A Textbook Evaluation of New Version (2nd edition) of "Top Notch English Series"

Seyyed Abdol Amin Askaripour

Department of English, College of Graduate Studies, Science and Research Branch of Kohgiluyeh & Boyer-ahmad, Islamic Azad University, Yasouj, Iran
amin_askari20@yahoo.com

This study evaluated the new version of Top Notch series (2009) in terms of learning objectives in Bloom's Revised Taxonomy (2001) to see which levels of Bloom's Revised Taxonomy were more emphasized in these textbooks. For this purpose, the contents of the new version of Top Notch series were codified based on a coding scheme designed by Ganbari (2013) and Razmjoo and Kazempoufard (2012). The coding scheme was based on Bloom's Revised Taxonomy of learning objectives. The data were then analyzed and the frequencies and percentages of occurrence of different learning objectives were calculated. The results of the study revealed that Lower Order Thinking Skills (LOTS), the three low levels in Bloom's Revised Taxonomy, were the most prevalent learning levels in these books. Moreover, a significant difference was also found among the textbooks in their inclusion of different levels of learning objectives. The other considerable finding of this study was the weak presence of metacognitive knowledge. All in all, it was found that Top Notch series cannot make learners critical thinkers. As a final point, some pedagogical implications for teachers and course book/textbook developers have been recommended.

Keywords: textbook, textbook evaluation, Bloom's old taxonomy, Bloom's revised taxonomy

Introduction

In the process of teaching L2 many significant components must be considered. Among these, textbook is an essential one and must be regarded seriously. Whether or not one selects to base his course on a coursebook, it is worth thinking about how one recognizes a good one when he sees it, and on what grounds he might reject or criticize it. As Rashidi and Bahrami (2012) state, textbooks all over the world are perceived by different scholars and instructors to be the framework and road map for any pedagogical plans in EFL field.

It is vastly important for EFL teachers to design, evaluate, select and adapt teaching materials to meet teaching and EFL students' learning needs. This is in order to employ the most fruitful and practical methods and strategies on the basis of their potential ability and merit. Razmjo and Kazempoourfard (2012) assert that evaluation of textbooks can guide EFL teachers to gain a useful view into the material in teaching and learning L2 processes.

In spite of its great importance, materials development and evaluation has been a new trend in the process of language teaching. It does not have a long history, however. Tomlinson (2001) (as cited in Razmjoo & Kazempourfard, 2012) explains that the study of materials development was not given any real importance until the 1990s when books on this subject started to be published.

Ur (1996) states that the main criteria for a coursebook in teaching/learning EFL relates to its evaluation. This evaluation of textbooks and syllabuses is important and considerable for some reasons that can be evaluated from a general point of view or from a specific perspective, meaning that one who is evaluating a textbook, sometimes focuses on the content for a small group of EFL learners and follows typical aspects or evaluates a textbook for a large group of EFL learners and tries to generalize the findings. It must be clarified whether the evaluation criteria aim to be applied to any language-teaching coursebook, or they follow a specific purpose, thus is really vital for linguists to define and recognize which aspects of a textbook must be regarded in evaluation process, in

other words, the matter which must be regarded in this vein, is the appropriateness of the book for a certain course or EFL learners' population.

The main aim of textbook evaluation in L2 processes is to facilitate the teaching/learning process. Richards and Schmidt (2002) state that in language teaching and learning, EFL teachers employs any strategies or methods to facilitate the learning of a language. These activates can include evaluative processes or selecting and revising the materials. These materials may be linguistic, visual, auditory, or kinesthetic, and they may be presented in print, audio or video form, on CD-ROMS, on the internet or through performance or display". They add that an approach to the design of a language syllabus which is based on study of the oral and written texts students encounter in particular learning contexts. This approach is sometimes used when a specific context for language learning has been identified. Target situation analysis is used to identify the types of texts most frequently encountered in the context, and units of work are then developed in relation to the texts and the linguistic features they exemplify. Such a syllabus may be regarded as a type of situational syllabus.

By textbook, Richards and Schmidt (2002) mean a book on a specific subject used as a teaching learning guide, especially in a school or college. Textbooks for foreign language learning are often part of a graded series covering multiple skills (listening, reading, writing, speaking and grammar) or deal with a single skill.

So we can conclude that our teaching materials are simultaneously problematic and may create disputable challenges among EFL teachers and learners, but the necessity of textbook cannot be ignored at all. In fact, it is extremely important for us as EFL teachers to evaluate, select and adapt teaching materials and textbooks to meet our teaching and students' learning needs in order to get the most out of learning potentials. As a matter of fact, textbook analysis and evaluation can help teachers gain good and useful insights into the nature of the material and draw a functional guideline to enhance EFL learners' achievement.

