Module and Lesson Unit Templates in the Course Book *English in Mind*: A Content Analysis

Joseph Emmanuel Krisdian[1], Fransiscus Xaverius Mukarto[2], and Laurensius Albertus Chandra Yuniarto[3]
[1,2,3]Sanata Dharma University, Indonesia
correspondence: joseph.e.krisdian@gmail.com
https://doi.org/10.24071/ijels.v8i2.5906
received 5 July 2022; accepted 30 September 2022

ABSTRACT

Using coursebooks in language learning is a crucial means of obtaining knowledge. This study focused on Indonesia, delves into examining the first edition of Cambridge University Press's English in Mind: Student's Starter Book through content analysis. The research objective is to uncover the book's module and lesson unit templates. The analysis concentrates on two of the four modules and their accompanying lesson units. Findings indicate that the module template is consistent and includes three significant components: topics and learning outcomes, lesson units, and assessment. The template for lesson units, however, displays a certain degree of variability regarding the number of sections and the content of learning tasks. This variance arises from the necessary scaffolding processes to achieve the unit's intended learning outcomes. Examining coursebook content through content analysis is crucial in understanding the language learning process and determining the effectiveness of instructional materials. In conclusion, the results of this study contribute to the advancement of language education by highlighting the significance of coursebook analysis in evaluating the quality and consistency of language instructional materials.

Keywords: backward design, content analysis, lesson unit template, scaffolding

INTRODUCTION

Adherence to coursebooks by teachers is vital for the adequate preparation and delivery of instructional materials. While coursebooks offer convenience and ease in teaching and learning, the absence of instructional design principles and strategies may lead to a misunderstanding of differentiated instruction as individualized learning. This may result in excessive time and effort to create unique materials for each student. To avoid this, instructional design principles and strategies are crucial in developing efficient differentiated instruction.

As defined by Smith and Ragan (2005), instructional design is a systematic and reflective process that incorporates principles of learning and instruction into the development of instructional materials, activities, information resources, and evaluations. The instructional design process is comprised of two fundamental components: instructional design principles and instructional design strategies. These elements are crucial in shaping a practical teaching approach (Rhonda & Akane, 2018).

Tomlinson (2014a) asserts that a teacher's unwavering belief in students' potential, understanding of learners and learning, and practical classroom experience are integral factors in developing effective differentiated instruction. As Chen et al. (2018) defined, instructional design strategy constitutes a set of methods to achieve a specific instructional goal. Chapman

and King (2009) further posit that instructional design strategies are procedures used to apply principles to classroom practice.

Thus, while instructional design principles encompass beliefs, knowledge, and practical experience, instructional design strategies link these principles and real-world classroom implementation. Guided by these principles and strategies, teachers can effectively incorporate materials and organize activities that align with the classroom environment and students' backgrounds, providing students with optimal learning experiences.

Studies on classroom practices have examined various strategies, but research on instructional design strategies in Same Course Content, Differentiated Instruction has remained limited (Dixon et al., 2014; Lin, 2021; Tao, 2005). Wang (2021) and Gao (2021) presented a set of instructional design strategies, while Li et al. (2020) compiled a list from recent studies in the field between 2010 and 2019. However, determining the most effective strategies and their transferability across similar educational contexts remains unexplored. Further, systematically synthesizing instructional design strategies has yet to be thoroughly investigated. The impact of effective differentiated instructional designs on student learning outcomes, motivation, and enthusiasm has been documented in previous studies (Linnerbrink-Garcia et al., 2016) and is significant in education (Chen, 2021; Lin, 2021).

In Indonesian high schools, English coursebooks are founded upon the English syllabus, and lessons are structured using teaching learning templates in the enacted curriculum. The 2013 curriculum incorporates a scientific approach for all subjects, including English. Numerous coursebooks aligned with the 2013 curriculum are accessible, while those based on Kurikulum Merdeka remain scarce. The present study endeavors to assess whether the 2013 curriculum-based English coursebooks adopt lesson unit templates rooted in the scientific approach.

The examination of a coursebook requires careful consideration of several vital aspects. One such aspect is book mapping, which illustrates and clarifies the organization of materials within the coursebook. As Tomlinson (2003) notes, a coursebook serves as a guide for teachers and learners, enabling them to anticipate and reflect upon the content of lessons. This structure knowledge is valuable for teachers in preparing relevant inputs and practices and for learners in understanding the skills to be acquired in a given course.

