



An analysis of the task types in the “English for creative students” English workbook for eighth-grade students at SMPN 1 Padang

Indah Tiara Chairani^{1*}, Yati Aisya Rani²

^{1, 2} Universitas Negeri Padang, Indonesia

Correspondence Email: teceindah@gmail.com

Volume 15, Number 2, 2026, 302-311

Abstract:

This study aims to analyze the task types and the cognitive level of the tasks found in the “English for Creative Students” English workbook for eighth-grade students. The study used descriptive research. A total of 60 tasks from four units and eight sections each were analyzed. This study applied Nunan's (1999) typology to identify the interpersonal and linguistics task, while Bloom's revised taxonomy by Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) was used to determine the cognitive levels of the task. The findings show that the dominance of linguistics task, particularly the practicing tasks with 36 tasks (60%) were identified, while conversational tasks and summarizing were absent. The “English for Creative Students” does not provide the balance distribution for the interpersonal and linguistic tasks. It indicates a strong emphasis on controlled practice and accuracy, which can limit students' language competence. Based on the cognitive level, most of the tasks fall at the Understanding (C2) level, with 25 tasks (41,67%), which is categorized in the lower order thinking skills (LOTS). But the workbook is aligned with Capaian Pembelajaran (CP) in the Merdeka curriculum. These findings highlight the teacher and book design to integrate more communicative and higher-order thinking skills tasks to balance the cognitive level and make learning more meaningful.

Keywords:

Task Type, English workbook, Cognitive level, Interpersonal task, Linguistic task

© The Author(s). Published by Universitas Negeri Padang. This is an open-access article under the Creative Commons License <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

1. INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

During the learning process, teachers use various types of instructional materials. Harmer (2007) states that there are four different forms of instructional materials used by teachers in their teaching: (1) boards; (2) realia; (3) photographs; and (4) books. One of the most common instructional materials that teachers and students use is a book. Mertler (2021) describes an educational book as a structured resource that guides learners through content, supports instruction, and provides a foundation for academic inquiry. It not only shares information but also teaches important lessons in an accessible way.

There are two main types of books that teachers use for teaching. They are textbooks and workbooks. Richards (2001) describes that the textbook provides structure and syllabus for

a program, standardizes instruction, and offers effective language models. The textbook serves as a guide to theory, while the workbook serves as exercises and worksheets. Among them, workbooks are important because they provide exercises that reinforce classroom instruction, encourage independent practices, and help students improve their language skills. According to Cunningsworth (1995), the Workbook serves as a bridge between theory and practice, guiding students to learn through tasks that reflect the curriculum goals and communicative competence. In its role in the learning process, an evaluation of the book is needed to ensure its content, structure, and pedagogy are aligned with the students' needs and curriculum goals.

Based on the writer's preliminary observation at SMPN 1 Padang during the pre-serving teaching period, the English teachers in this school usually use the workbook as the main resource in the teaching and learning process. Teachers usually ask students to do exercises in the workbook after discussing the topic. However, the researcher also found some significant problems, such as task repetition, an imbalance in focus on specific language skills, authenticity in the task scenarios, and lower-level questions. These issues may lead to reduced students' critical thinking development and limit interactive learning as the goal of Curriculum Merdeka. Moreover, Lesley and Labbo (2003) find that the overuse of worksheets can lead to a lower level of learning, where students only focus on getting the "right" answer instead of exploring the subject. Moreover, Lesley and Labbo (2003) find that the overuse of worksheets can lead to a lower level of learning, where students only focus on getting the "right" answer instead of exploring the subject.

To address these issues, one of the important steps is evaluating the workbook, particularly analyzing the task types that appear in the workbook. Analyzing task types helps reveal whether the material encourages meaningful learning or simply reinforces the understanding level. Nunan (1999) proposed pedagogical task types, which focus on the nature of the students' engagement rather than the language structure. It includes cognitive, interpersonal, linguistic, affective, and creative. Brown (2001) and Richards (2001) also explain that tasks should engage students in communication competence and develop real-world language use. By examining the variety and depth of tasks, the teachers can determine which tasks align with the curriculum goals, provide higher-order thinking, and support the students' communicative competence.

