

**Content Analysis of Student Book When English Rings A Bell (Revised Edition) for Grade VIII of Junior High School****Hayati Wasistyo Adi** ✉

English Department, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Article Info*Article History:*

Received in 3 October

2018

Approved in 29 July

2019

Published in 29 July

2019

*Keywords: textbook analysis; When English Rings a Bell; 2013 Curriculum; cognitive domain; psychomotor domain***Abstract**

The aim of this study was to analyze the relevance of the materials with the cognitive and psychomotor domains in the 2013 English curriculum competence in English Rings a Bell textbook for grade eight of junior high school. This study used qualitative methodology. The researcher conducted the analysis of textbook based on theory of Anderson and Krathwohl's (2001) taxonomy of cognitive domain and Simpson's (1972) taxonomy of psychomotor domain in order to more focus on its relevance with materials in the textbook. The instruments used to collect the data were observation in the form of checklists and document analysis. The result showed that in term of cognitive domain, there were 23 materials in the book which were relevant or 74.19%, 7 materials which were partly relevant or 22.58%, and only 1 material which irrelevant or 3.2%. Meanwhile, in term of psychomotor domain, there were 10 materials in the book which were relevant or 32.25%, 10 materials also which were partly relevant, and 11 materials which were irrelevant or 35.48 %. Thus, it can be concluded that the materials in this textbook materials are relevant with 2013 curriculum, in term of cognitive domain. Even though, it lacks relevant materials of psychomotor domain.

© 2019 Universitas Negeri Semarang

✉ Correspondent Address:
B3 Building FBS Unnes
Sekaran, Gunungpati, Semarang, 50229
E-mail: vyalya52@gmail.com

ISSN 2252-6706

INTRODUCTION

Textbook is an important item in learning process. It is used for student as a manual instructor in studying, and for teachers as directions to teach a lesson. The necessity of the textbook in Indonesia becomes the main element of learning English, because English is a foreign language in Indonesia. Students can learn by themselves through textbook. Teachers also get clear materials and activities that can be used in the classroom.

School curriculum always changes. The government (Ministry of Education and Culture of Indonesia) usually changes the curriculum in 5-10 years. They stated that the curriculum should be changed based on human development. The newest curriculum in Indonesia is 2013 curriculum. It is usually called as term K-13. This curriculum has different characteristics than the previous one.

K-13 is a curriculum of values that occupied by character building. The values can be tracked from the core competences. It consists of core competence (KI) 1 to 4. KI-1 is designed for spiritual competence, KI-2 for social competence, KI-3 refers to knowledge competence and KI-4 is for skill competence.

According to Ahmad (2014), the learning paradigm encompass direct and indirect learning model. Direct learning model reflects to KI-3 and KI-4. While, indirect learning model refers to KI-1 and KI-2. These two competences have no specific learning materials as it is integrated into cognitive and psychomotor domains. Therefore, a textbook usually only present the materials according to cognitive and psychomotor domains. KI-3 emphasizes cognitive domain and KI-4 represents psychomotor domain.

The government which is Ministry of Education and Culture of Indonesia (MECI), also published a textbook as a medium of learning based on K-13. It has two versions. There are student book and teacher book. For the English lesson, the title of the textbook is *When English Rings a Bell*.

According to Pusat Kurikulum dan Perbukuan Balitbang Kemdiknas, this textbook is one of the textbooks from the government which can be bought by the school. Therefore, almost every schools in Indonesia use its textbook. Based on telephone interviewed with them, schools in Indonesia should use Dana Bos (Bantuan Operasional Sekolah) to buy the textbook from the government. Even though, the textbook has many revision edition. For example, *When English Rings a Bell* seventh graders has been published in 2013 and revised in 2014, 2016, and 2017.

There are some researchers conducted similar studies about content analysis of student book entitled *When English Rings a Bell* (Revised Edition) for grade VIII of junior high school. Firstly, Kamila (2014) analyzed the relevance of materials in the textbook for seventh graders of junior high school to 2013 curriculum. This study found out that some of the materials are not relevant with the cognitive and psychomotor domains which are contained in the 2013 English Standard Competence. However, there are more materials which are relevant with the 2013 English Standard Competence than the materials which not.

