

READING QUESTIONS QUALITY IN AN ENGLISH WORKSHEET FOR GRADE XI OF VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL BASED ON REVISED BLOOM'S TAXONOMY

Ummi Kalsum Purba

Nora Ronita Dewi, S.Pd., S.S., M.Hum.

ABSTRACT

This research is aimed to analyze the reading questions quality in an English worksheet for grade XI of Vocational High School based on Revised Bloom's taxonomy. This study is conducted by descriptive method, with qualitative as well as quantitative area. The subject of this study is reading questions which are taken from English worksheet for grade XI published by Surya Grafika Mandiri. Since this study uses observation method, the instruments of collecting data is by using checklist. The result of the checklist was analyzed both as qualitative and quantitative data. These data are the reading questions in English worksheet based on Revised Bloom's Taxonomy. The final result was the quality of reading questions categorized into each types of cognitive domain of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy.

Key words: *Reading Questions Quality, Worksheet, Vocational High School, Revised Bloom's Taxonomy*

I. INTRODUCTION

In teaching English, there are some goals that should be considered by English teachers. English itself has four main skills that should be taught to the students, and one of them is reading skill. In order to reach the goal of making the students mastering reading skill, there are some aspects that must be considered. One of the aspects is the teaching and learning material.

Teaching and learning material can be presented in various forms, for instance textbooks, worksheets, etc. Using a worksheet to teach the English language as compared to the traditional method of using a textbook is meant to increase active learning and improve critical thinking, as well as problem solving skills. It also gives

the lecturer the opportunity for conducting formative assessment in the classroom. Standardized worksheets have their own styles, and their contents, depth of coverage of materials, and organization, may affect the teaching and learning environment.

In order to know whether a worksheet can help the teachers or not, English teacher can use revised Bloom's taxonomy. Bloom's Taxonomy is a framework, which has some categories. These categories are one of basic principles in the taxonomy itself (Anderson, Krathwohl, 2001). Parera (1983) said that Bloom's taxonomy could help English teachers in determining and choosing learning materials by analyzing the tasks given.

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 questions was not balance because the reading questions only contained more low level of thinking rather than the higher level.

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 question applies balance higher order of thinking. The critical thinking of students is useful for students to solve their problems easier and systematically.

The theoretical framework will be used in analyzing the reading question in the worksheet will be the cognitive domain of Revised Bloom's taxonomy, which is categorized into lower order levels of thinking (remembering, understanding, applying), and higher order levels of thinking (analyzing, evaluating, creating). The reason in using Revised Bloom's taxonomy as the tool of this research is that it contains educational objectives that have been used in many countries. Besides, Revised Bloom's taxonomy is the most sophisticated tool in order to analyze the quality of the questions given in a worksheet.

In this research, the researcher will examine the reading questions in English worksheet by Surya Grafika Mandiri for grade XI of Vocational High School. The reason for examining the worksheet is to know more about the learning materials. Since learning materials are one of important aspects in learning and teaching process, teachers must consider the best learning material to use, in this case the worksheet used. Unfortunately, there still have problems in most of worksheets. The quality of the questions used in these worksheets cannot be used to improve students' reading ability, as the questions are still in the category of lower order. Whereas, most of the time, worksheets are often used by teachers in the learning and teaching process. Considering that issue, researcher was interested in discovering the reading question quality in an English worksheet. The worksheet will be discovered based on Revised Bloom's Taxonomy.

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

1. Reading Skills

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.

2. Questions Quality

According to Bloom's revised taxonomy theory, qualified questions are those questions which are categorized in Higher Order Thinking Skill (HOTS) area. Those kinds of questions are called Higher Order Questions (HOQ). Higher-order questions are those that the students cannot answer just by simple recollection or by reading the information "verbatim" from the text. Higher-order questions put advanced cognitive demand on students. They encourage students to think beyond literal questions.

3. Student Worksheet

The student worksheet is a guide for students in which the worksheets are used to conduct an inquiry or problem-solving activities. It can be a guide for cognitive aspect development exercises as well as guidelines for the development of all aspects of learning in the form of experimental or demonstration guidelines (Trianto, 2008). According to Departemen Pendidikan Nasional (2004), student worksheet is a sheet that contains tasks that must be done by learners. Student worksheet contains instructions and steps to complete a task that is assigned to students that can be either theory of practice.

a. Questions in Student Worksheet

A worksheet provides questions to make an English teacher easier to provide the activities for students. Question is one of the components of worksheets and play important role for English teachers in teaching and learning process. Student's activities in the classroom are usually taken from some questions in the worksheet, for example: Student's practice conversation, reading stories, write in a paper, and sharing about the story.

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 et 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.

Cognitive Domain of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy

Cognitive domain also called cognitive process because those are consists 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 analyze the assessment and curriculum and those are indicating to focus only on remembering cognitive process without more exploration on the other cognitive process. Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) categorize the cognitive domain into the following categories as follow:

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, meta-cognitive, or combination among of that 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.

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 messages 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.

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.

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.

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.

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 processes. 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.

III. RESEARCH METHOD

This study was a descriptive study, which analyze the reading questions in English module for Vocational High School published by Surya Grafika Mandiri 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 will investigate the components cognitive processes of questions employed in English worksheet for Vocational High School published by Surya Grafika Mandiri based on the cognitive domain of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy. Furthermore, this research will use quantitative method as supporting qualitative method.

The data of this research was the reading questions. The data was taken from English worksheet published by Surya Grafika Mandiri. The worksheet is for Second graders of Vocational High School. The Reading questions used as the research data is the whole Reading questions in the worksheet.

IV. RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Findings

The data were analyzed per unit. This study covers 5 units and 2 reviews. There are 153 questions which were analyzed. Those questions spread over 76 (49.7%) remembering, 63 (41.2%) understanding, 2 (1.3%) applying, 4 (2.6%) analyzing, 8 (5.2%) evaluating, and 0 creating.

Table 4.1 tells that the worksheet does not distribute the questions into complete cognitive in each unit. There is a dominant question of the cognitive domain of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy in each unit in the worksheet.

This finding implies that the number of questions categorized in cognitive level of remembering is the highest in this worksheet with the percentage of 49.7%. The frequency of remembering is 76 of 153 questions. The questions categorized in understanding level take place as the second dominant with the percentage of 41.2% and the frequency is 63 of 153 questions. The third cognitive level that appears more than the other is evaluating with the percentage of 5.2% and the frequency is 8. Furthermore, the cognitive level of analyzing take as the fourth place with the percentage of 2.6% and the frequency is 4 questions. Meanwhile, the cognitive level of is in the fifth place with the percentage of 1.3% and the frequency is 2 questions. As a matter of fact, there is no question that could be categorized in the cognitive level of creating.

B. Discussion

Based on the data analysis toward the English worksheet for grade XI of Vocational High School, there is a tendency that the most dominant cognitive domain of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy in the worksheet is remembering level. It means that recalling previous material that had been taught before dominant in the worksheet. It can be seen from the result of the table of analysis that has shown 76 questions of 153 questions in reading area are remembering level. It appeared most frequently, with the percentage of 49.7%.

Understanding level occupied the second position after remembering. 63 of 153 questions or 41.2% of all the questions in reading area are categorized as understanding level. It showed that there are 33% of the questions supposed the student to grasp the meaning of material, translate the material, and interpret the material from one form to another. This is the lowest level of the comprehension material of the student.

Surprisingly, there are only 2 questions in reading area that can be categorized into applying level. It means that only 1.3% of all the reading questions supposed student to use and implement their knowledge in familiar task, to apply their knowledge in proper situations, and to execute the theories.

There are only few reading questions that can be categorized into analyzing level. It only consists of 4 questions of 153 reading questions, with the percentage of 2.6%.

Another cognitive domain that is not frequently found in the worksheet is evaluating level. It only consists of 8 questions of 153 reading questions, with the percentage of 5.2%.

Although the two domain of analyzing and evaluating are implemented in the worksheet, the amount of these two domains is not sufficient. It showed how the worksheet is not appropriate to use in order to increase the critical thinking skills of students.

Unfortunately, there is no question related in reading area found that can be categorized into creating level. It shows how weak the worksheet is to use.

The result implies that the author of the English worksheet published by Surya Grafika Mandiri for grade XI of Vocational High School placed emphasis on the lower order of thinking that the most dominant amount of the reading questions found is categorized as remembering level. This number is totally contrasts if we compare it to the higher order of thinking. There were not so many reading questions that can be categorized into the higher order of thinking skill. It is not suitable to use by teachers if their goal is to increase the students' thinking skills.

As demonstrated into the data, the English worksheet published by Surya Grafika Mandiri for grade XI of Vocational High School is not appropriate with the cognitive domain theory of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy. It did not cover the entire cognitive domain, especially in the three higher order thinking: analyzing, evaluating, and creating.

V. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Conclusion

Based on the data analysis, the conclusion of this research is that the English worksheet published by Surya Grafika Mandiri for grade XI of Vocational High School does not appropriate to use based on Revised Bloom's taxonomy. The worksheet did not cover the entire cognitive dimension of Revised Bloom's taxonomy in each unit. It showed that there were unequal reading questions distributions of the six levels of Revised Bloom's taxonomy. The amounts of those questions were not sufficient.

Regarding the cognitive dimensions of Revised Bloom's taxonomy found in the worksheet, the author of the worksheet placed emphasis on the lower thinking process rather than the higher one. 92.2% of the total of reading questions found in the worksheet was categorized as lower order thinking skill, and only 7.8% of the total questions could be categorized as higher order thinking skill. It means that the author of the worksheet had given more attention to the level of remembering, understanding, and applying rather than to the level of analyzing, evaluating, and creating.

Suggestion

It will be better for school to give more attention to the compatibility of the material to use, especially for the worksheet. Schools must be selective in choosing the appropriate worksheet that can develop student's competence.

Through this research, teachers can see which cognitive dimensions were appropriate to be taught for Grade XI of Vocational High School. Therefore, teachers need to revise the existing questions to supplement the inappropriate level.

References .

- Anderson, L., Krathwohl, R.D. (2001). *Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. New York: Longman.
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language Assessment Principle and Classroom Practices*. California: Longman.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.(2004). *Pedoman Umum Pengembangan Bahan Ajar Sekolah Menengah Atas*. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, ID: Direktorat Pendidikan Menengah Umum.
- Krathwohl, D. R. (2002). A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy: An Overview. *Theory into Practice*, 41(4), 212-218,
<http://www.unco.edu/cetl/sir/staff/statingoutcome/documents/krathwohl.pdf>
[Accessed 20 Maret 2019]
- Linse, C. T. (2005). *Practical English Language Teaching: Young Learners*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Mayer, R. E. (2002). *Teaching for Meaningful Learning*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Nawawi, H and Martini, M. (1994). *Penelitian Terapan*. Yogyakarta: Gajah Mada University Press.
- Parera, J.D. (1983). *Keterampilan Bertanya dan Menjelaskan*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Sugiyono.(2007). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta
- Trianto.(2008). *Mendesain Pembelajaran Kontekstual (Contextual Teaching and Learning) di Kelas*. Jakarta: CerdasPustaka.