However, not all workbooks provide a balanced or complete set of tasks and provide critical thinking tasks. Rahmadana (2024) and Ayu & Indrawati (2020) found unbalanced task types in the textbook. English textbooks focus more on linguistic tasks while ignoring the other task types. Arsana et al (2023) analyzed "English for Nusantara" textbook and found that HOTS tasks are fewer than the LOTS tasks. Another was conducted by Rustiyanil (2021), who did research on English textbooks in senior high school by using revised Bloom's taxonomy. The result showed that the dominant task was remembering, which is the lowest level in the cognitive level of the revised Bloom taxonomy.

In the context of workbook evaluation, tasks are particularly significant because they determine how learners engage with the material and whether the exercises align with curriculum objectives. As Richards and Rodgers (2014) note, tasks provide opportunities for learners to interact meaningfully with the target language. They support both language acquisition and classroom engagement. In the Indonesian context, the Kurikulum Merdeka emphasizes students' autonomy, creativity, and critical thinking by having more Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS) exercises, so the learning process will be meaningful and connect to real-world communication. For this reason, analyzing the types of tasks in a workbook or textbook is essential to ensure that the materials promote balanced skill development and align with the curriculum's goals.

This research will focus on identifying the linguistic and interpersonal tasks that appear in the “English for Creative Student” English workbook published by MGMP Padang, using Nunan's (1999) typology. The linguistics and interpersonal tasks that appeared in the workbook will be analyzed in the cognitive domain based on the revised version of Bloom's Taxonomy. Based on the background of the study that has been explained before, the problem can be formulated in the form of research questions:

1. What linguistic and interpersonal tasks are found in the “English for Creative Students” English workbook?
2. What cognitive level of the linguistic and interpersonal tasks are found in the “English for Creative Students” English workbook?

Many studies have applied Nunan's (1999) typology in evaluating the task types in the textbook, but are still limited in evaluating the task types in the workbook. Therefore, in this research, the researcher aims to find out the quality of the “English for creative students” English workbook based on the linguistic task, interpersonal task types, and determine the cognitive level of the task.

Among the various frameworks used to evaluate the English language workbook. The researcher will choose to adapt Nunan's (1999) typology in this research. Nunan's (1999) typology is chosen because it offers a comprehensive and multidimensional classification that aligns with student-communicative language teaching and student-centered pedagogy. Unlike Prabhu (1987) as the foundation of the task types and Richards (2001), Nunan's typology offers a wider analysis of how tasks engage students cognitively, emotionally, and socially. His typology is relevant to the newest curriculum, which develops not only in the linguistics part, but also critical thinking, collaboration, and communicative competence. However, in this study the researcher will specifically focus on interpersonal and linguistic tasks. By using this framework, the researcher aims to identify the interpersonal and linguistic tasks that appear in the “English for Creative Students” workbook and determine whether the workbook has a balanced distribution of task types to support language development.

In the English language teaching context, a workbook is seen as an instructional material that is designed to provide students with structured exercises and activities that support classroom instruction. According to Brown (2001), a workbook is a supplementary material that provides students with opportunities to practice language skills independently, through written tasks aligned with lesson objectives. In line, Wahab (2013) defines a workbook as a structured learning tool that supports language skills development through sequenced exercises.

In the English language teaching context, a workbook is seen as an instructional material that is designed to provide students with structured exercises and activities that support classroom instruction. Long (1985) defines a task in language teaching as an activity where students use the target language for communicative purposes. Bygate, Skehan, & Swain (2001) also define a task as an activity that requires students to use language, with emphasis on meaning, to attain an objective.

Some previous studies on textbook and workbook analysis have been extensively done. First, a research by Rahmadana in 2024 entitled “A Content Analysis of task types in *English for Nusantara* textbook used at SMPN 1 Pattalassang”. The purpose of this research is: 1) to find out the extent to which task types employed in the textbook align with the Nunan (1999) typology framework, and 2) to describe the teacher's perception of how the task types in the textbook.

Second, research conducted by Huda in 2019 entitled “Task types Found in the textbooks *Bahasa Inggris: When English Ring the Bell* and *Bright*”. The purpose of the research is to describe the task types and see the frequency of task types that appeared in the “Bahasa Inggris: When English Rings the Bell” and “Bright an English Course for junior high school” textbook. The data was collected by using a data format to classify the task types by using Nunan’s typology. The researcher found the highest frequency in each textbook. However, some of the tasks were ignored in the textbook.