Heycroft (1998) (as cited in Ghanbari, 2013) indicates that there is a psychological necessity of the textbooks for the learners since through using textbooks teachers could

measure their students' ability and progress concretely. Moreover, he contends that using textbooks nurtures some expectations among the students regarding textbooks. Grant (1987) believes that textbooks attempt to solve the issue by providing favorable learning circumstances for the learners to use the foreign or second language in the classroom to make them ready for the use of language in the real life situations outside the class. Richards and Rogers (2001) consider the following advantages for textbooks:

1. Framework: teachers and students know what they want to teach and learn next.
2. Syllabus: the carefully planned and balanced selection of language content allows teachers and learners to systematically follow the subjects.
3. Guidance: textbooks provide enough guidance and support for the teachers, especially for the ones who are less experienced.
4. Autonomy: the learner can use the textbook to learn new material and go ahead with some degree of autonomy.

Conversely, some linguists and EFL teachers highlight some points as weak points about using textbooks in L2 classes. For instance, Allwright (1982) believes that textbooks reflect the viewpoints and biases of their authors and represent particular educational and pedagogical ideologies. Therefore, the methodology supported by a textbook affects the language learning process. Clarke (1990) and Renner (1997) identified biases such as racism, sexism, and some cultural partiality in EFL textbooks. These studies indicate that materials might be biased subtly in showing social class, ethnic background and references to drinking and smoking. Richards and Renandya (2002) mention some of the disadvantages of coursebooks as follows: coursebooks are unable to provide suitable and reasonable models, they present marginal learner roles, they do not contextualize language tasks and activities, coursebooks do not support sufficient cultural understanding, they do not incorporate idioms in the teaching process, and they are gender biased.

Statement of the problem

In the process of teaching and learning L2, one of the most crucial factors which needs simultaneously to be functional and fruitful is textbook or syllabus. It seems really significant to analyze the contents and methods of textbooks in EFL classes to get their advantages and disadvantages. There are some different scales to analyze a textbook and Bloom taxonomy is one of them. As can be seen from the reviewed literature, Bloom's Taxonomy has been employed in different fields such as material designing and EFL learners' evaluation. In the field of coursebook/textbook evaluation, too, there are some studies which have made use of Bloom's taxonomy; however, such studies are quite small in number. Furthermore there are not any concise and reliable studies analyzing the new version of Top Notch series based on Bloom's revised taxonomy. In this way it becomes clear as to how much of the contents of these books are rather on the basis of the Lower Order thinking Skills (LOTS) levels or the Upper Order Thinking skills (HOTS). It seems that there is paucity in this and this study is an attempt to be a first step to fill the gap.

Objectives of the study

The current study aims to analyze the new version of Top Notch series to see how the content of these books are in agreement with the learning objectives designated in Bloom's revised taxonomy including six levels of learning from the lowest levels that are remembering, understanding, and applying to the highest ones that are analyzing, evaluating and creating. This study then intends to investigate the manifestation of these learning objectives in the new version of all the Top notch English series used in Iranian language institutes. Furthermore, this study aims at specifying which elements of Bloom's revised taxonomy are more prevalent in the new version of Top Notch series.

Research questions

1. Are the contents of new version of Top Notch series in agreement with the learning objectives designated in Bloom's revised taxonomy?

2. Are Bloom's revised taxonomy learning objectives considerably represented in the new version of Top notch English series? If yes, how?

3. Which elements of Bloom's revised taxonomy are more prevalent in the new version of Top Notch course books?

Significant of the study

It is essential to investigate the content and activities of textbooks in language teaching. The main task of material evaluation is to specify the degree to which the objectives designated in the curriculum are achieved. This study is an attempt to find the distribution of different levels of thinking in the new version of the Top Notch series, one of the widely used textbooks in Iran language institutes' educational system. Doing such study is necessary since very few researches in Iran have tried to evaluate the different elements of cognitive domain of English textbooks that are currently used in Iranian private language institutes. Thus evaluating these books could be valuable from the cognitive and pedagogical aspects. The results of this study could assess the features of Bloom's revised taxonomy in new version of the Top Notch series which will be fruitful for material developers, researchers and curriculum designers. Moreover, the results of this study could provide some pedagogical recommendations for further improving the quality of textbooks abroad and at home.

Methods

Materials

The materials in the current study are eight textbooks of second edition of Top Notch series. The authors of these books are Joan Saslow and Allen Ascher. In 2011 the textbooks were published by Pearson Longman Incorporation in the United States of America. There are eight books namely fundamentals A and B, Top Notch 1A and Top Notch 1B, Top Notch 2A, Top Notch 2B, Top Notch 3A, and Top Notch 3B including five units each. In each unit different skills and sub-skills of language learning are regarded and included. The textbooks are supplemented with a workbook, a CD and a teacher's manual.

Table 1. shows a general frame of the contents of the new version of Top Notch series including the number of units in each textbook, the number of different sections in a unit, and the language skills which have been considered in the textbooks.