The initial focus of coursebook analysis centered primarily on the publication's layout. Neglecting examination of the lesson templates, this study aims to analyze the consistency and structure of the coursebook's templates.

The present study examines the coursebook, "English in Mind: Starter Edition" by Herbert Puchta. The book offers ample resources for instructional and learning activities in the classroom. Examining the arrangement and objective of these materials provides insight into the author's structural design of the coursebook, offering guidance for future educators to create lesson coursebooks for their classrooms.

The research aims to explore two central questions: 1) What are the learning experiences conveyed through the coursebook? and 2) How is the structure of these learning experiences organized within the book? By examining these questions, the research endeavors to comprehend the intended design of the coursebook as a tool for classroom instruction. To address these questions, several theories will be employed to support the inquiry.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Module and Lesson Unit Template: A Visual Representation of Content

Module and lesson unit templates provide a visual representation of a book's content and learning tasks, providing ease in analyzing its structure. An English coursebook may contain modules and each module consists of several lesson units. When a coursebook contains several modules, the modules are structured consistently so that they can provide a visual representation of the content: the learning outcomes, how the learning outcomes are achieved, and how the achievement of the learning outcomes are assessed. The learning outcomes of the modules are achieved.

Designing or selecting coursebooks with consideration for meeting teacher expectations, student needs, and course objectives is crucial, as textbooks impact not only teachers and students but also the dynamics of the classroom. As noted by Sarem et al. (2013), textbooks, teachers, and students are considered the three critical components in the education process, with the structure of coursebooks affecting learning flow and classroom dynamics.

The choice of language teaching materials also dramatically impacts the quality of teaching-learning. David Williams (1983) established a criterion for textbook evaluation based on four assumptions: up-to-date methodology, guidance for non-native teachers, needs of second language learners, and relevance to socio-cultural environment. This criterion can be expanded into a checklist of elements in a coursebook, including general materials, speech, grammar, vocabulary, reading, writing, and technical materials.

However, teachers need to be adaptable to various issues in English Language Teaching, with each teacher potentially having unique views on the presentation of teaching materials. Ultimately, coursebook analysis requires a teacher's assessment of the validity of the evaluation criteria or checklist present in the book.

Banathy's Instructional System Design and Backward Design

In 1968, Bela Banathy published one of the earliest works dedicated to Instructional System Design (ISD). Banathy's approach aligns closely with the ADDIE model, as it involves steps such as formulating objectives, building a criterion test, analyzing the learning problem, designing the training or learning system, implementing and testing the output, and modifying for improvement (Banathy, 1968). Banathy's ISD model is unique in that it emphasizes the development of the criterion test immediately after the creation of the objectives.

Banathy asserts that systems have a purpose, process, and content and that the order of these components reflects their priority. He notes that the ultimate goal of an educational system is learning, not instruction, and scheduling should be flexible to accommodate varying learning rates (Banathy, 1968). Banathy's multi-directional approach incorporates feed-forward strategies for choosing learning events in addition to feedback. This makes educational systems dynamic rather than linear, according to the author.

Backward Design, introduced by Wiggins and McTighe (1998) in Understanding by Design, similarly prioritizes learning outcomes. This approach encourages intentionality in the instructional design process and repeatedly prompts teachers to clarify the goal of a task before incorporating it into their curriculum. As a result, Backward Design is a valuable tool for developing lesson plans, instructional modules, and entire courses. It makes it easier for instructors to create evaluations based on grounded learning outcomes.

The application of Backward Design also supports clear and concise instruction. Teachers who clearly state the course's learning objectives will better understand what they want their students to gain from the learning activities. Furthermore, this approach eliminates the potential for performing tasks or duties without purpose, as every assignment and instruction aligns with the course's overall objectives. Wiggins and McTighe (1998) argue that Backward Design involves three stages: identifying desired results, determining acceptable evidence, and planning the learning experience and instruction.

The Zone of Proximal Development and Scaffolding: An Overview

The Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), theorized by psychologist Lev Vygotsky, constitutes a seminal concept in Vygotskian socio-cultural psychology. The ZPD refers to the range of abilities an individual can perform with the guidance of an expert but is not yet capable of performing independently. The concept was first proposed in the context of psychological testing in schools and was later developed to include the realm of classroom and learning settings. Vygotsky's view of the ZPD emphasized the significance of considering an

individual's potential for development rather than just their current level of achievement. The ZPD, as described by Vygotsky, is the distance between what a person can do with and without help. The term "proximal" indicates the proximity of the assistance provided to the learner's current competence.