Another study related to the analysis of cognitive level in the textbook was done by Mardiah in 2021. The purpose of the research was to investigate the levels of cognitive and the distribution of writing tasks in the English textbook for senior high school based on the revised version of Bloom’s Taxonomy. In this research, the researcher use descriptive qualitative approach and applied documentation technique. The data was analyzed by using Miles and Huberman’s (1994), the steps include reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing. The results showed that the six levels of cognitive domain proposed by Anderson and Kratwohl (2001) were applied on writing task in the English textbook. The researcher also found out that the four types of writing task proposed by Brown (2004).

The other research was conducted in 2023. The purpose of the research is to assign the alignment between the cognitive domain of revised Bloom’s Taxonomy and the worksheets in the English textbook “English for Nusantara”. The tasks are categorized based on the cognitive level by using a data analysis table. The result showed that the distribution of lower-order thinking skills (LOTS) activities were higher than the higher-order thinking skills (HOTS). The most frequent type of activity was categorized in the remembering level. The research showed that using only the English textbook “English for Nusantara” may not be adequate to develop students’ critical thinking.

2. METHOD

This study uses descriptive research to conduct the research. The researcher attempts to analyze the interpersonal and linguistics task that appeared in the “English for Creative Students” and the cognitive level of the tasks. Moelong (2004) states that qualitative research is a type of research that does not include any calculation or numeration. It means that the data in this research is analyzed in the form of description and identification or analysis of the categories and forms of tasks contained in the workbook.

The subject in this research is the “English for Creative students” English workbook for eighth grade in SMPN 1 Padang. The workbook is one of the instructional materials that is used in the learning process. The workbook is written and published by the MGMP (English Teacher Association) Padang.

The researcher will use a coding sheet as the instrument to categorize the task types in the “English for Creative Students” workbook. The categorization of the task is adapted from Nunan’s (1999) task types framework. First, the researcher identifies and lists all the Interpersonal and linguistics task in the workbook. The tasks are classified based on the instruction or question forms. After identifying the interpersonal and linguistics task, the researcher categorizes the tasks into the cognitive level using revised Bloom’s taxonomy, in order to know the cognitive level. And then, the researcher concludes the distribution of the interpersonal and linguistic tasks and the cognitive level.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter discusses the findings and the discussion of the research. The researcher provides the answer to the two research questions that were stated in Chapter 1.

3.1. Results

After analyzing the workbook, the researcher found there are 9 interpersonal tasks and 60 linguistic tasks. These tasks are classified based on their instructions and question form. The researcher uses Nunan's (1999) typology to analyze the interpersonal and linguistics task. The interpersonal task includes co-operating dan role playing task, and the linguistics task includes conversational patterns, practicing, using context, summarizing, and selective listening.

However, the number of task types is unbalanced. The practice task types are the most common tasks in the workbook, and the others are less often used. Moreover, the researcher also analyzed the cognitive level of the task by using Bloom's Taxonomy revised version. There are six cognitive domain levels: Remembering, Understanding, Applying, Analyzing, Evaluating, and Creating. The interpersonal and linguistic tasks found in the workbook are categorized into six levels of Bloom's revised Taxonomy. The results show that the tasks are mostly found in the Understanding (C2) level.

3.2. Finding

3.2.1 Finding 1

A total of 60 interpersonal and linguistic tasks are identified in the "English for Creative Students" English workbook. To increase students' communication competence and language form, the interpersonal and linguistic tasks based on Nunan's (1999) typology are presented in this workbook. For interpersonal tasks, it includes co-operating and role-playing. On the other hand, linguistic tasks include practicing, using context, and selective listening. However, the number of task types is unbalanced. The practice task types are the most common tasks in the workbook, and the others are less often used. The example of the Interpersonal and linguistic tasks is explained below:

Table 1. The Distribution of Interpersonal Tasks

Task Types	Frequency	Percentage
Interpersonal Task		
Co-operating	5	8.33%
Role Playing	4	6.67%
Total	9	15%

The table shows the distribution of interpersonal tasks in the workbook, specifically focusing on co-operating and role-playing. Co-operating tasks appear 5 times, representing 8.33% of the total, while role-playing tasks occur 4 times, accounting for 6.67%. Together, these interpersonal tasks make up 9 occurrences, which is 15% of all tasks in the workbook.