Table 1. The general qualities of the new version of Top Notch

Textbooks	Number of units	Number of lessons in a unit	Language skills
Fundamentals A	7	3	Vocabulary
			Grammar
			Pronunciation
			Listening
			Reading
Fundamentals B	7	3	Vocabulary
			Grammar
			Pronunciation
			Listening
			Reading
Topnotch 1 A	5	4	Vocabulary
			Grammar
			Pronunciation
			Listening
			Reading
Topnotch 1 B	5	4	Vocabulary
			Grammar
			Pronunciation
			Listening
			Reading
Topnotch 2 A	5	4	Vocabulary
			Grammar

			Pronunciation
			Listening
			Reading
Topnotch 3 A	5	4	Vocabulary
			Grammar
			Pronunciation
			Listening
			Reading
Topnotch 3 B	5	4	Vocabulary
			Grammar
			Pronunciation
			Listening
			Reading

As Table 1. displays, each one of the Fundamentals textbooks (A &B) includes 7 units and every unit includes 3 lessons. However, each of the other textbooks has 5 units and in each unit there are 4 lessons. The grammatical skills in the textbooks consist of vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, listening and reading comprehension. In the end of every unit, there is a section called "unit wrap up". This part asks the learners to practice the vocabulary, grammar and social language in the contexts provided through pictures. Each textbook includes a checkpoint section that has to do with the review of materials taught in all units. Furthermore there is a workbook part dealing with the homework activities that EFL learners should do at home or out of their classes.

Coding Scheme

Razmjoo and Kazempoufard (2012) developed a coding scheme based on Bloom's revised taxonomy to evaluate the materials in Interchange series. Their purpose was to determine the distribution of different levels of bloom's taxonomy in the above mentioned textbooks. The cognitive domain of this scheme according to Bloom's revised

taxonomy is comprised of six levels, that is, A) Remember B) Understand C) Apply D) Analyze E) Evaluate and F) Create. The knowledge dimension includes four parts: 1) Factual knowledge 2) Conceptual knowledge 3) Procedural knowledge and 4) Metacognitive knowledge. This coding scheme is represented in Table 2.

It is worth mentioning that the contents of each book were categorized and put in the relevant boxes. In this table two points have been regarded apparently; knowledge dimension and cognitive dimension. As it can be seen, there are two dimensions; knowledge and cognitive. The contents of each unit will be put under the correct column on the basis of Bloom's revised taxonomy; consequently they will be categorized and analyzed to get a conclusion.

Table 2. Coding scheme of the research

	The cognitive process dimension					
The Knowledge Dimension	A. Remember	B. Understand	C. Apply	D. Analyze	E. evaluate	F .create
1. *Factual Knowledge*	A1	B1	C1			
2.*Conceptual Knowledge*	A2	B2	C2	DO	E0	F0
3.. Procedural Knowledge	A3	B3	C3			
4. Metacognitive Knowledge	A4	B4	C4	D4	E4	F4

According to this table A1 equals 'remember the factual knowledge' A2 ' remember conceptual knowledge', A3 ' Remember Procedural Knowledge' A4 'Remember Metacognitive Knowledge'. B1 'Understand Factual Knowledge' B2 'Understand conceptual Knowledge', B3 'Understand Procedural Knowledge' B4 ' Understand Metacognitive Knowledge'. C1 is ' Apply Factual Knowledge', C2 (Apply conceptual Knowledge'), C3 (Apply Procedural Knowledge'), and C4 (Apply Metacognitive Knowledge'). D0 equals 'Analyze using facts, concepts, and procedures), E0 is the same as ' Evaluate using facts, concepts, and procedures', F0 equals 'Create using facts, concepts, and procedures', D4 stands for 'Analyze Metacognitive Knowledge, E4 is the same as 'Evaluate Metacognitive Knowledge, and F4 equals ' Create Metacognitive Knowledge'. A detailed explanation of cognitive dimension processes and knowledge dimension is shown in separate tables in Appendix section. Furthermore, the original taxonomy table is also provided.

Data collection and analysis procedures

To collect data two units from each textbook were randomly selected. Then the contents (activities and exercises) of each unit were analyzed according to the coding scheme mentioned above. In other words, in categorizing and codifying these activities, the learning objectives available in Bloom's revised taxonomy (2001) were regarded. Codifying the materials identified the frequency of each learning objective for each and all levels. Furthermore, to determine whether there is a significant pattern in the occurrence of different levels of cognitive skills in the textbooks, Chi-square tests were run. Therefore, this study is a sample of mixed method, meaning that in data analysis both qualitative and quantitative methods have been employed. In quantitative part, we have described the output of Chi-Square which aims to indicate the frequency, and in qualitative part the contents of the textbooks have been analyzed and interpreted subjectively, meaning that there is no numeral or statistical data.

Results and discussion

The representation of RBT learning objectives in the new version of Top Notch series

As Table 3. indicates, there is a complete and precise representation of the contents of the new version of Top Notch textbooks in knowledge dimension including knowledge and cognitive domains.

On the basis of Table 3, we have the same situation in Fundamental B, meaning that there is no place for procedural knowledge (0.00 percent), but conceptual knowledge (53.8 percent) and factual knowledge (46.2 percent) have been frequently employed in this book and they are the most prevalent learning objectives in these introductory textbooks.