The ZPD is integral to Vygotsky's more extensive theory, and its significance can be fully appreciated only within that context. A failure to grasp the interconnections between the ZPD and Vygotsky's theory could lead to confusion with any instructional technique that involves guidance by an expert. Vygotsky's position on the relationship between education and development was that education should not merely follow but rather anticipate and guide the child's development. The distance between an individual's ability to perform a task independently and with assistance indicates the stages of their development, which may differ among individuals. Thus, the instructor plays a crucial role in shifting the learner's thoughts and abilities from one level to the next.

In language learning, backward design methods have been demonstrated to provide a valuable framework for curriculum planning. The backward design model has been shown to support teachers in setting curricular priorities, organizing learning outcomes, increasing student understanding, and monitoring student achievement. In addition, the backward design model provides opportunities for teachers to reflect on their pedagogical practice and make necessary improvements in future contexts. A unit plan based on the backward design model typically incorporates three main aspects: identifying desired outcomes, determining acceptable evidence, and designing the learning experience and instruction. The successful application of the backward design model can help teachers achieve language curriculum articulation and facilitate performance transfer.

In conclusion, the ZPD is a crucial concept in Vygotskian socio-cultural psychology, and its significance extends to education and language learning. The backward design model provides a valuable framework for curriculum planning that can support teachers in facilitating student development and performance transfer. Any function within the ZPD matures due to the interaction between the individual and their environment, guided by an expert. Through this interaction, the individual moves from dependence to independence.

METHOD

In this study, a content analysis was employed as the research methodology. Recognized as a qualitative research technique, content analysis summarizes content by quantifying various aspects of the material (Mihailescu, 2019). Berelson (1952) highlights content analysis's objective and systematic nature, with its clear-cut rules guiding researchers to obtain consistent results from the same data. According to Harwood and Garry (2003), content analysis dates to the 19th century, when it was used to analyze newspapers, magazines, advertisements, hymns, and political speeches. Since then, its application has expanded across the social sciences, arts, and humanities. Content analysis can be applied to analyze five types of texts: written, oral, iconic, audio-visual, and hypertext.

For this study, the first edition of the course book "English in Mind: Student Book Starter," written by Herbert Puchta and Jeff Stranks and published by Cambridge University Press, served as the document under examination. Although the series consists of six books, the analysis was limited to the Student Book Starter alone. Out of the four modules in the book, only modules 1 and 4 were selected for analysis—the first analysis focused on the modules' structure, specifically the modules' template. The second analysis examined the templates of the lesson units, including (1) the learning experiences represented by the main sections in the lesson units and (2) the language skills and elements presented in the units. To avoid results that are too general, the analysis was further extended to include the learning tasks within each main section of the units. The results, presented in the form of tables, offer an overview of the template of the lesson units at a global level.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of the study was to determine the structural layout of the modules and the lesson units. This was accomplished by examining (1) the arrangement of the sections or learning tasks and (2) the language skills and elements present in each lesson unit. The research aimed to uncover the underlying template of the modules and the lesson units to enhance understanding of the coursebook's pedagogical design.

Template of the Modules

Adopting a backward design approach, the course book's modules comprise three fundamental sections: learning objectives, lesson units, and evaluation. Commencing with the desired results, in the form of can-do statements that outline the expected competencies in the four language skills, the learning objectives are to be realized through the learning experiences provided in the lesson units. The final section of the module, the evaluation, assesses the learners' progress toward achieving the learning objectives, offering them an opportunity to reflect on their advancement after completing the four lesson units in the module.

The learning objectives in the modules are articulated as can-do statements or basic competencies. However, the can-do statements for speaking are framed differently from those for writing, reading, and listening, as illustrated in Table 1. Samples from both Module 1 and Module 4 are displayed.

Table 1. Learning outcomes (pp. 6 and 80)

Learning Outcomes			
Speaking	Writing	Reading	Listening
• Introduce yourself • Ask for words in English • Talk about famous people • Interview a partner about things they do	• Write a telephone message • Write a letter about yourself • Write an email about a holiday • Write a story about a strange place	• Read a dialog in a game show • Read an interview with a singer • Read an article about John Lennon • Read a text about Florence Nightingale	• Listen to a telephone message • Listen to a game show • Listen to a dialogue about Beatle • Listen to an interview about Lord Lucan

The formulation of the learning outcomes for speaking begins with verbs associated with oral communication, such as "introduce," "talk," and "interview," followed by contents or topics. Conversely, the writing, reading, and listening skills commence with the verbs "write," "read," and "listen," respectively, followed by the subject matter.