Table 2. The Distribution of Linguistic Tasks

Task Types	Frequency	Percentage
Linguistic Task		
Conversational Pattern	-	-
Practicing	36	60%
Using Context	13	21.67%
Selective Listening	11	18.33%
Summarizing	-	-

Total	60	100%
-------	----	------

The table presents the distribution of linguistic tasks found in the workbook, categorized into four types: practicing, using context, selective listening, and summarizing. Among these, practicing tasks appear most frequently, with a total of 36 occurrences, accounting for 60% of all linguistic tasks. This indicates that the workbook places a strong emphasis on controlled practice, where students rehearse language forms in structured exercises. Interestingly, conversational pattern tasks and summarizing tasks are not present in the workbook, as indicated by the absence of frequency and percentage values.

Overall, the total number of linguistic tasks is 60, and the distribution highlights the workbook's prioritization of practicing tasks, while still incorporating contextual and listening-based activities to support comprehension. The absence of summarizing and conversational pattern tasks suggests that the workbook emphasizes accuracy and controlled practice more than extended production or discourse-level skills.

3.2.2. Finding 2

The interpersonal and linguistic tasks found in the workbook are categorized into six levels of Bloom's revised Taxonomy. However, certain levels receive more focus than others, making the overall distribution uneven. The result shows that Understanding (C2) is dominant with a total number of 25 tasks (41.67%). Followed by Applying (C3) 18 tasks (30%), Analyzing (C4) 5 tasks (8.33%), Evaluation (C5) 3 tasks (5%), and tasks in the Creating task (C6) 9 tasks (13.33%). The analysis results are shown in the following table:

Table 3. The Percentage and Frequency of the Cognitive Level

Task Types	Frequency	Percentage
Linguistic Task		
C1- Remembering	-	-
C2- Understanding	25	41.67%
C3- Applying	18	30%
C4- Analyzing	5	8.33%
C5- Evaluating	3	5%
C6- Creating	9	15%
Total	60	100%

This indicates that the workbook primarily emphasizes developing students' basic comprehension and application skills rather than fostering higher-level critical thinking skills. Although students are given tasks to understand and apply the language concepts, they are less frequently challenged to analyze, evaluate, or create skills that are essential for deeper cognitive engagement.

These findings are in line with the previous research done by Rahmadani (2021). The research was conducted to analyze the cognitive domain levels on the speaking activities in 2013 curriculum English textbook. The results showed that the speaking activities of the English textbook were identified in the low-order thinking skills. There are 42 speaking activities categorized in the low order thing skill (LOTS) and no representation of high-order thinking skill (HOTS). It indicates limited opportunities for students to develop higher-order thinking skills through speaking tasks. The other study was done by Hidayat et al (2025) under the titled "Cognitive I Levels of Indonesian Junior High School English Textbook Questions: A

Revised Bloom's Taxonomy Analysis". The research found out that the textbook is more inclined to LOTS than HOTS, with Remembering (C2) as the most frequent task in the textbook, and Creating (C6) as the least represented in the textbook. The study suggests incorporating more HOTS-based questions to align with the Curriculum's Objectives and support critical thinking development. This concern is also supported by Richards (2013) and Widodo (2016), who emphasize that language learning materials should integrate higher-order thinking tasks to promote meaningful learning and communicative competence.

3.3. Discussion

Based on the findings above, some points need to be discussed. The analysis is interpreted by using Nunan's (1999) typology and Bloom's revised taxonomy, focusing on the "English for Creative Students" English workbook. In total, 60 tasks were analyzed, and the results show that the majority appeared in the form of practicing tasks, while conversational tasks were absent. This distribution highlights the workbook's strong emphasis on the language pattern; it prioritizes controlled practice rather than interactive communication.

According to Nunan (1999), conversational pattern tasks are designed to encourage communicative interaction by requiring students to use expressions in spoken interaction. This absence is explained by *Capaian Pembelajaran (CP) in Merdeka Curriculum*. At this stage, CP for English highlights the ability to understand spoken, written, and produce short, simple texts. The curriculum prioritizes accuracy and clarity in basic communication before moving toward more complex material. As a result, workbook designers often choose practice tasks and simple text because it is aligned with CP and more measurable in a large classroom setting.

