

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

After considering all of the information in previous chapter, the agreement statement will make in this chapter, exactly in the point of conclusion. And the suggestion for certain subject also discusses in this chapter.

A. Conclusion

After doing a piece of evaluation unit using revised Bloom's Taxonomy approaches on the exercise in '*Intensive English course book 1*'. The results of the study showed that, the codified data reflected six level of cognitive process dimension in revised Bloom's taxonomy (remember, understand, apply, analyze, evaluate, and create).

However, the allocation of codes was imbalance. Some of the codes had more score than other, then other got a few, and some was lost. It was found that level which was frequently occur was level 'understand' in the realm of factual, conceptual, and procedural knowledge dimension or in the coding scheme, namely (A2, B2, and C2) respectively. Moreover no items of exercises were in the level with metacognitive dimension area.

In conclusion, level understand as the focus target in *Intensive English course book 1* present the cognitive process used to transfer. Mayer's study (as cited in Krathwohl, 2002) state that if you wish to expand your focus by finding

ways to foster and assess meaningful learning, you need to emphasize those cognitive processes that go beyond remember.

B. Suggestion

The researcher would like to propose some suggestion as a result of practical textbook evaluation based on Revised Bloom's taxonomy that might be useful for related people.

1. Even, the result of this study implied the lower order thinking skill of revised Bloom's taxonomy, it does not mean that this textbook have low standard in presenting the subject material, giving any activities or exercise relates or have failed to develop higher order thinking skill. We have to note that the six cognitive process dimension in Revised Bloom's taxonomy (remember, understand, apply, analyze, evaluate, and create) is a process of individual's thinking and every of us ever passed the lower category before moved to higher category. As Kauchak & Eggan's study (as cited in King, Goodson, and Rohani) point out that Start with lower-order questions, remediating as needed, and lead up to higher-order questions. In addition, standardization of material included in this textbook is based on long experience. So the good criteria must be considered by the team's writer.
2. If there is a need to focus more on the higher order thinking skill and students must be situated in this area and does, it reflects great quality of thinking and respond to a difficulty problem can raised the intellectuality, as Gordon's

study (as cited in Zareian, et al., 2015) state that focus on the higher-order cognitive processes can help students contribute more effectively and intellectually in the topic. Introduce and facilitate the student around this area is very important. But, again all of the processes have to be satisfied.

3. Based on the result, Metacognitive of knowledge dimension in all cognitive process dimensions is not available at all. It is better for teacher to introduce the criteria of Metacognitive to the students with other sources.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, W., Krathwohl, R., Airasian, W., Cruikshank, A., Mayer, R., Pintrich, R., Raths, J., & Wittrock, C. *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. New York: Longman.
- Askaripour, Seyyed Abdol A. (2014). A Textbook Evaluation of New Version (2nd edition) of "Top Notch English Series". *English for Specific Purposes World*, Vol. 15.
- Baškarada, S. (2014). Qualitative Case Study Guidelines. *The Qualitative Report*, 19(40), 1-18. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol19/iss40/3>
- Derico, Hidayat U, Guimba, Wardah D, and Alico, Jerryk C. (2018), Learning Competencies of Two Science Textbooks for Grade 9: A Comparative Content Analysis Based on Bloom's Revised Taxonomy of Cognitive Domain. In: *Education Quarterly Reviews*, Vol.1, No.2, 254-267.
- Ebadi, S., Mozafari, V. (2016). Exploring Revised Bloom's taxonomy of Educational Objectives in TPSOL Textbooks. *Journal of Teaching Persian to Speakers of Other Languages*, 5
- Gordani, Y. (2010). An Analysis of English Textbooks Used at Iranian Guidance Schools in Terms of Bloom's Taxonomy. *The Journal of ASIA TEFL*, 7(2), 249-278.
- Harrison, J., Dikken, O., Peer, V. D. (2017). *Question Classification According to Revised Bloom's taxonomy*. (Bachelor, Delft University of technology, Holland) Retrieved from <http://repository.tudelft.nl/>
- King, FJ, Goodson, L., Rohani, F. Higher Order Thinking Skills: Definition, Teaching Strategies, Assessment. www.cala.fsu.edu
- Krathwohl, D. R. (2002). A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy: An overview. *Theory into Practice*, 41(4), 212- 218. Retrieved from Marksberry, M., (1963). *Foundations of creativity*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Litz, David R. A. (2005) Textbook Evaluation and ELT Management: A South Korean Case Study. *ASIAN EFL Journal*, 48, 1-53. Retrieved from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/Litz_thesis.pdf

- Mizbani, M., and Chalak, A. (2017). "Analyze Listening and Speaking Activities of Iranian EFL Textbook Prospect 3 Through Revised Bloom's Taxonomy." *Advances in Language and Literacy Studies*, 1- 6.
- Mizbani, M., and Chalak, A. (2017). "Analyze Reading and Writing Activities of Iranian EFL Textbook Prospect 3 Based on Revised Bloom's taxonomy." *Journal of Applied Linguistic and Language Research*, 1-15.
- Muchlis (2015). An analysis of Thinking Order of Reading Comprehension Questions in English Textbook for Young Foresters of Forestry Vocational School of Samarinda. *Jurnal Naral Pendidikan*, 3(1), 56.
- Overbaugh, R.C. & Schultz, L. (n.d.). Bloom's Taxonomy. Retrieved from http://www.odu.edu/educ/roverbau/Bloom/blooms_taxonomy.htm.
- Razmjoo, S. A., Kazempourfard, E. (2012). On the Representation of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy in Interchange Course Books. *The journal of teaching language skills*, 4(1).
- Revised Bloom's Taxonomy Process Verbs, Assessment, and Questioning. Retrieved from <https://www.cloud.edu>.
- Riazi, M. A., Mosalanejed, N. (2010). Evaluation of Learning Objectives in Iranian High-school and Pre-university English Textbooks Using Bloom's Taxonomy. *The electronic Journal for English as a second language*, 13 (4).
- Sahragard, R., Rahimi, A., Zaremoayeddi I. (2008). An In-depth Evaluation of Interchange Series (3rd Edition). *Porta Linguarum*, 37-54.
- Shah, K. S. (2014). Textbook Evaluation of English for Academic Purposes by British Council. *Research on Humanities and Social Science*, 4(7).
- Tangsakul, P., Kijpoonphool, W., Linh, D. N., Kimura, N. L. (2017). Using Revised Bloom's Taxonomy to Analyze Reading Comprehension Questions in Team Up in English 1-3 and Grade 9 English O-net Tests. *International Journal Research Granthaalayah*, Vol.5
- Tikhonova, E., Kudinova, N. (2015). Sophisticated Thinking: Lower Order Thinking Skills. *Education and Educational Research*.
- Williams, D. (1983). Developing Criteria for Textbook Evaluation. *ELT Journal*, 37(3), 251-255. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/37.3.251>

Zareian, G., Davoudi, M., Heshmatifar, Z., and Rahimi, J. (2015) An Evaluation of Questions in Two ESP Course Books Based on Bloom's New Taxonomy of Cognitive Learning Domain. *The International Journal of Education and Research*, 3 (8).