Hashemnezhad and Maftoon (2011) evaluated English Language Grammar textbook for Iranian college students. The result of statistics for the questionnaire showed that subject matter, vocabulary and structure, and physical makeup of the book are emphasized. Data analysis for the checklist indicated that within cognitive domain, only first stages are emphasized and the last stages of synthesis and evaluation are neglected.

In a similar vein, Razmjoo and Kazempourfard (2012) reported the activities and the exercises for three units of each of the four coursebooks of Interchange Series using the six levels of Bloom's taxonomy. The results conveyed that lower order cognitive skills were most frequent in Interchange coursebooks.

In general, there are many researchers who have examined English textbooks e.g. Chyntia (2013), Kamila (2014), Zareian (2015), and Al-Mashaqba (2017). They also have different criteria to

analyze, such as content, physical appearance, assessment, English skills, gender, mood realization, etc. For instance, there are many of researchers who analyzed the cognitive domain level in the textbook. However, they only presented the percentage of the cognitive level based on high order thinking skills and low order thinking skills. On the other hand, there is a few researchers who investigated the psychomotor domain of the textbook.

Textbook is an important element in learning process. Awasthi (2006) in Nguyen (2015) stated that textbook is a teaching and learning material for both the teacher and the learner to rely on in the process of teaching and learning. This textbook is much needed to help the learning process inside and outside class.

In English lesson, the role of textbook is very helpful for the students. When the students cannot listen the teacher clearly, they can take a look to the textbook. Usually English words tend to have different pronunciation with its letters. Even though, not all textbooks have compatible content for the students. For those reasons the importance of textbook analysis is needed.

Textbook analysis will evaluate the content of the textbook. It will use several instruments to evaluate the data. From the evaluation, the readers will know whether the textbook is good nor not. They also can know the compatibility of the textbook with the curriculum being used.

As we know, curriculum is a set of regulation which arranges learning process. Romine in Hamalik (2006:65) also stated that curriculum is interpreted to mean al of the organized courses, activities, and experiences which pupils have under the direction of the school, whether in the classroom or not.

In Indonesia, there are many curricula that are used. The latest curriculum is 2013 curriculum. According to the 2013 Curriculum, English standard competence contains two kinds of competences, they are: core competences and basic competences. Core competence is divided into four objectives. The first and second objectives emphasize on affective domain. The third objectives emphasize on cognitive domain, and the forth objectives emphasize on psychomotor domain (Permendikbud No. 68 Tahun 2013).

According to Taxonomy of Educational Objectives by Bloom (1956), cognitive refers to the knowledge domain. It is related to the learner's thinking. Affective refers to the emotional and value domain that related to the learner's attitude. And psychomotor refers to the use of motoric creativity that is related to the learner's skill. Cognitive and psychomotor domain indeed become vital elements in learning process. Those domains should be appeared in the textbook. Because the existence of basic competence three and basic competence four emphasize cognitive and psychomotor domains. Hence, the purpose of 2013 curriculum can be achieved. Consequently, I focused on the cognitive and psychomotor domains which showed in the textbook. I analyzed the textbook in term of cognitive and psychomotor domain. I also used the English syllabus from 2013 curriculum as reference.

Therefore, the purpose of this study are to describe the relevance between the materials in the student book entitled *When English Rings a Bell* (Revised Edition) for grade VIII of junior high school with the core and basic competence in 2013 curriculum in terms of cognitive and psychomotor domains.

METHODS

In this research, I implemented descriptive qualitative content analysis as the research design. According to Kothari (2004:8) stated that qualitative research deals with data that are in the form of words or pictures rather than numbers and statistics. As the data was in the form of words and documents, so the data were analyzed qualitatively.