Table 3. Representation Knowledge dimension in the new Fundamentals (A & B)

Book		Knowledge domain				
		Factual	Conceptual	Procedural	Cognitive	Total
Fundamental A	Frequency	5	7	0	0	12
	Percentage	41.7	58.3	0.00	0.00	100.0
Fundamental B	Frequency	6	7	0	0	13
	Percentage	46.2	53.8	0.00	0.00	100.0

Table 4. which concerns cognitive domain, indicates that in Fundamentals A "remember" is the most prevalent code with 41.7 percent, "apply' with 33.3 percent is the second most frequent code, and understand is in the third place with 25.0 percent, while there is no place for evaluate and create domains (with 0.00 percent). These percentages in Fundamentals B for analyze, evaluate and create are the same, meaning that the percentages of all are zero. But the most prevalent code with 61.5 percent belongs to

understand and apply and remember codes that have occupied the second and third place with 23.1 and 15.4 percent, respectively.

Table 4. Representation of cognitive domain of Fundamentals (A&B)

Book		Cognitive domain						
		Remember	Understand	Apply	Analyze	Evaluate	Create	total
Fundamental A	Frequency	5	3	4	0	0	0	12
	Percentage	41.7	25.0	33.3	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.0
Fundamental B	Frequency	2	8	3	0	0	0	13
	Percentage	15.4	61.5	23.1	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.0

The output of Table 5. shows that the main focus of Fundamentals A and B textbooks are on lower-order thinking skill levels with 100.00 percent, while higher order thinking skills comprise no part of focus in this book (0.00).

Table 5. Representation of LOTS and HOTS in the new version Fundamentals (A&B).

Learning Objectives	Frequency	Percentage
LOTS	25	100.00
HOTS	0	0.00
SUM	25	100.00

By running a chi-square test, the distribution of six levels of RBT learning objectives in Fundamentals A and B textbooks have been investigated, respectively. The results appear in Tables 6. and 7. below.

Table 6. Chi-Square test for the six levels of objectives in Fundamentals A

Test Statistics	
book	**Fundamentals A**
Chi-Square	.611[a]
df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.0468

Table 7. Chi-Square test for six levels of objectives in Fundamentals B

Test Statistics	
book	**Fundamentals B**
Chi-Square	1.743
df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.0321

Tables 6. and 7. display that the results of these chi-squares are significant. The result of Table 4.4 is (x2=0.611, df= 3, sig=.0468), meaning that the distribution of RBT cognitive levels follow a specified pattern in Fundamentals A textbook, since the P value is less than .05 (.0468). It must be added that we have the same situation in the output of Table 4.5 and P value is .0321 which is less than .05, too.

According to Table 8, there is a considerable change in the content of the book Top Notch 1A, in other words, in this book most of content belongs to factual knowledge, while conceptual and procedural knowledge are on the second and the third place, respectively 30.8 and 7.7 percent. As we come to the Top Notch 1B, we have these three knowledge domains, too. But the frequency of the new version of Top Notch 1A and 1B are not the same. Table 8, indicates that frequency of the content has been distributed in factual knowledge, conceptual knowledge and procedural knowledge. The point which must be regarded is the decrease of factual knowledge and the increase of conceptual knowledge in the new version of Top Notch 1B.

Table 8 . Representation of Knowledge dimension in the new Top Notch 1 (A & B)

Book		Knowledge dimension				
		Factual	Conceptual	Procedural	Cognitive	Total
Top Notch 1A	Frequency	8	4	1	0	13
	Percentage	61.5	30.8	7.7	0.00	100.0
Top Notch 1B	Frequency	9	7	4	0	20
	Percentage	45.00	35.00	20.00	0.00	100.0

On the basis of Table 9 , both books have followed the same order in distributing cognitive codes, meaning that in both we see 'understand', 'apply' and 'remember' even though their percentage rates are not the same. Additionally, we have 5.0 instances of 'create' in the new version of Top Notch1B even though not very many.

Table 9. Representation of cognitive domain of the new Top Notch 1 (A&B)

Book		Cognitive domain						
		Remember	Understand	Apply	Analyze	Evaluate	Create	total
Top Notch 1A	Frequency	0	10	3	0	0	0	13

	Percentage	0.00	76.9	23.1	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.0
Top Notch1 B	Frequency	1	13	5	0	0	1	20
	Percentage	5.0	65.0	25.0	0.00	0.00	5.00	100.0

According to Table 10, the main focus of the new Top Notch(A &B) textbooks are on lower-order thinking skills(LOTS) with 96.00 percent, while higher order thinking skills (HOTS) comprise a small part of focus in these books (4.00).

Table 10. Statistical representation of LOTS and HOTS in the new version of Topnotch 1 (A&B).

Learning Objectives	Frequency	Percentage
LOTS	32	96.00
HOTS	1	4.00
SUM	33	100.00

A chi-square test was run to compare the distribution of six levels of RBT learning objectives in the new Top Notch 1 (A&B) textbooks.