Each module's second component consists of four lesson units, each offering a set of learning tasks or experiences. Banathy's principle holds that the learning objectives dictate the learning tasks and, therefore, the student's attainment of desired results. The analysis of the lesson units is detailed in the subsequent section.

The final component of the module serves as an evaluation tool for determining the student's progress. A rubric is included to enable students or users of the book to assess their advancement.

Total Score ☐☐	☺ Very good	😐 OK	☹ Not very good
Grammar	17-24	13-16	Less than 13
Vocabulary	22-26	18-21	Less than 18
Everyday English	3-5	2	Less than 2

Assessing the achievement of language skills such as speaking, listening, reading, and writing is not the sole focus of the assessment instrument. The instrument, "Checking your progress," measures the student's understanding of grammar, vocabulary, and everyday English. Ideally, all learning outcomes would be evaluated. However, evaluating performance is more complex than assessing language elements, and, as a result, only progress in grammar, vocabulary, and everyday English mastery is assessed.

Template of Lesson Units

In addressing the second research question, the focus is on the structure of the lesson units, defined as the main components. Adhering to the principles of backward design or instructional system design, the lesson units are crafted to align with the learning outcomes outlined in the modules. Engaging learners in these learning experiences are crucial to attaining these learning outcomes.

The sections within the lesson units encompass a range of components, including Listening (L), Speaking (S), Reading (R), Writing (W), Reading and Listening (RL), Listening and Speaking (LS), Listening and Writing (LW), Grammar (G), Vocabulary (V), Pronunciation (P), Vocabulary and Speaking (VS), and Everyday English (EE). These sections encompass language skills, language elements, and combinations of language skills and elements such as grammar and speaking and vocabulary and speaking.

Table 2. Lesson unit template

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Module 1 Unit 1	RL	V	G	P	V	L	V	RL	EE	LW	
Module 1 Unit 2	RL	G	V	G	P	V	G	S	L	W	
Module 1 Unit 3	RL	G	V	GS	G	P	LS	RL	EE	W	
Module 1 Unit 4	RL	G	P	S	V	G	S	L	R	W	
Module 4 Unit 13	RL	G	P	VS	L	V	RL	EE	W		
Module 4 Unit 14	RL	G	P	L	G	P	V	R	W		
Module 4 Unit 15	RL	G	G	S	R	V	P	L	RL	EE	W
Module 4 Unit 16	RL	V	P	S	R	V	S	R	W		

Table 2 displays variations in section distribution among the lesson units. Most units contain ten sections, except four units in module 4, which exhibit varying section counts-- three units with nine sections and one with eleven. The opening section of all units is Reading and Listening, but subsequent sections differ in composition. Subsequent sections often comprise language components, such as grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation, yet they are not evenly distributed. Specifically, the frequency of Vocabulary, Grammar, and Pronunciation is 4, 8, and 3, respectively. The fourth section exhibits further variability, incorporating tasks ranging from language elements, Pronunciation, and Grammar to language skills Speaking and Listening, and even combinations of language elements and skills-- Grammar and Speaking, and Vocabulary and Speaking. This pattern of variability is consistent throughout the remaining sections, which exhibit varying headings and tasks.

Table 3. Frequency of headings

	L	S	R	W	G	V	P	RL	LS	LW	GS	VS	EE
Module 1 Unit 1	1				1	3	1	2		1			1
Module 1 Unit 2	1	1		1	3	2	1	1					
Module 1 Unit 3				1	2	1	1	2	1		1		1
Module 1 Unit 4	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1					
Module 4 Unit 13	1			1	1	1	1	2				1	1
Module 4 Unit 14	1		1	1	2	1	2	1					
Module 4 Unit 15	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2					1
Module 4 Unit 16		2	2	1		1	2	1					

The frequency distribution of the lesson unit headings or tasks is shown in Table 3. Variations in types of tasks or headings range from 6 in Unit 16 to 9 in Unit 15. Unit 16, for instance, encompasses 9 sections, including two for speaking, two for reading, one for writing, one for vocabulary, two for pronunciation, and one for reading and listening. On the other hand, Unit 15 presents 11 sections: one for listening, speaking, reading, writing, vocabulary, pronunciation, everyday English, and two for grammar and, reading, and listening. Inconsistencies in the number of sections and the sequencing of learning tasks do not imply a lack of a clear template in the lesson units. Instead, instructional materials need proper sequencing to provide scaffolding to assist learners in moving step by step through the zone of proximal development.