I used *When English Rings a Bell* for grade eight of junior high school textbook as the object of the study and did the analysis by breaking down the materials in the textbook into two categories,

cognitive and psychomotor domains and examined them by relational analysis to core and basic competences of 2013 curriculum.

The data from this study were collected through several steps of observation. First, I read and observed the content of the textbook thoroughly. Second, I collected the materials of the textbook with the 2013 curriculum in terms of cognitive domain. Third, in a similar way, I also collected the materials of the textbook with the 2013 curriculum in terms of psychomotor domain.

I used the tables of observation checklist as the observation instrument. As stated by Cunningsworth (1995) in Alavinia and Siyadat (2013: 154), one of the research instruments in content analysis is checklist. I implemented BSNP (Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan) checklist as my instruments. There are two kinds of observation checklist. The first is observation checklist to observe the relevance between the materials in the book with the cognitive aspect in basic competence three of the 2013 English curriculum. The second observation checklist is to observe the relevance between the materials in the book with the psychomotor aspect in basic competence four of the 2013 English curriculum. The figures below are my observation checklist of cognitive and psychomotor domains.

Figure 1. Observation Checklist of Cognitive Domain

Basic Competence Three (Cognitive Domain)		When English Rings a Bell					Notes
Basic Competence	Materials (Sub-basic competence)	Page	Example of Materials	Relevance to Basic Competence			
				Relevant	Partly Relevant	Irrelevant	

Figure 2. Observation Checklist of Psychomotor Domain

In this research, I also used Bloom’s revised taxonomy of cognitive domain stated in Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) and psychomotor domain stated by Simpson (1972) as my document analysis

Basic Competence Four (Psychomotor Domain)		When English Rings a Bell					Notes
Basic Competence	Materials (Sub-basic competence)	Page	Example of Materials	Relevance to Basic Competence			
				Relevant	Partly Relevant	Irrelevant	

guidelines. Here are the figures which I used to analyze the level of cognitive and psychomotor domains.

Level	Action Verbs	Page	Notes
Remember			
Understand			
Apply			
Analyze			
Evaluate			
Create			

Figure 3. Cognitive Domain Level Analysis

Level	Action Verbs	Page	Notes
Perception			
Set			
Guided Response			
Mechanism			
Complex or Overt			
Adaptation			
Origination			

Figure 4. Psychomotor Domain Level Analysis

In this research the process of analyzing data used four steps. First, the materials were classified based on the basic competence three as the cognitive domain and basic competence four as the psychomotor domain. I used Anderson and Krathwohl's (2001) cognitive domain and Simpson's (1972) psychomotor domain keyword levels to classify the materials into basic competence three and basic competence four.

After that, the data from the textbook were collected and entered to the checklist table to make comparison between the materials on the textbooks and the materials required in 2013 curriculum. Then, I identified the differences and similarities between the materials in the textbook with those are suggested by basic competence of 2013 curriculum. Last, the materials in the textbook were evaluated to find out its relevancy with the core and basic competence of 2013 curriculum.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of the study are presented into two categories which are the relevance of the materials to the cognitive and psychomotor domains.

Findings

The Relevance of the Materials to the Cognitive Domain

The first result analysis of materials based on basic competence three in student English textbook entitled *When English Rings a Bell*. The categorization of cognitive level analysis has been done by referring to Anderson and Krathwohl's (2001) cognitive taxonomy. Even though, some activities or instructions did not use original action verb that was stated in Anderson and Krathwohl (2001). Therefore, I should find the similar meaning of the textbook activities or instructions with action verbs that has been stated in the theory.

After breaking down the materials written in the textbook according to the basic competence three of 2013 curriculum and finding out its relevance to the cognitive domain of learning used the checklist instrument I conclude that there is relevance between textbook materials and the basic competence three. It can be seen in the following figure:

The Relevance	The Basic Competence Four
Relevant	Sub-basic competence 4.5.1, 4.7.1, 4.8.1, 4.8.2, 4.10.2, 4.11.1, 4.11.3, 4.12.1, 4.12.2, 4.13.1.
Partly Relevant	Sub-basic competence 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.3.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.3, 4.4.1, 4.6.2, 4.7.2, 4.9.1, 4.9.3.
Irrelevant	Sub-basic competence 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 4.4.2, 4.4.3, 4.6.1, 4.6.3, 4.9.2, 4.10.1, 4.11.2.

