THE ANALYSIS OF READING TASKS IN "ENGLISH IN FOCUS" TEXTBOOK BASED ON COGNITIVE DOMAIN OF REVISED BLOOM'S TAXONOMY

THESIS

Presented as a Partial Requirement for A "Sarjana" Degree in the

English Language Education Study Program

By:

AYATURROCHIM

AIB009056

ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM
DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGE AND ARTS
FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION
UNIVERSITAS BENGKULU
2014

APPROVAL

THE ANALYSIS OF READING TASKS IN "ENGLISH IN FOCUS" TEXTBOOK BASED ON COGNITIVE DOMAIN OF REVISED BLOOM'S TAXONOMY

THESIS

BY:

AYATUROCHIM

A1B009056

APPROVED BY

Supervisor	**Co- Supervisor**
Drs Mulyadi, M.A.	**Dra. Elfrida, M.Pd**
NIP. 19591024 198702 1 002	NIP 19801103 200501 2 002

The Dean of Faculty of Teacher Training and Education	**Department of language and arts chairperson**
Prof. Dr. Rambat Nur Sasongko, M.Pd.	**Dra. Rosnasari Pulungan, M.A.**
NIP. 19611207 198601 1 001	NIP. 19540323 198403 2 001

APPROVAL

THE ANALYSIS OF READING TASKS IN "ENGLISH IN FOCUS" TEXTBOOK BASED ON COGNITIVE DOMAIN OF REVISED BLOOM'S TAXONOMY

THESIS

BY:

AYATURROCHIM
A1B009056

Has been examined by the examining board of the English Language Education study program of FKIP UNIB on June, 16th 2014 at Dekanat FKIP Building

Principal Examiner

Co- Principal Examiner

Drs. Mulyadi, M.A.
NIP 19591024 198702 1 002

Dra. Elfrida, M.Pd
NIP 19801103 200501 2 002

Examiner I

Examiner II

Drs. Rudi Afriazi, M.Ed.
NIP. 19610121 198601 1 002

Gita Mutiara Hati, M.Pd
NIP. 19550425 198601 1 001

<center>Motto</center>

1. Learning is not compulsory… neither is survival (Edwards Deming).
2. Do your best

<center>Dedication</center>

With my greatest love and gratitude, this thesis is dedicated to:

- ♥ My lord Allah SWT and my prophet Nabi Muhammad SAW.
- ♥ My beloved parents, Thanks for all your loves, prays supports, and patients. I even do not know how to repay you for everything you have done to me. I love you.
- ♥ My beloved brother, Agung Mulyono. Thanks for all your supports and prayers. I love you.
- ♥ My sister in law, Pridawati. Thanks for the supports
- ♥ My truly best friends in EDSA 2009, Cahyo, Exo, Eko Saputra, Fajrin, Dhanar, Egi, Fenza, Ucok and Mamek. I will always put all of you in the special place in my heart. Thanks for everything guys.
- ♥ My beloved family
- ♥ My Almamater

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Alhamdulillah, First and foremost the researcher would like to honour to Allah S.W.T for giving his strength and chance to finish this thesis which is entitled *"The Analysis of Reading Tasks in "English in Focus" Textbook Based on Cognitive Domain of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy"*. This is written to fulfil one of the requirements for "sarjana" degree in language teaching and learning at the English Education Study Program of Universitas Bengkulu.

In this opportunity, the researcher would like to say thanks to many people assisted during completing this thesis. The researcher would like to say thanks to:

1. Drs. Mulyadi, M.A. as the Supervisor and Dra. Elfrida, M.Pd. as the Co-Supervisor, for giving the useful supervision, guidance, and constructive ideas during the process of completing this thesis.

2. Prof. Rambat Nur Sasongko, M.Pd. as the Dean of Teacher Training and Education Faculty of UNIB for his help and support.

3. Dra. Rosnasari Pulungan, M.A. as the Head of Language and Arts Department for her help and support.

4. Drs. Syafrizal S, M.A. as the Head of English Education Study Program for his help and support.

5. Drs. Mukhrizal, M. App. Ling. as his academic supervisor for help and support.

6. All the lecturers in English Education Study Program for their help and support.

7. The big family of English Department Student Association (EDSA) for being part of the researcher's college life.

8. All the people that indirectly help the researcher during the completion of this thesis.

The researcher had tried his best for this thesis. He realized that there were some mistakes in this research. Finally, the researcher sincerely accepts critics and suggestions dealing with this research.

Bengkulu, 16 June 2014

The researcher

ABSTRACT

Ayaturrochim. (2014). *"The Analysis of Reading Tasks in "English in Focus" Textbook Based on Cognitive Domain of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy."* Thesis, English Language Education Study Program, Education and Teachers Training Faculty, Bengkulu University. Supervisor: Drs. Mulyadi, M.A., and Co-supervisor: Dra. Elfrida, M.Pd.