In this study, the sections tallied in the units are merely the headings of the learning tasks. Each section encompasses more detailed learning tasks that help students grasp the learning materials. For example, Unit 1 includes two vocabulary sections. The first focuses on single vocabulary items and classroom objects. Students begin by asking for the English word and proceed to write the English words, then practice asking and answering questions about the classroom objects. The instructional materials are carefully scaffolded to enable students to engage in transactional interactions in English.

The curriculum presented in the lesson units showcases a consistent approach to the design of the activities. Each unit commences with reading and listening activities, followed by writing tasks that serve as the culminating point. This consistent format is evident throughout all units in the book.

The unit sessions offer a comprehensive and rich learning experience beyond what might be suggested by their title. For instance, Unit 1's reading and listening session is designed to incorporate matching labels and pictures, repetition of words, indirect speaking, and vocabulary acquisition. Despite this, reading and listening remain the primary focus of these sessions.

To provide clarity and direction, the learning outcomes of each module are outlined in two-page introductions found at the beginning of each module. These introductions enumerate speaking, reading, writing, listening, vocabulary, and grammar objectives. This structure benefits teachers and students as they prepare for the upcoming materials.

While the overall structure of the learning experience is characterized by consistency, there are deviations, as evidenced by the varying number of sessions in modules 2 and 4, in contrast to modules 1 and 3, which offer ten sessions per unit. However, the consistent sequence remains unchanged, beginning with reading/listening and culminating with writing.

The lesson units demonstrate the use of scaffolding, evident in the reduction of total activities in modules 4 to 44 and the reduction of listening activities in 9. In contrast, pronunciation and writing activities remain stable, with four activities in each module. This showcases a deliberate effort to adjust the learning experience to suit the students' levels and needs as they progress.

The book's focus on classroom activities encourages active learning through student-teacher interaction, an intentional design aspect of the coursebook. Additionally, social interaction plays a crucial role in student success, fostering character development and providing a well-rounded educational experience.

The provision of a consistent, structured, and scaffolded learning experience is a testament to the effectiveness of the coursebook. The blend of classroom activities, student-teacher interaction, and social interaction provides a comprehensive and engaging learning environment tailored to suit the needs and abilities of the students.

In conclusion, the design and implementation of the lesson units provide a comprehensive and engaging learning experience that leverages a consistent format, structured learning outcomes, and scaffolded activities. This, combined with the focus on classroom

activities, student-teacher interaction, and social interaction, offers a well-rounded and practical educational experience.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the lesson units in the coursebook offer a consistent structure for the student's learning experience. The template begins with reading and listening activities, followed by a writing activity, allowing for the consolidation of various language skills. The scaffolding of the materials is evident in their ability to adjust to the student's needs and levels as they progress through the course.

Additionally, the coursebook provides a wealth of content to aid learning. This includes valuable learning materials, engaging color and imagery, and opportunities for independent learning. The author's focus on creating an active learning environment is evident through the incorporation of classroom activities and the consideration of social interaction in the design of the coursebook.

As a starter handbook, the book is a comprehensive resource for students to learn and improve their language skills effectively. The scaffolding and consistent structure of the materials provide a solid foundation for their language development, while the engaging content and opportunities for independent learning encourage their progress and growth.

REFERENCES

Ahmadi, A., & Derakhshan, A. (2016). EFL teachers' perceptions towards textbook evaluation. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 6*(2), 260-266. https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.6.2.260-266

Banathy, B. H. (1968). *Instructional systems*. Belmont, CA: Fearon Publishers.

Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Bowen, R. S. (2017). Understanding by design. Retrieved from https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/understanding-by-design/

Bruner, J. S. (1984). Vygotsky's zone of proximal development: The hidden agenda. *New Directions for Child Development, 23*, 93–97. https://doi.org/10.1002/cd.23219842309

Chapman, C., & King, R. (2009). *Instructional strategies and activities for the differentiated writing classroom.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452219462.n5

Chen, L. (2018). Study on the current situation of heterogeneous age teaching in non-major subjects: A case study of an experimental primary school. *School Administrators, 113,* 119–138. https://doi.org/10.3966/160683002018010113008

Cole, M., & Cole, S. (2001). *The development of children* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Scientific American Books, Distributed by W.N. Freeman and Company.

Demir, Y., & Ertas, A. (2014). A suggested eclectic checklist for ELT coursebook evaluation. *Reading, 14*(2), 243-252. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.read.2014.01.005

Dixon, F. A., Yssel, N., McConnell, J. M., & Hardin, T. (2014). Differentiated instruction, professional development, and teacher efficacy. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 37*(2), 181-199. https://doi.org/10.1177/0162353294350133

Drisko, J. W., & Maschi, T. (2016). *Content analysis.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fox, B. E., & Doherty, J. J. (2012). Design to learn, learn to design: Using backward design for information literacy instruction. *Communications in Information Literacy, 5*(2), 144-155. https://doi.org/10.15760/comminfolit.2012.5.2.109

Gao, K. (2021). Research on differentiated education of career planning under the background of "million enrollment expansion". *Status and Security Journal, 21*(7), 65-66.

Handayani, S. (2016). The evaluation of English textbook for grade VII of junior high school in Indonesia. *Proceedings of ISELT FBS Universitas Negeri Padang, 4*(2), 328-339.

Hanuscin, D. L., & Lee, D. (2008). Using the learning cycle as a model for teaching the learning cycle to preservice elementary teachers. *Journal of Elementary Science Education, 20,* 51-66. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03173670

Harwood, T. G., & Garry, T. (2003). An overview of content analysis. *The Marketing Review, 3*(4), 479-498.

Kayapinar, U. (2009). Coursebook evaluation by English teachers. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 10*(1), 69-78.

Kilickaya, O. (2018). Pre-service English teachers' views on coursebook evaluation and designing supplementary materials. *Kastamonu Education Journal, 27*(2), 523-536. https://doi.org/10.24106/kefdergi.2574

Krippendorff, K. (2018). Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Li, H., & Li, X. (2020). Rural and urban general education teachers' instructional strategies in inclusive classrooms in China: A dual system perspective. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 27*(1), 72-88. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2020.1821796

Lin, C. (2021). Do different routes go the same way?. *Tian Jin Education Journal, 21*(17), 57-58.

Linnenbrink-Garcia, L., Patall, E. A., & Pekrun, R. (2016). Adaptive motivation and emotion in education: Research and principles for instructional design. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 3*(2), 228-236.

Mihailescu, M. (2019). Content analysis: A digital method. http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.21296.61441

Mukundan, J., Hajimohammadi, R., & Nimehchisalem, V. (2011). Developing an English language textbook evaluation checklist. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research (CIER), 4*(6), 21-28.

Neuendorf, K. A. (2017). *The content analysis guidebook.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Puchta, H., & Jefferies, J. (2004). *English in mind: Student's book starter*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rhonda, B., & Akane, Z. (2018). Step 4: Shop adjustments—help. In *Differentiated Instruction Made Practical* (pp. 87-107). Oxfordshire: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351248471-8

Sarem, S. N., Hamidi, H., & Mahmoudie, R. (2013). A critical look at textbook evaluation: A case study of evaluating an ESP coursebook: English for international tourism. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences, 4*(2), 372-380.

Scribani, J. (2022, November 1). How to create an effective course outline (+template). Thinkific Blog. Retrieved from https://www.thinkific.com/blog/how-to-create-an-effective-course-outline/

Shvarts, A., & Bakker, A. (2019). The early history of the scaffolding metaphor: Bernstein, Luria, Vygotsky, and before. *Mind, Culture, and Activity, 26*(1), 4-23. https://doi.org/10.1080/10749039.2019.1574306

Stemler, S. (2000). An overview of content analysis. *Practical assessment, research, and evaluation, 7*(1), 1-6.

Tomlinson, B. (2010). Principles of effective materials development". Harwood (Ed.), *English language teaching materials: Theory and practice* (pp. 81–108). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tsiplakides, I. (2011). Selecting an English coursebook: Theory and practice. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 1*(7), 758-764. https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.1.7.758-764

Walker, R. (2013, October 3). What makes a good coursebook?. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://oupeltglobalblog.com/2013/10/03/what-makes-a-good-coursebook/

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (1998). Backward design. In *Understanding by design* (pp. 13-34). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Williams, D. (1983). Developing criteria for textbook evaluation. *ELT journal, 37*(3), 251-255.

Woodrow, L. (2018). Introducing course design in English for specific purposes (Vol. 184). London: Routledge.

Zaretskii, V. K. (2009). The zone of proximal development: What Vygotsky did not have time to write. *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology*, *47*(6), 70–93. https://doi.org/10.2753/RPO1061-0405470604

Zohrabi. (2010). Coursebook development and evaluation for English for general purposes course. *English Language Teaching, 4*(2), 213-222. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n2p213