Table 11. Chi-Square test for six levels of objectives in Top Notch 1A

Test Statistics	
book	**Topnotch 1A**
Chi-Square	3.846
df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.0368

The result of Table 11, shows the chi-square at significant level of (0.05). The data in the above-mentioned table (11) suggests that there is a significant difference among six different levels of RBT regarding the frequency of these learning objectives in Bloom's taxonomy. That is, the distribution of the learning objectives of RBT is not random and follows a special pattern, since the P value is less than .05 (.0368).

Table 12. Chi-Square test for six levels of objectives in Top Notch 1B

Test Statistics	
book	**Topnotch 1B**
Chi-Square	7.76
df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.0402

Similar to the previous Chi-Square test, the result of table 12, shows chi-square at significant level of (0.05) and the output of the above table (12) suggests that there is a significant difference among six different levels of RBT regarding frequency, since P= .0402 which is less than .05, meaning that, the distribution of the learning objectives of RBT follows a special pattern.

According to Table 13, the content of Top Notch 2A represents that as the previous volumes it has followed Bloom's revised taxonomy (RBT); factual, conceptual and procedural knowledge respectively, but the noticeable point is the reduction of procedural knowledge in comparison with Top Notch 1B, in other words, the percentage of the procedural knowledge in 2A is 6.3, while in 1B was 20.0.

Furthermore, the analysis of the new Top Notch 2B on the basis of Bloom's revised taxonomy represents that most of the content belongs to the factual knowledge (68.8 percent), whereas the conceptual knowledge and procedural one are in second and third steps, respectively 18.8 and 12.5 percent. It must be mentioned that in the new Top Notch 2B the considerable point is the increase of factual knowledge.

Table 13. Statistical representation of Knowledge dimension in Top Notch 2 (A & B)

Book		Knowledge dimension				
		Factual	Conceptual	Procedural	Cognitive	Total
Top Notch 2A	Frequency	9	6	1	0	16
	Percentage	56.3	37.5	6.3	0.00	100.0
Top Notch 2B	Frequency	11	3	2	0	16
	Percentage	68.8	18.8	12.5	0.00	100.0

Based on Table 14, with regarding the distribution of cognitive codes in the new Top Notch 2A and 2B, it is considerable that "understand and apply" codes have occupied the first and the second places in RBT. The third most frequent code in 2A is remember with 12.5 percent, while in 2B there is no place for remember code, instead "analyze" is the most frequent code with 6.3 percent. Finally in Top Notch 2A and 2B increase of create code with 6.3 percent is noticeable.

Table 14. Statistical Representation of cognitive domain of Top Notch 2 (A&B)

Book		Cognitive domain						
		Remember	Understand	Apply	Analyze	Evaluate	Create	total
Top Notch 2A	Frequency	2	9	4	0	0	1	16
	Percentage	12.5	56.3	25.0	0.00	0.00	6.3	100.0
Top Notch 2B	Frequency	0	11	3	1	0	1	20
	Percentage	0.00	68.8	18.8	6.3	0.00	6.3	100.0

Table 15. Statistical representation of LOTS and HOTS in Topnotch 2 (A&B).

Learning Objectives	Frequency	Percentage
LOTS	29	90.5
HOTS	3	9.5
SUM	32	100.00

Table 15, represents that the main focus of the new version of Top Notch 2 A and 2B is on lower-order thinking skills (LOTS) level with 90.5 percent, whereas higher-order thinking skills (HOTS) comprise just a small part of the contents of these two books (9.5percent). It has been clearly presented in Tables 16, and 17, which have been designed after running Chi-Square:

Table 16. Chi-Square test for six levels of objectives in Top Notch 2A

Test Statistics	
book	**Topnotch 2A**
Chi-Square	7.125
df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.0133

Table 17. Chi-Square test for six levels of objectives in Top Notch 2A.

Test Statistics	
book	**Topnotch 2B**
Chi-Square	9.625
df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.0249

The result Tables 16, and 17, show chi-square at significant level of (0.05) with. The data in the above-mentioned tables suggest that there is a significant difference among six different levels of RBT regarding frequency, since in both cases P value is less than .05, meaning that the distribution of the learning objectives of RBT in the new version of Top Notch 2a and 2B is not randomly, but follows a special pattern.

Table 18, which belongs to the new Top Notch 3(A&B) displays that factual knowledge in Top Notch 3A is in the first place and conceptual knowledge has occupied the second place of Bloom's revised taxonomy, but the procedural knowledge is in the third place with 3.6 percent.

The last volume of the new Top Notch series which has been analyzed through Bloom's revised taxonomy is 3B. The content of this book is like 3A and the other volumes, meaning that procedural knowledge is in the lowest level and factual knowledge is in the highest level, respectively 8.4 and 54.5 percent.

Additionally, it must be mentioned that unanimous absence in knowledge domain refers to the meta-cognitive item. In other words, just 10.7 percent of the new Top Notch 3A content comes from meta-cognitive vein, whereas the other volumes don't have this item.