Abstract- The aim of this descriptive study are to find out the dominant component of cognitive domain of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy in reading task of "English in Focus" Textbook for Junior High School published by The National Education Department in 2008. The population of this study was 155 tasks in reading tasks of the first, second, and third grade in "English in Focus" textbook. The samples were 31 tasks taken by using stratified random sampling technique. The data were collected by using checklist as an instrument proposed by Anderson and Krathwohl (2001). Checklists were used to analyse the level of cognitive domain such as remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating. The results show that there were 30 (98%) reading tasks used remembering level of the cognitive domain and only 1 (2%) reading task used understanding level. Reading tasks in English Focus Textbook only had 2 components of cognitive domain of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy. The other levels of cognitive domain were not used in reading tasks of "English in Focus" textbook. It could be concluded that the dominant cognitive domain of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy was remembering level. Reading tasks in English Focus Textbook for Junior High School published by The National Education Department is considered inappropriate to develop students' critical thinking as proposed by Anderson and Krathwohl (2001).

Key Word: Reading tasks, Cognitive domain of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy.

ABSTRAK

Ayaturrochim. (2014). *"The Analysis of Reading Tasks in "English in Focus" Textbook Based on Cognitive Domain of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy*." Skripsi, Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan, Universitas Bengkulu. Pembimbing Utama: Drs. Mulyadi, M.A., dan Pembimbing Pendamping: Dra. Elfrida, M.Pd.

Abstrak- Tujuan dari penelitian deskriptif ini adalah untuk mengetahui komponen ranah kognitif yang dominan dari revisi Taksonomi Bloom di dalam tugas membaca dari buku teks "English in Focus" untuk Sekolah Menengah Pertama (SMP) yang diterbitkan oleh Departemen Pendidikan Nasional tahun 2008. Populasi dari penelitian ini adalah 155 tugas membaca dalam buku teks "English in Focus" untuk kelas 1, 2, dan 3. Sampel dari penelitian ini adalah 31 tugas membaca yang diambil menggunakan teknik stratifikasi sampel acak. Data diambil dengan menggunakan instrumen checklist yang dikemukakan oleh Anderson dan Krathwohl (2001). Checklist kemudian juga digunakan untuk menganalisis tingkatan dari ranah kognitif seperti mengingat, memahami, menerapkan, menganalisis, mengevaluasi, dan menciptakan. Hasil dari penelitian menunjukkan bahwa 30 tugas membaca (98%) menggunakan tingkatan mengingat dan hanya 1 tugas membaca (2%) yang menggunakan tingkatan memahami. Tugas membaca di dalam buku teks "English in Focus" hanya menerapkan 2 komponen dari Ranah kognitif Taksonomi Bloom. Tingkatan lain dari revisi Taksonomi Bloom tidak digunakan dalam tugas membaca di dalam buku teks "English in Focus." Dapat disimpulkan bahwa wilayah kognitif dari revisi Taksonomi Bloom yang paling dominan adalah tingkatan mengingat. Tugas membaca dalam buku teks "English in Focus" untuk Sekolah Menengah Pertama (SMP) yang diterbitkan oleh Departemen Pendidikan Nasional dipertimbangkan tidak cocok untuk mengembangkan pemikiran kritis dari siswa seperti yang dikemukakan oleh Anderson dan Krathwohl (2001).

Kata kunci: Tugas membaca, Ranah kognitif dari revisi Taksonomi Bloom.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: I INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

CHAPTER III METHODOLOGY

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Problem.

The goal of teaching English is very important. Without clear goal, English teachers cannot facilitate students to achieve the target. Therefore, the goal of teaching English must be setted rationally and clearly based on the student's level such as junior high school or senior high school. The goal of teaching and learning usually stated in teaching plan (RPP). If the goal cannot be achieved, it means the target fails and the teachers cannot change students through failed process.

One component that is needed in order to reach the goal of teaching and learning is materials. Teaching and learning material can be presented in form of textbooks, workbooks, and hand-outs. The teaching material, which is presented in those form, usually contain material combination from some different sources but supporting each other in a unit. Lamie (1999) said that textbooks play a pivotal role in language classroom in all types of educational institutions-state school, colleges, and language school all over the world. It means that a textbook is important thing in teaching and learning process. English teachers can maximize their material from textbooks, workbooks, and hand-outs to achieve the goal of teaching English.

The government of Indonesia through the National Education Department recommends English in Focus textbook to be used in junior high schools. Textbooks should be related to all teaching activities, such as in making test items. It is supported by Fullan in Lamie (1999) who stated that an approval

textbook might easily become the curriculum in the classroom, yet fails to incorporate significant features of the policy or goals that is supposed to address. An English teacher must synchronize the material in textbooks with the goal of teaching English to make it works in line. Dependence on the textbooks may distract attention from behaviour and educational beliefs crucial to the achievement of desired outcomes.

However, there are some criteria of a good textbook that a teacher should consider. According to Harmer (1983: 219) a good textbook often contain lively and interesting material; it provides a sensible progression of language items, clearly showing what has to be learnt and in some cases, summarizing what has been studied so that students can revise grammatical and functional points that they have been concentrating. Those criteria are useful to produce qualified students who can achieve the target in teaching plan.

English teacher can use Bloom's Taxonomy of educational objective to select a criterion of good task in textbooks. Bloom's Taxonomy is a framework, which has some categories. These categories are one of basic principles in the taxonomy itself (Anderson, Krathwohl, 2001). As Parera (1983) said that Bloom's Taxonomy could help English teachers in determining or choosing learning materials by analysing the tasks given. Original Bloom's taxonomy only contains a dimension, but in the new revision of the taxonomy contains two dimensions. Those two are cognitive domain and knowledge domain. Interrelation between those two dimensions is called the Table of Taxonomy (Anderson and Krathwohl, 2001). There are some others differences between the original taxonomy and revised taxonomy. Those differences will be explained clearly in chapter II.