In Nunan's multidimensional typology, practicing tasks always shown in the form of controlled activities, typically presented in the form of drilling questions. This repetition can strengthen their grasp of linguistic structures and connect the receptive skills, such as listening and reading to productive skills, such as speaking and writing. In sum, drilling provides support to learners to internalize the correct forms before applying them in authentic communication, ensuring that they are equipped with the linguistic confidence necessary for fluency in real-world contexts.

The cognitive level analysis indicates that most interpersonal and linguistic tasks in the workbook are concentrated at the Understanding level (C2) with a total of 25 tasks (41.67%). Based on the revised Bloom's Taxonomy by Anderson and Krathwohl (2001), the cognitive domain levels are divided into Lower-order Thinking skills (LOTS) and Higher-order Thinking Skills (HOTS). LOTS include Remembering (C1), Understanding (C2), and Applying (C3), while HOTS include Analyzing (C4), Evaluating (C5), and Creating (C6). As Brookhart (2010) states, the distinction between LOTS and HOTS is important in evaluating instructional materials, as higher-order thinking skills are crucial for fostering critical thinking and independent learning.

The analysis of the workbook shows a clear dominance of LOTS-based tasks in the workbook, with most of the tasks categorized as the Understanding (C2) level. In contrast, HOTS-based tasks appear less frequently, with only 17 tasks (28.33%), mainly at Creating (C6). This indicates that the workbook primarily emphasizes developing students' basic comprehension and application skills rather than fostering higher-level critical thinking skills.

In sum, it is clear that the "English for Creative Students" English workbook emphasizes lower-order thinking skills, particularly Understanding (C2) and Applying (C3). While these skills are fundamental for language acquisition, relying more on LOTS may limit students' opportunities to develop higher-order thinking abilities. Skehan (1998) highlights that strengthening accuracy first helps students to feel more confident and prepared, so it will be easier for them to apply English in real-world situations. Therefore, it is important for teachers

and material developers to integrate more HOTS-oriented tasks to ensure balanced cognitive development and better prepare students for complex language use and critical engagement.

4. CONCLUSION

The results showed that the workbook provides a variety of tasks for interpersonal and linguistic tasks. Interpersonal tasks include co-operating and role-playing. Meanwhile, the linguistics task includes conversational patterns, practicing, using context, selective listening, and summarizing.

However, among the interpersonal and linguistic tasks, the practice task is the most frequent in the workbook. The other task types are less frequent, such as co-operating, role-playing, selective listening, and using context. But the conversational patterns and summarizing task type do not appear in the workbook. In sum, the “English for Creative Students” does not provide the balance distribution for the interpersonal and linguistic tasks. This can limit the students' language competence. The frequent use of practice tasks reflects the broader trend in the book design, where grammar and structural accuracy are more emphasized than the other.

In the cognitive level, the interpersonal and linguistics task are mostly focused on the Understanding level (C2), which is categorized in the lower order thinking skills (LOTS). But this finding is consistent with the *Capaian Pembelajaran (CP) in Merdeka curriculum*, which explains that junior high school students need to reach A2 FER level. The level which emphasize the ability to understand and produce short, simple text with correct grammar and vocabulary. However, the absence of conversational and HOTS-based tasks may reduce students' confidence and preparation to progress towards B1 level, which requires more complex, analytical, and creative language use.

REFERENCES

- Abdel Wahab, M. M. 2013. Developing an English language textbook evaluative checklist. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 1(3), 55–70.
<https://doi.org/10.9790/7388-0135570>
- Arikunto, S. 2013. *Prosedur penelitian suatu pendekatan praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Sorensen, C. K. 2002. *Introduction to research in education* (6th ed.). Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Astuti, R. W. 2019. *An analysis of English course book (content analysis of "Bahan Ajar Bahasa Inggris" used by the ninth grade students of junior high school in Madiun) a thesis*. English Education Department, Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training.
- Betri, R. 2018. *Content analysis of english textbook entitled "talk active" used by the senior high school (student's book) a thesis*. Department of English Education Program Faculty of Education and Teaching Training of State Islamic University Sultan Thaha Saifuddin Jambi.
- Brown, H. D. 2007. *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (3rd ed.). Pearson Education.
- Council of Europe. (2020). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages*:

Learning, teaching, assessment – Companion volume. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

- Fitriazmi, A. D. 2019. *Evaluation of English workbook published by PT. Swadaya Murni (A content analysis based on Curriculum 2013) a thesis*. Department of English Education, Faculty of Educational Sciences.
- Hanifa, R. 2018. EFL published material: An evaluation of English textbooks for junior high school in Indonesia. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 9(1), 166–174.
<https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v9n.1p.166>
- Harmer, J. 2007. *How to Teach Writing*. Longman: UK, Cambridge.
- Hidayat, M. Y. R., & Rohmana, W. I. M. (2025). Cognitive levels of Indonesian junior high school English textbook questions: A revised Bloom's taxonomy analysis. *Journal of English Educational Study*, 8(1), 1–15.
- Hsieh, H.-F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277–1288.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687>
- Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi Republik Indonesia. (2022). *Capaian pembelajaran bahasa Inggris SMP/MTs (Fase D) Kurikulum Merdeka*. Jakarta: Badan Standar, Kurikulum, dan Asesmen Pendidikan (BSKAP).
- Kirgoz, H. (2009). Evaluating the English materials for young learners of English at Turkish primary education. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1(1), 79–83.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2009.01.016>
- Lesley, M., & Labbo, L. D. 2003. *A pedagogy of control: Worksheets and the special need child*. *Language Arts*, 80(6), 444.
- Maili, Sjafty Nursitti NP, and Endang Sondari. 2020. Analysis of the Content of Exercise Seventh Grade English Textbook. *Journal Basis* 7(2): 387–94. doi:10.33884/basisupb.v7i2.2482.
- Nurhamsih, Y., & Syahrial, S. 2018. Evaluation of English Teaching Materials used at a Vocational High School Based on Cunningsworth's Checklist. *JOALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics & Literature)*, 1(1), 33–46. <https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v3i2.6830>
- Pambudi, H. 2019. *A content analysis of an English textbook entitled "When English Rings a Bell" for eighth grade of junior high school a thesis*. UMS Institutional Repository.
<https://eprints.ums.ac.id/id/eprint/75963>
- Rahmadani, D., & Aryuliva, A. (2021). An analysis of cognitive domain level on speaking activities in 2013 curriculum English textbook for grade XI. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 10(3), 548–556. <https://doi.org/10.24036/jelt.v10i3.113833>
- Raihan Utami, Alvi, Dyah Aminatun, and Nina Fatriana. 1 *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning (JELTL) STUDENT WORKBOOK USE: DOES IT STILL MATTER TO THE EFFECTIVENESS OF STUDENTS' LEARNING?* <http://jim.teknokrat.ac.id/index.php/english-language-teaching/index>.

- Richards, J. C. 2001. *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2013). Curriculum approaches in language teaching: Forward, central, and backward design. *RELC Journal*, 44(1), 5–33.
- Richards, Jack C. 2015. *The Role of Textbook in Language Program*.
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265455920>.
- Tomlinson, B. 2011. Materials development for language learning and teaching. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (pp. 1–24). Cambridge University Press.
- Ufuk, T., Akdeniz, A. R., Cimer, S. O., and Gurbuz, F. 2013. *Extended Workbook Developed According to 5E Model Based on Constructivist Learning Approach*. International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications.
- Safitri, Y. Y. 2020. *Analysis of English textbook “When English Rings a Bell” based on Cunningsworth’s criteria a thesis*. Institut Agama Islam Negeri Salatiga. UIN Salatiga Repository. <http://e-repository.perpus.uinsalatiga.ac.id/id/eprint/6153>
- Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Syale, Ari Sihad, Kamaluddin Kamaluddin, and Siam Siam. 2019. Content Analysis on the English Textbook Entitled Bahasa Inggris Sma/Ma Kelas X. *Journal of Teaching English* 4(2): 226. doi:10.36709/jte.v4i2.13923.
- Ur, P. A. 1996. *Course in language teaching: practice and theory*. Great Britain Cambridge University Press.
- Wiji Astuti, Dwi. 2017. The Content Analysis Of English Workbook Used In Smkn 1 Gombong. 3(1).
- Widodo, H. P., & Renandya, W. A. (Eds.). (2016). *English language teaching today: Linking theory and practice*. Cham: Springer.