps of ESL students at intermediate level in Pakistani colleges. Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature, 12(1), 44-64.

Manan, S. A., Dumanig, F. P., & David, M. K. (2017). The English-medium fever in Pakistan: Analyzing policy, perceptions and practices through additive bi/multilingual education lens. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 20(6), 736-752.

Mansoor, S. (2005). Language planning in higher education: A case study of Pakistan. Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Milton, J. (2010). The development of vocabulary breadth across the CEFR levels. Communicative proficiency and linguistic development: Intersections between SLA and language testing research, 211-232.

Moody, S., Hu, X., Kuo, L. J., Jouhar, M., Xu, Z., & Lee, S. (2018). Vocabulary instruction: A critical analysis of theories, research, and practice. Education sciences, 8(4), 180.

Nation, P. (2001). Learning vocabulary in another language. Cambridge University Press.

Nordlund, M. (2016). EFL textbooks for young learners: A comparative analysis of vocabulary. Education Inquiry, 7(1), 27764.

Nunan, D. (1989). Designing tasks for the communicative classroom. Cambridge university press.

Nunan, D., Candlin, C. N., & Widdowson, H. G. (1988). Syllabus design (Vol. 55). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Oscarson, A. D., & Oscarson, M. (2010). Using the CEFR in the foreign language classroom. Putting the CEFR to Good Use, 83-91.

Range, (2005). Retrieved from: https://www.wgtn.ac.nz/lals/resources/paul-nations-resources/vocabulary-analysis-programs.

Richards, J. C. (2014). The ELT textbook. In International perspectives on materials in ELT (pp. 19-36). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Schmitt, N. (2010). Researching vocabulary: A vocabulary research manual. Palgrave Macmillan.

Shahbaz, M., & Liu, Y. (2012). Complexity of L2 motivation in an Asian ESL setting. Porta Linguarum: Revistainternacional de didáctica de las lenguasextranjeras, (18), 115-132.

Thawarom, T., &Singhasiri, W. (2020). Lexical richness of one-minute speaking task by science and technology university students. Journal of Asia TEFL, 17(1), 70.

Tuan, N. H., & Mai, T. N. (2015). Factors Affecting Students' Speaking Performance at LE Thanh Hien High School. Asian Journal of Educational Research, 3.2, 8–23.

Yu, M., &Renandya, W. A. (2021). A Corpus-based Study of the Vocabulary Profile of High
    School English Textbooks in China. LEARN Journal: Language Education and
    Acquisition Research Network, 14(1), 28-49.

Zhou, Q. (2012). A corpus-based study on the vocabulary in China's contemporary college
    English coursebooks [Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Shanghai Normal
    University].