The research about taxonomy is addressed as a reference for English teachers. They must be able to choose appropriate teaching and learning materials that contain balance order of thinking as stated detail in cognitive domain. Based on the previous research about Bloom's taxonomy, the cognitive domain of reading tasks was not balance because the reading tasks only contained more low level of thinking rather than the higher level. Noprika (2006) had conducted research, which aimed to find out the Reading Tasks in English Textbooks for Junior High School Published by Erlangga by Using Cognitive Domain of Bloom's Taxonomy. The result of this research shows that the highest percentage for all series were comprehension. The percentage of reading task for the first book was 55.1%, for the second book was 53.8%, and for the third book was 59.1%. The highest-level evaluation was not applied in all three books series. Anggraeni (2013) investigated about The Analysis of Reading Questions Based on Revised Bloom's Taxonomy in English Textbooks for Senior High Schools Grade X. This study found that the questions in the low levels of thinking (remembering, understanding, and applying) were dominant, while the questions in the high levels of thinking (analyzing, evaluating, and creating) were limited. Furthermore, Novianti (2002) had conducted research, which aimed to reveal task categories in English textbooks for senior high schools published by the department of national education based on cognitive domain of bloom's taxonomy. It was also found that the most of the tasks categories mainly focused on lower level cognitive categories, namely knowledge and comprehension category. While application, analysis, and synthesis only constituted a small percentage. The highest-level category (evaluation) did not exist.

The higher order of thinking is very important for students to build their critical thinking. If the task only applies much low order of thinking, the critical thinking of students will not be developed as well as if the task applies balance higher order of thinking. The critical thinking of students is useful for students to solve their problems easier and systematically.

Reading task is text-based activities. Text-based tasks often used to assess student's ability. Text-based assessment also became a part of assessment combination in speaking, writing, or listening skill as a part of language skill as could be seen in national examination. National examination is used as standard test for graduation and generally uses text-based questions not only in reading but also in listening, speaking, and writing. It can prove that reading task is very important part of assessment.

The researcher has two reasons in choosing "English in Focus" textbook as the object of the research. The main reason is that the book was published by National Education Department and recommended for English teacher as one of the sources of teaching and learning material. The additional reason is that at this time so many textbooks that published by private publisher are expanding to the educational institution. English teachers need a reference of which appropriate materials are accommodating the development of student's critical thinking based on Revised Bloom's Taxonomy beside the other aspects outside the context of this research. Based on the previous explanation, the researcher investigated the components of cognitive domain that were applied in the contents of reading tasks in "English in Focus" Textbooks. The research is entitled "**The Analysis of**

Reading Tasks in "English in Focus" Textbook Based on Cognitive Domain of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Based on the background above, the statement of the problem was:

Many textbooks contain low level of cognitive domain of Bloom's Taxonomy as dominant component in reading tasks. According to Anggraeni (2013) low levels of cognitive domain are remembering, understanding, and applying. Moreover, she stated that higher levels are analyzing, evaluating, and creating.

1.3 Research Question.

What is the dominant component of cognitive domain employed in reading tasks of "English in Focus" Textbooks for Junior High School published by The National Education Department?

1.4 Research Objectives.

The purposes of this research was to find out the dominant component of cognitive domain used in reading tasks of "English in Focus" Textbook for Junior High School published by The National Education Department.

1.5 Limitation of the Research

This study investigated:

1. The reading tasks based on the components of the cognitive domain of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy in reading tasks (Krathwohl and

Anderson, 2001) namely remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating.

2. The study was a textbooks analysis covers in instruction of task in reading skill.

1.6   Significance of the Research.

1. The researcher hopes that the study is useful for English teachers in using textbooks as teaching materials more efficient in order to choose the appropriate task for the students based on the cognitive domain of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy.

2. English teachers are able to make a good assessment or task communicatively contain higher order of thinking to develop student's critical thinking.

1.7   Definition of Key Term

1) Task is a learner's activity that has purposes to communicate the target language to achieve outcome based on the goals of using task.

2) A cognitive domain is a level of cognitive process, which consists of six categories (Remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating).

3) Revised Bloom's Taxonomy is a framework for classifying statements of what we expect or intend students to learn as the result of instructions which are proposed by Bloom and revised by Anderson and Krathwohl.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1   Reading Skill

Reading skill is one of four language skills in English. Reading is a set of skill that involves making sense and deriving meaning from the printed Words (Linse, 2005:69). Reading skills are useful for learners to comprehend information from a source and transfer the information as detail as they read. Reading material is not only in form of the text, but also in form of pictures or symbols that have a meaning.

Teaching reading skill cannot be separated from the other skill in English. It is supported by Brown (2007) who stated that reading ability would be developed best in association with writing, listening, and speaking activities. Combination of those skills will develop reading comprehension that has complex parts such as macro and micro skills. Reading comprehension is divided into two parts of skills. Those two skills are micro and macro skills. Macro and micro skills are different in concept and related to reading comprehension. Brown (2004:187) stated that the micro and macro skills represent for objectives in the assessment of reading comprehension.