Table 18. Statistical representation of Knowledge dimension of Top Notch 3 (A & B)

Book		Knowledge dimension				
		Factual	Conceptual	Procedural	Cognitive	Total
Top Notch 3A	Frequency	16	8	1	3	28
	Percentage	57.1	28.6	3.6	10.7	100.0
Top Notch 3B	Frequency	14	8	3	0	25
	Percentage	56.0	32.0	12.0	0.00	100.0

Once again, in two last volumes of the new Top Notch textbooks, namely Top Notch 3A and 3B, as Table 19, indicates, understanding level is the most frequent code with 67.9 and 52.00 percent respectively. Table 19, represents that in 3A the cognitive codes; apply and analyze are at the same level (both are 14.3 percent) and the create code is in the third place. The considerable point is the complete absence of remember code in 3A. Conversely, on the basis of the RBT cognitive code, there is a remarkable increase in the amount of analyze code in 3B (24.0 percent) which has located the analyze code in second place, while the most third code belongs to the apply code, remember code comes after that and create code is the least frequent with 0.00 percent.

Table 19. Statistical representation of cognitive domain of Top Notch 3 (A&B)

Book		Cognitive domain						
		Remember	Understand	Apply	Analyze	Evaluate	Create	total
Top Notch 3A	Frequency	0	19	4	4	0	1	28
	Percentage	0.00	67.9	14.3	14.3	0.00	3.6	100.0
Top Notch 3B	Frequency	1	13	5	6	0	0	25
	Percentage	4.00	52.00	20.00	24.00	0.00	0.00	100.0

Table 20, represents that the main focus of the new version of Top Notch 3 A and 3B is on lower-order thinking skills (LOTS) level with 85.00 percent, whereas higher-order thinking skills (HOTS) comprise 15.00 percent of the content on the basis of RBT objectives. It is worth mention that there is a noticeable increase of HOTS level in the new Top Notch 3 (A&B) in comparison with the other volumes.

Table 20. Statistical representation of LOTS and HOTS in Topnotch 3 (A&B).

Learning Objectives	Frequency	Percentage
LOTS	45	85.00
HOTS	8	15.00
SUM	53	100.00

By running Chi-Square test, the RBT frequency of the new Top Notch 3A and 3B in Tables 21, and 22, have been represented. The result of Table 21, shows chi-square at significant level of (0.05) and the output of the above-mentioned table (21) suggests that there is significant difference among six different levels of RBT regarding frequency, because P value is less than .05 (P=.05 > .0446), meaning that the distribution of the learning objectives of RBT is not random and follows RBT pattern. Moreover, we have

this regularity of distribution of RBT objectives in the contents of the new Top Notch 3B, too. Since sig. level is(.0496) which is less than .05.

Table 21. Chi-Square test for six levels of objectives in Top notch 3A

Test Statistics	
book	**Topnotch 3A**
Chi-Square	18.619
df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.0446

Table 22. Chi-Square test for six levels of objectives in Top notch 3B

Test Statistics	
book	**Topnotch 3B**
Chi-Square	8.880
df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.0496

Table 23, and 24, show the total representation of the contents of the new Top Notch series in knowledge and meta-cognitive domains. These tables indicate that more than half of the content (54.5) has been designed on the basis of factual knowledge, 35.0 percent belongs to conceptual knowledge, 8.4 percent of this textbook's series is procedural knowledge and just 2.1percent of the content has been designed on the basis of meta-cognitive domains.

Table 23 : Knowledge dimension in total

	Knowledge			
	Factual	Conceptual	procedural	Meta-cognitive

Total	Count	78	50	12	3
	% within Book	54.5%	35.0%	8.4%	2.1
	% of Total	54.5%	35.0%	8.4%	2.1

Table 24 : Cognitive dimension in total

		Remember	understand	apply	analyze	evaluate	create	total
Total	Count	11	86	31	11	0	4	143
	% within Book	7.7%	60.1%	21.7%	7.7%	0.0	2.8	100.0%
	% of Total	7.7%	60.1%	21.7%	7.7%	0.0	2.8	100.0%

Table 25, is a summary of the table 24, and has tried to summarize the contents of the new version of Top Notch series. As these tables indicate, most of the content of the new version of Top Notch series has been located in the three first levels, namely, LOTS (90.00), while a little amount of these textbooks belongs to the three last taxonomies which have been called HOTS (10.00). This assertion has been precisely represented in the following table:

Table 25 : frequency of LOTS and HOTS of the new Top Notch series in total

Learning Objectives	Frequency	Percentage
LOTS	128	90.00
HOTS	15	10.00
SUM	127.00	100.00

4.2 Discussion

This part of the study is an attempt to revisit the research questions once more and aims to provide answers on the basis of the current study findings and the statistical results.

1. Are the contents of the new version of Top Notch series in agreement with the learning objectives designated in Bloom's revised taxonomy?

According to Tables 24, and 25, Lower-order thinking skills (LOTS) outnumber the Higher-order thinking skills (HOTS) in the new version of Top-notch series. 'Understanding' has the highest percentage of learning objectives, followed by 'Applying' and 'remembering' as the second and third most prevalent learning objectives in RBT. Also, the individual analysis of all eight textbooks indicates that the number of LOTS is much more than the number of HOTS. Again, 'Understanding' has the highest percentage of learning objectives, followed by 'Applying' and 'remembering' as the second and third most prevalent learning objectives in RBT. The obtained results indicate that the emphasis of the new version of Top-notch series is mostly on LOTS level of RBT and little attention is paid on HOTS level. Thus we can assert that the answer of the first research question is negative. The results of the study are in line with Ghanbari (2013) and Razmjoo & Kazempourfard (2012).