Figure 5. The Relevance of Textbook Materials to the Basic Competence Three (Cognitive Domain)

I made a percentage form of the data analysis. I used a percentage of the textbook relevancy to cognitive domain. In total there were 31 materials included in the cognitive domain according to the 2013 curriculum standard of contents.

First, there are 23 materials which are relevant or around 74.19%. Second, there are 7 materials which are partly relevant or about 22.58%. Third, there is only one material or around 3.22% which is irrelevant to the cognitive domain.

According to those percentages, I concluded that the textbook fulfills around 74.19% materials which are relevant to the cognitive domain and able to cover the purposes of the topic, language features, and social functions of the ideal materials which are intended to be achieved by the students.

The Relevance of the Materials to the Psychomotor Domain

This is the second result analysis of materials based on basic competence four in Student English Book entitled *When English Rings a Bell*. The categorization of psychomotor level analysis has been done by referring to Simpson's (1972) taxonomy. Several activities or instructions did not use original action verb that was stated in Simpson (1972). Therefore, I should find the similar meaning of the textbook activities or instructions with action verbs that has been stated in the theory.

After I classified the materials in the textbook and found out its relevance to the psychomotor domain used the checklist instrument, I resumed the findings. Figure 6 shows the relevance of textbook materials to the basic competence four.

After I analyzed the data, I made percentage form of the data analysis. I used a percentage of the textbook relevancy to psychomotor domain. There were 31 materials which include in the psychomotor domain according to the 2013 curriculum standard of contents.

Firstly, there are 10 or around 32.25% of relevant materials. Secondly, there are also 10 or around 32.25% materials which are partly relevant. Lastly, there are 11 materials or around 35.48% which are irrelevant to the psychomotor domain.

According to those percentage, I concluded that the textbook only fulfilled around 32.25% materials which were relevant to the psychomotor domain and abled to cover the purposes of the topic, language features, and social functions of the materials which were intended to be achieved by the students.

The Relevance	The Basic Competence Four
Relevant	Sub-basic competence 4.5.1, 4.7.1, 4.8.1, 4.8.2, 4.10.2, 4.11.1, 4.11.3, 4.12.1, 4.12.2, 4.13.1.
Partly Relevant	Sub-basic competence 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.3.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.3, 4.4.1, 4.6.2, 4.7.2, 4.9.1, 4.9.3.
Irrelevant	Sub-basic competence 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 4.4.2, 4.4.3, 4.6.1, 4.6.3, 4.9.2, 4.10.1, 4.11.2.

Figure 6. The Relevance of Textbook Materials to the Basic Competence Four (Psychomotor Domain)

Discussion

According to those findings, I concluded that the textbook covered around 74.19% materials which are relevant with the cognitive domain and able to fulfill the purposes of the topic, language features, and social functions of the ideal materials which are intended to be achieved by the students.

The finding above has a great gap with the previous study by Kamila (2014). The researcher evaluated Bright textbook for grade seven of junior high school. The findings conveyed that the textbook covered 80% of relevant materials of cognitive domain. Similarly, Akbar (2016) also revealed that his study presented around 88% of relevant materials in the selected eleventh graders textbook. It emphasized that Kamila (2014) and Akbar (2016) findings have higher percentage of relevant materials rather than *When English Rings a Bell* textbook.

Besides, Chyntia (2013) also investigated *When English Rings a Bell* textbook for grade seven of junior high school based on 2013 English curriculum. The results of her study showed that the textbook covered around 53% of relevant materials. This confirmed that the textbook has lower percentage rather than my findings in terms of cognitive domain.

Furthermore, *When English Rings a Bell* textbook only applied around 32.25% materials which were relevant with the psychomotor domain and did not able to fulfill the purposes of guiding the students to use their psychomotor ability to create something with their creativity which should be achieved by the students according to the syllabus. This matched well with previous findings by Hashemnezhad and Maftoon (2011) and Tivany and Pusparini (2013). Their studies revealed that psychomotor domain were rarely used in the textbooks.

In contrast to the findings above, Kamila (2014) and Heriati (2017) conveyed that their studies applied 61% and 72% of relevant materials in terms of psychomotor domain. My findings do not support the previous studies in this area. In fact, unlike what was previously thought, I found that different textbook and grade of the school can differentiate the results of the research.

Moreover, I elaborated the data analysis by analyzing the level of each domain, especially cognitive and psychomotor. The analysis focused on action verbs of each domain which reflected their level. The findings shown that the most frequent level that was discovered in the textbook was remember level. Remember (C1) level used 9 action verbs. While, understand (C2) level has 5 action verbs. Apply (C3) level has 2 action verbs. Analyze (C4) level has 5 action verbs. Evaluate (C5) level has 2 action verb. And create (C6) level has 2 action verbs. Therefore, the total of low order thinking level (C1, C2, and C3) was 16 action verbs. Whereas, the total of the high order thinking level (C4, C5, and C6) was only 9 verbs. It can be concluded that the low order thinking level was used frequently rather than high order thinking skill in this textbook.

The results above shared a number similarities with Hashemnezhad and Maftoon (2011), Razmjoo and Kazempourfard (2012), Assaly and Igbaria (2014), Roohani et al. (2014) Abdelrahman (2014), Abu–Dabat (2014), Alfaki (2014), Zareian (2015), Assaly and Smadi (2015), and Ulum (2016) findings. Those studies also presented that the textbook applied a great numbers of low order thinking level than high order thinking level. Therefore, it can be illustrated that there is no significant difference between the previous studies and my study in terms of cognitive domain.

Whereas, the usage of high thinking level should be introduced in junior high school. According to Muhajir Effendy, the minister of education and culture of Indonesia, national examination applied 10% of high thinking level questions in 2018. Therefore, the high thinking level is really important for the students. They should be taught not only low thinking level activities, but also high level one. When they only try to answer the questions in low level, they will not accustomed to answer high level questions. Consequently, they may have trouble to answer high thinking level questions in national examination. For those reasons, the content of the textbook also should provide more high thinking level materials or activities. Hence, the students will be more understand about the activities in high thinking level.

The results also showed that the most level that was often discovered in the textbook was guided response level (P3). The frequency of these level were: perception (P1) level has 2 action verbs; set (P2) level has 1 action verb; guided response (P3) level has 6 action verbs; mechanism (P4) level has 2 action verbs; complex or overt (P5) level has 2 action verbs; adaptation (P6) level has 1 action verb; origination (P7) level has 2 action verbs. The total of these action verbs was 16.

The result above concurs well with Heriati's (2017) study. In her research, the total of action verbs in psychomotor domain was 11. On the other hand, there were 34 action verbs used in cognitive domain. Hashemnezhad and Maftoon (2011) also support this finding. Their study shown that there were 48 action verbs of psychomotor domain. Meanwhile, the total of action verbs in cognitive domain was 56. In summary, the number of psychomotor action verbs were not as much as cognitive domain. Therefore, this will impact in the process of teaching and learning. Because most of the level has rare action verbs as the instructions of doing in the teaching and learning materials of the textbook.

As already stated, 2013 curriculum emphasizes on affective, cognitive, and psychomotor domains. As a result, the application of psychomotor domain which focuses in students' skills should be balanced. The finding has shown that the most frequent action verb used was repeat (P3). It was used for 44 times in the textbook. It conveys that the textbook applied listening and speaking skill the most. However, in learning English the students should master listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills. Therefore, the application of psychomotor domain activity should be enhanced in the textbook. The students not only get the knowledge from the materials but also have a great skill in English.

CONCLUSION

After analyzing the data of materials of the textbook entitled *When English Rings a Bell* for eighth graders senior high school published by the Ministry of Education and Culture of Indonesia. I found the relevance of the relevance material based on basic competence curriculum in terms of cognitive and psychomotor domain.

In terms of the relevance of the materials in the English student book *When English Rings a Bell* with the core and basic competence three materials written in the English lesson syllabus for eighth graders of junior high school and the instruction of each material with the cognitive domain action verbs stated in Anderson and Krathwohl (2001), there were 23 materials in the book which were relevant or about 74.19 %, 7 materials which were partly relevant or about 22.58 %, and 1 material which was irrelevant or about 3.2%. According to those findings, I conclude that the textbook

covers around 74.19 % materials which were relevant with the cognitive domain and able to fulfill social functions of the ideal materials which are intended to be achieved by the students.

In terms of the relevance of the materials in the English student book *When English Rings a Bell* with the core and basic competence four materials written in the English lesson syllabus for eighth graders of junior high school and the instruction of each material with the psychomotor domain action verbs stated in Simpson (1972), there were 10 materials in the book which were relevant or about 32.25%, 10 materials which were partly relevant or about 32.25%, and 11 materials which were irrelevant or about 35.48%. According to those findings, I come to conclusion that the textbook only covers around 32.25 % materials which were relevant with the psychomotor domain. It can fulfill the purposes of guiding the students to use their psychomotor ability to create something with their creativity which should be achieved by the students according to the syllabus.

After conducting the analysis, I provide some suggestion for the book writer, the book user, government, and other researchers as follows. The writer of this book should develop and improve the materials written in the book both in terms of cognitive and psychomotor domains because the materials in the book just have around 74.19% relevancy to the Anderson and Krathwohl's (2001) taxonomy cognitive domain and basic competence three of the English syllabus and about 32.25% relevancy to the Simpson's (1972) taxonomy psychomotor domain basic competence four of the English lesson syllabus.

I also suggest the book users to look for other source of materials which can complete the materials in this book. I also recommend that if the book users use this book as their main source or learning, they should have a complement source of learning in order to get the complete explanation of the materials.

The government also should give the teacher and students enough materials to learn and evaluate the teaching and learning process in the school. If the teachers and students did not enough source of learning, the government should help them to cover it. The further researchers who are interested to conduct a study in the same field as I did, I recommend them to analyze other terms in the same textbook. They also can investigate the other textbook related to the 2013 curriculum with the same or different terms.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abdelrahman, M. (2014). An Analysis of the Tenth Grade English Language Textbooks Questions in Jordan Based on the Revised Edition of Bloom's Taxonomy. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 5(18), 139–151. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/301205529%0AAAn>
- Anderson, L., W, Krathwohl., David, R., Airasian,. Peter, W, et al. (2001). *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision on Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Akbar, R. (2016). An Analysis of Selected Eleventh Grade English Textbook. *Journal of English and Education*, 4(1), 109–126.
- Al-ghazo, A., and Smadi, O. M. (2013). A Content Analysis of the English Reading Text's Authenticity in Student's Book of Action Pack Eleven in Jordan. *European Scientific Journal*, 9(29), 342–359. <https://doi.org/1857-7431>
- Al-Mashaqba, N. J. H. (2017). Micro and Macro Content Analysis of English Textbook Entitled “Mosaic One Listening and Speaking (Student's Book)” in The Light of Communicative Competence. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 8(2), 41–47. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.8n.2p.41>

- Alavinia, P., and Siyadat, M. (2013). A Comparative Study of English Textbooks Used in Iranian Institutes. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, 3(1), 150–170. Retrieved from <http://www.pakinsight.com/pdf-files/150-170.pdf>
- Assaly, I., and Igharia, A. K. (2014). A Content Analysis of the Reading and Listening Activities in the EFL Textbook of Master Class, 3(2), 24–38. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.edu.20140302.11>
- Hashemnezhad, H., and Maftoon, P. (2011). An Evaluation of English Language Grammar for College Students: An EAP Coursebook Evaluation. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 1(2), 106–114. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v1n2p106>
- Hamalik, O. (2006). *Proses Belajar Mengajar*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Instrumen Penilaian Buku Teks Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris Tahun 2014 BSNP. Available at: <http://bsnp-indonesia.org/2014/05/28/instrumen-penilaianbuku-teks-pelajaran-tahun-2014/> [retrieved 01/30/17]
- Ismawati, E. 2015. *Telaah Kurikulum dan Pengembangan Bahan Ajar*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Ombak.
- Kamila, H. (2014). A Study on the Relevance of Materials in English Textbook “Bright” for Seventh Graders of Junior High School Published by Erlangga to 2013 Curriculum. *RETAIN. 2 (2)*. Available at <http://ejournal.unesa.ac.id/jurnal/retain/abstrak/7520/a-study-ontherelevance-ofmaterials-in-english-textbook-bright-for-seventh-graders-ofjunior-high-schoolpublished-by-erlangga-to-2013-curriculum> Keban, N.
- Keban, N. V., Muhtar, A., and Zen, E. L. (2012). *A Content Analysis on English for Kids Grade 3, A Textbook Used in Elementary Schools in Malang*. State University of Malang.
- Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. 2017. *Bahasa Inggris “When English Rings a Bell” Kelas VIII*. Jakarta : Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Kurniasih, I and Berlin, S. 2014. *Implementasi Kurikulum 2013: Konsep and Penerapan*. Surabaya: Katapena
- Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques (Second Edition)*. New Age International Publishers: New Delhi.
- Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative Researching Second Edition*. SAGE Publications: London.
- Mulyoto. 2013. *Strategi Pembelajaran di Era Kurikulum 2013*. Jakarta: Prestasi Pustaka.
- Muzamiroh, L. 2013. *Kupas Tuntas Kurikulum 2013*. Surabaya: Katapena.
- Nasution, S. 2008. *Asas- Asas Kurikulum*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara
- Nazaruddin, R. (2017). Content Analysis Speaking Materials in English Textbook Based on 2013 Curriculum for The First Grade Student. *Journal of English Education and Development Volume*, 1(1), 49–56.
- Nazeer, M., Shah, K., and Sarwat, Z. (2015). Evaluation of Oxon English Textbook Used in Pakistan Public Schools for 6 th and 7 th Grade. *Journal for the Study of English Linguistics*, 3(1), 51–79. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jsel.v3i1.7778>
- Poerwati, E., Loelock., and S, Amri. (2013). *Panduan Memahami Kurikulum 2013*. Jakarta: Prestasi Pustaka Publisher.

- Purwani, A., Rochsantiningsih, D., and Kristina, D. (2017). A Content Analysis of Bright 1: A 2013 Curriculum-Based Textbook for VII Grade Students. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research (ASSEHR)*, 158(Ictte), 88–100.
- Roohani, A., Taheri, F., and Poorzangeneh, M. (2014). Evaluating Four Corners Textbooks in Terms of Cognitive Processes Using Bloom ' s Revised Taxonomy. *RALs*, 4(2), 51–67.
- Sitepu, B, P. (2012). *Penulisan Buku Teks Pelajaran*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Stemler, S. An introduction to content analysis. Available at: <https://www.ericdigests.org/2002-2/content.htm> [retrieved 01/31/17]
- Sugiyono. (2009). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R and D* .Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Tarigan, H. Guntur and D. Tarigan. (2009). *Telaah Buku Teks Bahasa Indonesia*. Bandung: Angkasa
- Wahab, M. (2013). Developing an English Language Textbook Evaluative Checklist. *IOSR Journal of Research and Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)*, 1(3), 55–70. Retrieved from www.iosrjournals.org
- Wen-cheng, W., Chien-hung, L., and Chung-chieh, L. (2011). Thinking of the Textbook in the ESL / EFL Classroom. *Canadian Center of Science and Education*, 4(2), 91–96. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n2p91>
- Zareian, G. (2015). An Evaluation of Questions in Two ESP Coursebooks Based on Bloom ' s New. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 3(8), 313–326.