Learners also need strategies in reading activities such as skimming, scanning, and vocabulary building. The use of strategies depends on the objective of reading itself. There are some learner's activities in reading such as; reading story, reading newspaper, and reading books. Student's ability is needed in reading to decode the printed words and comprehend what they read.

2.1.1 Types of Reading Activities

Reading has much kind of activities from different sources of teaching materials, such as: fill in the blank, multiple choices, true and false, and many other types. Brown (2007:385) stated there are some types of reading type such as; (1) perceptive reading; (2) selective reading; (3) interactive reading; (4) extensive reading. Each kinds of reading type have difference reading activities. For example, in Selective reading, the type of reading activities like multiple choice and interactive reading like short answer tasks. The type of reading assessment must be matching with the reading type that is given to learners. There are some kinds of reading activities that appropriate with the type of reading (Appendix 5).

2.2 Task in textbooks

A textbook provides materials to make an English teacher easier to provide the activities for students. Task is one of the component of textbooks and play important role for English teachers in teaching and learning process. Student's activities in the classroom are usually taken from some tasks in the textbooks, for example: Student's practice conversation, reading stories, write in a paper, and sharing about the story. Tasks make the learners available to do activity in their classroom (Nunan, 2004:3). Something that provides learners to do something related to the learner's activities is called task.

There are some definitions of task from the experts. Richards and Rodgers (2001:224) stated that task is an activity that is carried out using language such as finding a solution to a puzzle, reading a map, making a telephone call, writing a

letter, and reading a set of instruction. The activity in a task should accommodate the learner's need. Task not only setted for personal work but also for two or more persons. Non-individual task can be used to simulate how to work together in a group.

Nunan (2004:4) argued that a task is a classroom activity that transformed from the real world. It means that almost of learners' activities in the classroom taken from real situation. Some learners' activities usually reading books, answering the questions, and interaction among the learners. Furthermore, Nunan (2004) defined tasks as

> "A parts of classroom activities which improve the learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing, or interacting in the target language but their attention is principally on presenting their grammatical knowledge to bring meaning rather than to manipulate form."

Student's activity in interaction when using a language has different outcome. Willis (1996:23) argued that tasks are student's activity used the target language for communicative purposes to attain an outcome. The objectives of the syllabus or instructional goals are resulting outcomes. For example: the outcome of task in reading skill is remembering information retrieved from specific reading text and deliver the content of the information to the other students. Shortly, the outcome of the task in using target language makes learners to interact each other by using the target language itself as much as possible.

In my conclusion, task is student's activities, which has some particular purposes. The purposes of the task are setted based on the objectives of teaching and learning English as stated in syllabus and more specific in lesson plan. The

tasks for the first grade of junior high school students are different from second grade.

2.2.1 Components of Task

Some experts have divided the content of task into several categories. According to Richards and Rogers, (2001:226) task should contain four important dimensions; (1) the products students asked to produce; (2) the operation they are required to use; (3) the cognitive operations required; 4) the accountability system involved. Shavelson and stern (1981:478) stated that tasks designer should take into six components namely contents, materials, activities, goals, learners, social community. Furthermore, task should consider the following points; learners needs, input tasks type, goal, tasks link, learner's organization, and role (Dammacco, 2010).

The components in a task have important role to determine the quality of the task. Nunan (2004) stated that tasks should consider some points such as; (1) Goal, general outcomes of task and must be setted up carefully and clearly by giving attention to the correlation with the general curriculum as unity; (2) Input, data which taken from different sources by adjusting with the goals that are setted before and consist of verbal and non verbal materials which learners have to deal with; (3) setting, an environment to support the effectivity of tasks; (4) Procedures, what learner will actually do with the input that forms the points of departure for the learning tasks; (5) Role, a part where the learner and teacher is expected to play in carrying out the learning tasks as well as the social and interpersonal relationship between the participants.

2.3   Textbook

English teachers usually use textbooks as main teaching material on learning process. They take many tasks from textbooks to make them easier to create activities for their students. English teachers must be able to choose appropriate textbooks for the students that contain materials as what students need. According to Byrd in Gomes (2010:332) almost of teachers, depend on textbook as required tool, because they provide content and activities that shape what happen in the classroom. Textbook is always contain some instruction to make activities in the classroom.

There were so many material taken from different sources in teaching and learning English. However, Brown (2007) stated that textbook is common form of material support for language instruction. It means that the majority of language teachers tend to use textbook rather than the other sources. A language teachers may has particular reason for choosing textbooks as teaching materials.

Many textbooks in Indonesia created based on the concept of English as foreign language (EFL). According to Gomes (2010) EFL textbooks are, indeed, a major necessity for most teachers, because the bulk of them feature an eclectic approach based on the current theories proposed by communicative trends. There is a connection between communicative issues with textbook. It means some textbooks also created based on communicative approach beside the other approach that are still used by some textbook's developer like contextual and grammatical textbook.

The National Education Department has concerned about the teaching and learning materials that are recommended for teachers and learners. According to the article 11 of PerMenDikNas (2005), Textbook is used as a main reference for teachers and learners in teaching and learning process. Furthermore, the government of Indonesia has also stated in the article 3 of PerMenDikNas (2005) that textbooks for every single major of education that used in every level of education are chosen from recommended textbooks of Badan Nasional Standar Pendidikan (BNSP).

Based on guideline for approval of textbook by ministry of education Ontario (2006:6) that textbook is a comprehensive learning resource which in many form like electronic form, combination of print, and non-print material to support in substantial curriculum. The contents of textbook should be designed as interesting as possible to get learners interest. In the other hand, textbook has aim to support the objective of curriculum. A textbook must be related to syllabus or instructional goal. It can be analysed from the tasks, activities, or instructional in textbook whether in line with the objective of curriculum or not.

English in focus is one of the textbooks that are published by The National Education Department in 2008. The writers of the textbook are Artono wardinan, Masduki B, jahur, and M sukirman djusma. English in focus is designed for EFL students and divided into three levels of class. The textbook is divided into first grade, the second grade, and the third grade. Based on the policy of The National Education department, this book is not for sale. English teachers or the other people can download this book in The National Education Department's website.

It makes easier for the English teachers or public society to get the English in Focus textbook.

2.4 Revised Bloom's Taxonomy

During the 1990's, a former student of Bloom's, Lorin Anderson, led a new assembly that met for updating the taxonomy, hoping to add relevance for 21st century students and teachers. Like the original former group, they were also worked hard in their pursuit of learning, spending six years to finalize their work. The revision includes several significant changes and Published in 2001. Several excellent sources are available which detail the revisions and reasons for the changes. There was a significant question why the original taxonomy needs to be revised? There were two reasons to revise the original taxonomy.

First, Rohwer at al in Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) stated there is a need to redirecting the focus of educators to the taxonomy, not only as historical document but also as pioneer of incredible masterpiece in the its age. According to Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) there is still a lot of important ideas in original taxonomy related to the modern educators which are still facing educational problems such as design and application of appropriate program, standard curriculum and authentic assessment.

The second reason, there is a need to combine new thoughts and knowledge in a framework categories of educational objectives. The world society has changed since 1956, and the changes affected the way of thinking and educational practice. The rapid progress development of knowledge supports the

necessity to revise the taxonomy. The changes occur in three broad categories: terminology, structure, and emphasis.

2.4.1 Change of Terminology

The names of six major categories were changed from noun to verb forms. As the taxonomy reflects different forms of thinking and thinking is an active process verbs were used rather than nouns. The sub-categories of the six major categories also replaced by verbs and some subcategories were reorganised. The knowledge category was renamed.

Knowledge is an outcome or product of thinking not a form of thinking. Consequently, the word knowledge was inappropriate to describe a category of thinking and was replaced with the word remembering instead. Comprehension and synthesis were retitled to understanding and creating respectively, in order to better reflect the nature of the thinking defined in each category (Anderson and Krathwohl, 2001).

2.4.2 Change of Emphasis

The revision's primary focus was on the taxonomy in use. The revision is aimed to the broader audience. Bloom's Taxonomy was traditionally viewed as a tool best applied in the earlier years of schooling (i.e. senior and junior high schools). The revised taxonomy is universal and easily applicable at elementary, secondary, and even tertiary levels. The revision's primary focus is on the taxonomy in use. Essentially, this means that the revised taxonomy is a more authentic tool for curriculum planning, instructional delivery and assessment. The

revision emphasizes explanation and description of subcategories. For example, sub-categories at the Remembering level of the taxonomy include:

- Recognizing / identifying - Locating knowledge in memory that is consistent with presented material.

- Recalling / Retrieving / Naming - Retrieving relevant knowledge from long-term memory.

2.4.3 Change of structure

There was an additional dimensional form of the original taxonomy from one dimension becomes two-dimensional table with the addition of the products of thinking (i.e. various forms of knowledge). Forms of knowledge are listed in the revised taxonomy as factual, conceptual, procedural, and metacognitive. The major categories were ordered in terms of increased complexity. As a result, the order of synthesis (create) and evaluation (evaluate) have been interchanged. This is in deference to the popularly held notion that if one considers the taxonomy as a hierarchy reflecting increasing complexity, then creative thinking (i.e. creating level of the revised taxonomy) is a more complex form of thinking than critical thinking (i.e. evaluating level of the new taxonomy).

Higher-level questions require complex application, analysis, evaluation, or creation skills. Questions at higher levels of the taxonomy are usually most appropriate for encouraging students to think more deeply and critically, problem solving, encouraging discussions, and stimulating students to seek information on their own.

Lower level questions are remembering, understanding and lower level application levels of the taxonomy. Usually questions at the lower levels are appropriate for evaluating students' preparation and comprehension, diagnosing students' strengths and weaknesses, and reviewing and/or summarizing content. The higher-level students can comprehend, the more students can develop their critical thinking deeply.

Table 6. The comparison cognitive domain of original taxonomy and revised taxonomy:

Bloom's Original Taxonomy	Anderson's Revised Taxonomy
Knowledge	Remembering
Comprehension	Understanding
Application	Applying
Analysis	Analyzing
Synthesis	Evaluating
Evaluation	Creating

2.4.4 Cognitive Domain of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy

Cognitive domain also called cognitive process because those are consist of some different level of thinking. According to Anderson and Krathwohl (2001), cognitive process is one of dimensions in Revised Bloom's Taxonomy that consist of six parts. Bloom's taxonomy is often used to analyse the assessment and

curriculum and those are indicating to focus only on remembering cognitive process without more exploration on the other cognitive process

The most important parts in cognitive process are retention and transferring. Retention is ability on remembering the lesson materials for certain period as the material was taught before. Mayer and Wittrock (1996) stated that transfer is ability on solving new problems, answering new questions, or making easier to learn new materials by using the knowledge that was learned before. Shortly, according to Bransford, at al in Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) the objectives of retention are charging the students to remember what they have learned and transferring requires the students just not only to remember, but also to comprehend and use what they have learned. In conclusion, the retention focus on the past and transfer focus on the future.

When teacher teaches and assesses the students to make them learn a material or lesson then remember for a certain period, it means that teachers directly focus on remembering as one of cognitive process categories only. When teacher expand the focus to develop the lesson for growing and assessing the meaningful learning, they need to develop more complex cognitive process beyond remembering.

In retention, teacher just needs the students to remember the lesson as one of cognitive process. The others five cognitive processes such as understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating can be used to transfer the learning materials. Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) categorize the cognitive domain into the following categories and sub-categories (Appendix 6).

2.4.4.1 Remembering

Remembering process is the lowest level of cognitive process in education taxonomy. Remembering process is retrieving knowledge that is needed from long-term memory (Anderson and Krathwohl, 2001). The knowledge can be in form of factual knowledge, conceptual knowledge, procedural knowledge, metacognitive, or combination among of those knowledge. The learning condition can be different or same as the situation when the knowledge is taught. Remembering process is very important for meaningful learning and solving some problems that have similarities with the other problems. According to Anderson and Krathwohl (2001), remembering process is divided into two categories. The categories are: (1) Recognizing, Retrieving the information which are needed from long term memory and then comparing with the new information; (2) Recalling, Adopting information which is needed from long term memory as required by assessment.

2.4.4.2 Understanding

The process of understanding is included in a part of transfer. According to Anderson and Krathwohl (2001), understanding means determine the meaning of instructional massages including oral and graphics communication. Students reconstructs the meaning in learning message into different form such as oral or graphics which are communicated from the learning sources. Krathwohl (2002) divided this category into several following sub-categories: (1) Interpreting, Interpreting is changing the information from one form to another such as paraphrasing, or changing words into pictures or inverse of it; (2) Exemplifying,

Giving examples about a concept or principle from the sources to make it more detail and easy to understand; (3) Classifying, Categorizing an example into general classification of concept or principle; (4) Summarizing, Representing the whole information to the more specific without eliminating the basic information; (5) Inferring, Determining a pattern in some samples and also involving the process of comparing the whole samples to get specific pattern as conclusion from the information about samples; (6) Comparing, Involving similarities or differences between two or more objects or information; (7) Explaining, Making models of causal relationship into a system and could be generated from theory or the result of research or experience.

2.4.4.3 Applying

Applying is the next higher level of cognitive domain after understanding. According to Anderson and Krathwohl (2001), applying means carrying out or using a procedure in particular situation and it is related with procedural knowledge. Problem is an assessment in which the procedure to solve it is still unidentified by students so, they have to find the procedure to solve the problems. Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) separate this category into some sub-categories; (1) Executing, Procedure to be applied in familiar assignment and usually associates with skills and algorithms which are contain some plural steps and must be executed by constant sequences; (2) Implementing, Choosing a procedure to solve unfamiliar problems.

2.4.4.4 Analyzing

The more specific cognitive process is analyzing. Analyzing involves breaking material into its constituent parts and determining how the parts are related to each other and to an overall structure (Mayer: 2002). The process of analyzing involves skill to differentiate between the specific part and general concept. General concept must be comprehended before separating and relating the parts. There are 3 subcategories included into this category (Krathwohl, 2002), they are; (1) Differentiating, Separating relevant or important parts of a structure; (2) Organizing, Identifying the elements of situation or communication and recognize how the elements build a coherent structure; (3) Attributing, Establishing point of view, opinions, values, or objectives behind the communication.

2.4.4.5 Evaluating

The fifth level in cognitive process is evaluating. According to Krathwohl (2002), evaluating involves making judgement based on criteria and standard. The standard can be qualitative or quantitative. Evaluating also cover; (1) Checking, Process of testing inconsistency or internal mistake in operation or product; (2) Criticizing, Evaluating product or process based on external criteria or standard.

2.4.4.6 Creating

The last category of cognitive domain is creating. This process is the highest level among the other previous cognitive level. The process of creating usually requires high creativity and relating with the other five cognitive process. Creating means putting elements together to a form and the whole form is coherent and functional

(Anderson and Krathwohl, 2001). It can be also defined as making an original product. It means reorganized some elements into a particular pattern or structure that never exists before and requires creativities and in line with the previous learning experiences. Mayer (2002) divided this part into 3 sub-categories; (1) Generating, Describing problems and making choice or hypothesis which fulfil particular criteria or standard; (2) Planning, Practicing several steps to create real solution of problems or arranging systematic and suitable problem-solving method based on criteria of the problems itself; (3) Producing, Executing plans which fulfil certain specification to solve problems

2.5   Review of Related Finding

In doing this study, the researcher looked at the related study of analysed textbook. It could be seen as follows:

Noprika (2006) had conducted research, which aimed to find out the Reading Tasks in English Textbooks for Junior High School Published by Erlangga by Using Cognitive Domain of Bloom's Taxonomy. The population of this research was all of tasks from the three books series. The sample of this study was selected by using random sampling technique. The first unit in odd section of the English textbooks was selected as sample. This research used documentation technique for collecting the data. The data were collected by using checklist based on cognitive domain of bloom's taxonomy in the English textbook for junior high school (book 1, 2, and 3). The result of this research shows that the highest percentage for all series were comprehension. The percentage of reading task for the first book was 55.1%, for the second book was 53.8%, and for the third book was 59.1%. The highest-level evaluation was not applied in all three books series.

The coefficient correlation result was 0.94. The coefficient correlation between main researcher and co researcher were significant, because "r" value higher than the table critical value.

Anggraeni (2013) investigated about The Analysis of Reading Questions Based on Revised Bloom's Taxonomy in English Textbooks for Senior High Schools Grade X. This study was intended to describe the question forms and the categories of reading questions based on Revised Bloom's Taxonomy as the widely used taxonomy in education. Besides, it was also to know the frequency of each category of each monologue text, which included recount, narrative, procedure, descriptive, and news item taught in grade X. In particular, this study was conducted to analyse reading questions based on the question forms and Revised Bloom's Taxonomy between the English textbook published by the government and the non-government.

The data were collected by gathering all the post-reading questions and sorting the reading questions in each monologue text. Then, they were analysed based on the knowledge dimension and the cognitive process dimension of Revised Bloom's taxonomy and the question forms. After the analysis was done, the data were converted into the percentage. The results of this study were divided into three parts. The first dealt with the question forms in both textbooks. The second part was Revised Bloom's taxonomy categories found. The first textbook had six categories: remembering factual knowledge, understanding factual knowledge, understanding conceptual knowledge, applying factual knowledge, applying conceptual knowledge, and analyzing conceptual knowledge, while the second textbook consisted of nine categories: remembering factual knowledge,

understanding factual knowledge, understanding conceptual knowledge, analyzing factual knowledge, analyzing conceptual knowledge, evaluating factual knowledge, evaluating conceptual knowledge, creating factual knowledge, and creating conceptual knowledge.

The third part was the frequency of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy categories in each monologue text. This study found that the questions in the low levels of thinking (remembering, understanding, and applying) were dominant, while the questions in the high levels of thinking (analyzing, evaluating, and creating) were limited. The first textbook showed that the frequency in the recount text was 100% questions in the low levels of thinking, the narrative text was 96% questions in the low levels of thinking and 4% questions in the high levels of thinking, the procedure text was 100% questions in the low levels of thinking, the descriptive text was 100% questions in the low levels of thinking, and the news item was 100% questions in the low levels of thinking. In Textbook 2, the percentage in the recount text was 72.5% questions in the low levels of thinking and 27.5% questions in the high levels of thinking, the narrative text was 68.2% questions in the low levels of thinking and 31.8% questions in the high levels of thinking, the procedure text was 57.1% questions in the low levels of thinking and 42.9% questions in the high levels of thinking, the descriptive text was 86.4% questions in the low levels of thinking and 13.3% questions in the high levels of thinking, and the news item was 81.25% questions in the low levels of thinking and 18.75% questions in the high levels of thinking. To conclude, the first textbook had 148 questions or 98.7% questions in the low levels of thinking, and 2 questions or 1.3% questions in the high levels of thinking, while the second textbook had 123

questions or 74.1% questions in the low levels of thinking, and 43 questions or 25.9% questions in the high levels of thinking.

Novianti (2002) had conducted research, which aimed to reveal task categories in English textbooks for senior high schools published by the department of national education based on cognitive domain of bloom's taxonomy. The population of this research was all units in English textbook while the sample was units in English textbook for the first, second, and third year students, selected by employing the systematic random sampling technique. The data were selected by identifying all tasks in the sample, categorizing, and analysing them based on bloom's taxonomy (cognitive domain), comprising knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation categories. The results show that there were five categories, which were applied in three book-series. It was also found that the most of the tasks categories mainly focused on lower level cognitive categories, namely knowledge and comprehension category. While application, analysis, and synthesis only constituted a small percentage. The highest-level category (evaluation) did not exist.

According to the result of the previous studies, the researcher can conclude that almost of the reading tasks in the textbooks only focus on the low levels of cognitive domain.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.1   Research Design

This study was a descriptive study, which analysed the reading tasks in "English in Focus" textbook for Junior High School published by The National Education Department in 2008 based on the cognitive domain of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy. Nawawi and Martini (1994:73) stated descriptive method as procedure to solve the problem through describing object of the research based on fact finding.

The dominant design of this research was Qualitative method. Qualitative method is research method which is use to investigate a natural object and stresses on meaning or purpose (Sugiyono, 2007:1). The research investigated the components cognitive processes of task employed in English Focus Textbook for Junior High School" published by The National Education Department based on the cognitive domain of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy. Furthermore, this research used quantitative method as supporting qualitative method.

Bryman in Brannen (2005:37) stated that quantitative methods could be used as facilitator in qualitative research. Quantitative method will describe percentage of every component of cognitive process in the task. Emzir (2011:28) stated Quantative method is a research method which primary use paradigm based on constructivist view. The researcher used quantitative method to find out percentage of any components cognitive domain of reading tasks. The percentages

of those components were used as a standard to determine dominant component that was stated in the reading tasks of English in focus textbook.

3.2. Object of the Research

3.2.1. Population

The populations of this study were 155 reading tasks of English in Focus textbook that is published by The National Education Department in 2008. This textbook is used by English teacher at the first, second, and third grade of the Junior High School. Book 1 is designed for the first grade. Book 2 is designed for the second grade. Book 3 is designed for the third grade.

Table 7. Tasks in three books.

Book	Chapter	Tasks
Book 1	8	47 tasks
Book 2	6	57 tasks
Book 3	5	51 tasks
	19 chapter	155 tasks.

3.2.2. Sample

The sample of this study was reading tasks in "English in Focus" textbook for first, second and third grade. This study used proportional stratified random sampling technique. Random sampling is sampling that is chosen by random manner from the population and stratified random sampling is the way to choose some elements in population, so every element has a chance to be chosen equally (Susanti, 2010:23).

There were several justifications to use random sampling: 1. Total of every task in one book almost same. 2. All reading tasks in three books are taken as the sample of this research. Total of reading tasks in three books are 155 tasks. If the number of population is less than 100, thus it must be taken all, but if it is more than 100, it is enough to take 10 – 15 % or 20-25% from the number of population that have decided (Arikunto, 2006:134).

The researcher decided to use 20% from 47 tasks of book 1, 20% from 57 tasks of book 2, and 20% from 51 tasks of book 3. The researcher will use SPSS (Statistical Program for Social Science) version 16.0 to choose random sampling in every book. SPSS is set of statistic computerization program, which is used to process and analyse research data. SPSS program can be used to process or analyse data systematically. The researcher used SPSS to pick up 20% from 155 tasks that was used as sample of this research. The researcher served the result in the following table:

Table 8. Sample of the Research

Book (Tasks)	Number of tasks	Number Quantity of sample
Book 1 (Tasks 1- 47)	1,5,9,10,12,20,21,29,32	9
Book 2 (Task 48-104)	1,5,9,10,11,12,20,21,29,32,43,56	12
Book 3 (task 105-155)	3,9,13,15,22,27,31,33,40,51	10
	Sum	31

3.3. Instrument

The researcher used observation method in this study. Observation method is observing and making a note through systematic phenomenon that will be investigated (Hadi, 1989:134). The instrument of observation was checklist. Checklist is a list of data variable that will be collected (Arikunto, 2006:159). The observation checklist contained six components of cognitive process of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy. The researcher marked (✓) in the columns of the checklist if the task was using the component of cognitive process of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy.

Table 9. The sample of checklist

Cognitive Domain					
Remembering	Understanding	Applying	Analyzing	Evaluating	Creating

3.4. Data Collection Technique

The data was collected by using checklist. The checklist was used to analyse the components of the cognitive domain of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy. The researcher used two raters to collect the data. The two raters were the researcher and co-researcher. The checklist of Cognitive domain contain

remembering level, understanding level, applying level, analyzing level, evaluating level, and applying level.

The researcher created the basic rules in rating. The form level of cognitive domain in the task was appropriate with the level of cognitive domain in the checklist. The researcher and co-researcher marked (✓) in the column if the cognitive level of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy in the tasks matches with the description of the cognitive domain of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy.

The reliability between researcher and co-researcher was analysed by using SPSS application. The researcher was described as rater 1 and co-researcher was described as rater 2. The reliability between the researcher and co-researcher analysed reliability in cognitive level. The result of reliability between researcher and co-researcher was 1,000 (excellent). Therefore, the researcher only used researcher's result.

3.5   Research Procedure

The procedures of the research were:

1. The researcher collected English in Focus Textbook for Junior High School.

2. The researcher collected all of reading tasks in every book to get sum of tasks.

3. The reading tasks in every book took equally by proportional stratified random sampling technique.

4. The researcher used SPSS application to choose random sampling and took 20 % of reading tasks from every book.

5. The researcher and Co-researcher categorized the reading tasks by using the checklist, which consist of six components of cognitive domain.

6. The researcher analysed the result's reliability between researcher and co-researcher by using Cohen's kappa formula and calculates in SPSS application to find reliability.

7. The researcher described the result of the research.

3.6   Data Analysis

The reading tasks were analysed and evaluated by using components of cognitive process and operational verb proposed by Krathwohl and Anderson in Revised Bloom's Taxonomy. The researcher used checklist as the instrument to analyse and evaluate the sample tasks. The checklist consists of six cognitive domains. The research processes involved Co-researcher as a partner to get reliability. The co-researcher was approximately in the same level knowledge with the researcher himself to get reliability. Finally, the result of the checklist showed the percentage of tasks, which are using the cognitive domain of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy.

The data analysed use the following formula:

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\ \%$$

P = percentage

F = the Number of tasks

N = the number of all tasks

(Adapted by Sudijono (2010:43))

The researcher used Cohen's kappa formula to avoid the degree of subjectivity in making judgement and analysed the reliability between researcher and co-researcher. The formula was published by Cohen (1960). Cohen kappa coefficient is a statistical measure of inter-rater agreement for qualitative items. Furthermore, the researcher used SPSS program to calculate it.

The formula is:

$$k = \frac{Pr(a) - Pr(e)}{1 - Pr(e)}$$

k   = Agreement Frequency

Pr (a)= the Overall Probability of Same Agreement

Pr (e)= the Overall Probability of Random Agreement

If the result is below 0.40, it mean as poor agreement

If the result is between 0.41-0.70, it mean as fair to good agreement

If the result is above 0.70, it mean as excellent