2. Are Bloom's revised taxonomy learning objectives considerably represented in the new version of Top notch English series? If yes, how?

On the basis of results, we can assert that all the levels of learning objectives have been regarded in the new version of Top Notch series except the learning objective of evaluating which has zero frequency. But, it must be mentioned that no consistency was found in terms of learning objectives distribution across the textbooks. The results of the study are in line with Ghanbari (2013) and Razmjoo & Kazempourfard (2012).

3. Which elements of Bloom's revised taxonomy (Lots or HOTS) are more prevalent in the new version of Top Notch course books?

The results of codifications reveals that 'Understating', 'Applying' and 'Remembering' are more prevalent than 'Analyzing, ' Evaluating' and 'Creating'. As mentioned before, we have designed a categorization among these cognitive codes and divided them into two levels: LOTS including remembering, understanding, and applying, while HOTS includes analyzing, evaluating and creating. As the findings indicate, in these textbooks LOTS has been used more than HOTS and this difference is really significant. The results of the study are in line with Ghanbari (2013) and Razmjoo & Kazempourfard (2012).

Conclusions and implications

In the process of designing a textbook, no matter in L1 or L2, there are some theoretical and pedagogical factors which must be regarded. They have been entitled as need analysis, purpose of training, and level of evaluation. Among these, one of the considerable factors is Bloom's Taxonomy, meaning that there must be a framework to scale the types and the process of activities that pupils do as classroom treatment which was the final target of the present study.

The results of the study in codification process indicated that in all the textbooks of the new version of Top Notch series LOTS (lower order thinking skills) were much more privileged than HOTS (higher order thinking skills). Thus we can assert that the content of the new version of Top Notch series have emphasized LOTS level rather than HOTS one. Moreover, the findings of the study revealed that there was no consistency among the evaluated variables, in other words, there was no consistent pattern in terms of learning objectives distribution in the new version of Top Notch series.

On the basis of the other studies, it seems that there is a shortage and paucity in designing the content of EFL syllabus, meaning that through evaluating the different books in L2 process from Bloom's perspective, more or less, we come to the same conclusion and a majority of the contents belong to the LOTS level. It can be an effective weak point in this realm, since EFL learners don not get enough time and chance to experience creativity and autonomy in their classroom sets.

As more attention is paid to LOTS in the new Top Notch series, it seems that there is a need to implement higher order thinking skills in the textbooks especially in those areas which are

considered as higher level textbooks. Based on the findings, it is recommended that textbook designers regard such credited taxonomies like Bloom's revised taxonomy to incorporate higher learning objectives in their books such as analyzing, evaluating and creating. Furthermore, EFL teachers can consider the HOTS level of evaluation rather than LOTS level in their formative and summative evaluations. Additionally they can inform the EFL learners about the advantage of HOTS level in comparison with LOTS level in L2 process.

The results of the present study could be a guideline for EFL teachers and private language institutes to evaluate their textbooks and syllabuses more carefully and precisely and recommend those ones that satisfy EFL learners need in terms of the learning objectives they are seeking. The last point, but not the least one is the weak presence of Metacognitive exercises in the new version of Top Notch as an issue that EFL teachers can remove this pedagogical problem by handout or supplementary sources in their class sets

5.3 Limitation and delimitation of the study

There were a number of limitations in this study which must be acknowledged. Firstly, with a small sample, the data collected did not represent all the contents and aspects of these series. Thus as a result, the findings cannot be generalized. Secondly, the techniques chosen to collect data may not have been sufficient to provide an in-depth understanding and categorizing all the details concisely. Finally, choosing just two units of every textbook occurred consciously, since it was a time-consumer task. Therefore if all the units were considered, a better picture of the results could emerge.

5.4 Suggestions for further research

Throughout the research process and findings, the following questions were generated which this researcher suggests them for further investigation.

1. The same study could be conducted to evaluate the representation of RBT learning objectives in other textbooks used in English language teaching particularly Passages Series which is usually taught to advanced level EFL learners in Iranian private language institutes.

2. Another research can be done to evaluate the representation of RBT learning levels ILI textbook series.
3. Another research could be conducted to investigate how it is really possible to design textbooks based on HOTS (higher order thinking skills) rather than LOTS (lower order thinking skills.

References

Allwright, R. (1982). What do we want teaching materials for? *ELT Journal*, *36*(1) 5-13.

Amer, A. (2006). *Learning objectives in university Persian & English general language courses in terms of Bloom's taxonomy.* Unpublished master's thesis, Shiraz University, Iran.

Ansary, H and Babaii, E. (2002). Universal characteristics of EFL/ESL textbooks: A step towards systematic textbook evaluation. *The Internet TESL Journal, 8* (2), 38-47.

Azizifar, A. and Baghelani, E. (2014). Textbook evaluation from EFL teachers' perspectives: The case of "Top-Notch" series. *International SAMANM Journal of Business and Social Sciences , 2*(1), 22-41.

Bloom, B. S. (Ed.). (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives handbook: Cognitive domain*. New York: McKay.

Brown, D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New York: Longman Pearson.

Clarke, J. and M. Clarke. 1990. *Stereotyping in TESOL materials: Culture and the language classroom*. Modern English Publications/British Council.

Ellis,R. (1997). The empirical evaluation of language teaching materials. *ELT Journal 51*(1). 36-42.

Ghanbari, R. (2013). *The representation of Bloom's Taxanomy in Topnotch series.* Unpublished Master's Thesis, Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran.

Grant, N. (1987). *Making the most of your textbook.* Oxford: Heinnemann Publishers

Ltd.U. KAYAPINAR.

Heyneman, S., Farrell, J. and Sepulveda-Stuardo, M. (1978)Textbooks and achieve ment: What we know. *World Bank Staff Working Paper*, *298*, 1-45.

Inal, B. (2006). Course book selection process and some of the most important criteria to be taken into consideration in foreign language teaching. *Journal of Arts and Sciences*, *5*, 19-29.

Iraji, A. (2007). *Pragmatic features of New Interchanger: How communicative and task-based it is*. Unpublished master's thesis, Shiraz University, Iran.

Jahangard, A. (2007). The Evaluation of the EFL Materials Taught at Iranian Public High Schools. *Karen's Linguistics Issues*. Retrieved October 20014 from: http://www3.telus.net/ linguistics issues/bymonth.html

Lawrence,W. (2011). *Textbook evaluation: A framework for evaluating the fitness of the Hong Kong new secondary school (NSS) curriculum*. MA thesis, Department of English City University of Hong Kong.

Litz, D.R.A. (2005).Textbook evaluation and ELT management: A South Korean case study. *Asian EFL Journal*, *9*, 78-91.

McDonough, J. and Shaw, C. (2003). Materials and Methods in ELT. Blackwell Pub-lishers Inc. Oxford: Oxford University.

Mehrpour, S. (2010). *A comprehensive survey of major issues in language learning and language teaching*. Shiraz: Pake Pishro-Mehran.

Mohammadpour, I. and Abdulghafar, M., (2009). The analysis of Iranian universities' 2003- 2004 entrance examination to detect biased items. *Journal Teknologi*, 5(E), 21-27.

Mesbah, Z. (2011)Textbook evaluation based on the ACTFL standards: The case of Top Notch series, *Iranian EFL journals*, 4. 58-67.

Rahimpur, S.(2013). TEFL textbook evaluation. *GSE Journal*, 764-772.

Ranalli, J. (2002). An Evaluation of New Headway Upper-Intermediate. Retrieved from: http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/Ranalli3.pdf

Renner, C. (1997). 'Women are Busy, Tall, and Beautiful: Looking at Sexism in EFL Materials' From: Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. Orlando, FL. March 11-15.

Rashidi,N. and Bahrami, M. (2012). An in-depth evaluation of intermediate Topnotch. *Journal of Studies in Learning and Teaching English*, *1*(2), 137-166.

Razmjoo, S. A. (2007). High schools or private institute textbooks? Which fulfill communicative language teaching principles in the Iranian context? The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly, *9*(4), 89-108.

Razmjoo, A. and Kazempourfard, E. (2012). On the representation of Blooms' revised taxonomy in interchange coursebooks. *The journal of teaching languages kills (JTLS)*, *4*(1), 171-204.

Riazi, A. M. (2003). What do textbook evaluation schemes tell us? A study of the text book evaluation schemes of three decades. *Methodology and Materials Design in Language Teaching, 52-68.*

Richards, J.C., Platt, J., & Platt H. (1992). *Longman dictionary of language teaching & applied linguistics.* London: Longman Press.

Richards, J. & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching. Cambridge*: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J.C., and Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics (3rd ed.).* A Pearson Education Book.

Tomlinson, B. (1998). *Materials development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Sahragard, R.,Rahimi, A., & Zaremoayedi, I.(2009). An in-depth evaluation of Interchange series (3rd-ed),*PortaLinguarum*,12, 37- 49.

Saslow, J. and Ascher, A. (2011). *Top Notch series; English for todays' world (2nd-ed)* Pearson Education, INC.

Sheldon, L. (1988). Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials. *ELT Journal*, 42(*2*), 237-246.

Soozandehfar, S. M & Sahragard, R. (2011) A textbook evaluation of speech acts

and language functions in Top-Notch series. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(12), 1831-1838.

Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching; Practice and theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vellenga, H. (2004). Learning pragmatics from ESL & EFL textbooks: How likely? *TESL-EJ, 8 (2),* 25-38.

ZareMoayedi, I. (2007). *An in-depth evaluation of Interchange series (3rd-Ed.)*. Un-published master's thesis, Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran.