# THE CLASSIFICATION OF READING COMPREHENSION QUESTIONS IN THE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEXTBOOK ENTITLED "ENGLISH" USING BARRETT'S TAXONOMY

#### **A THESIS**

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Sarjana Pendidikan Degree in English Language Teaching



By:

#### **Irene Candra**

1213010020

ENGLISH DEPARTMENT
FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION
WIDYA MANDALA CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY
SURABAYA
2014

(1)

This thesis entitled The Classification of Reading Comprehension Questions in the Senior High School Textbook Entitled "English" Using Barrett's Taxonomy conducted and submitted by Irene Candra has been approved and accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for Sarjana Pendidikan Degree in English Language Teaching by the following advisors:

Dr. V. Luluk Prijambodo, M. Pd. First Advisor Johanes Leonardi Taloko, M. Sc. Second Advisor

a hard

#### APPROVAL SHEET

(2)

This thesis has been examined by the Committee on Oral Examination on July 18<sup>th</sup>, 2014. with a grade of\_ Chairperson Dra. Susana Teopilus, M. Pd. Member Dra, Agnes Santi Widiati, M. Pd. Secretary Johanes Leonardi Taloko, M. Sc. VID Tites Advisor

Training and Education

## SURAT PERNYATAAN PERSETUJUAN PUBLIKASI KARYA ILMIAH

Demi perkembangan Ilmu Pengetahuan, saya sebagai mahasiswa Universitas Katolik Widya Mandala Surabaya:

Nama Mahasiswa : IRENE CANDRA

Nomor Pokok : 1213010020

Program Studi : Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris – Jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa & Seni

Fakultas : Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan

Perguruan Tinggi : Universitas Katolik Widya Mandala Surabaya

Tanggal Lulus : 18 JULI 2014

Dengan ini SETUJU/TIDAK SETUJU\*) Skripsi atau Karya Ilmiah saya,

Judul: THE CLASSIFICATION OF READING COMPREHENSION QUESTIONS

IN THE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEXTBOOK ENTITLED "ENGLISH"

USING BARRETT'S TAXONOMY

Untuk dipublikasikan/ditampilkan di Internet atau media lain (Digital Library Perpustakaan Universitas Katolik Widya Mandala Surabaya) untuk kepentingan akademik sebatas sesuai dengan Undang-undang Hak Cipta yang berlaku.

Demikian surat pernyataan **SETUJU/TIDAK-SETUJU\***) publikasi Karya Ilmiah ini saya buat dengan sebenarnya.

Catatan:

\*) coret yang tidak perlu

Surabaya, 18 JULI 2014 Yang menyatakan,

7EFACACF331603118
ENAM RIBU RUPIAH

6000 DJP

IRENE CANORA NRP.: 1213010020

#### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Without the help and support of the kind people around me, it would not have been possible to write this thesis as a partial fulfillment of the requirement for the Sarjana Pendidikan Degree.

Above all, the writer would like to express her deepest gratitude for both of her advisors; Dr. V. Luluk Prijambodo, M. Pd–the first advisor, and Johanes Leonardi Taloko, M. Sc–the second advisor, who have given valuable guidance, encouragement, inputs and suggestions for the completion of this thesis. Their endless guidance and patience have helped the writer a lot, which the writer is extremely grateful of.

The writer would also like to thank her family who has given encouragement, kindness and support during the completion of this thesis.

At last but not least, the writer would also like to thank her friends from Widya Mandala Catholic University namely: Amelia Wijaya, Angelina Ariyanti, Diania Yovita, Yohanna Omegawati Rumondor and Selvin Priscilla Wardana for their supports, helps and kindness.

There are also absolutely many people that she could not mention their name here one by one. Without their help, this thesis could have never come in its present form.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPR	ROVAL SHEE	ET (1)	i	
APPR	ROVAL SHEE	ET (2)	ii	
SURA	AT PERNYAT	ΓAAN PUBLIKASI	iii	
ACK	NOWLEDGE	MENT	iv	
TABI	LE OF CONT	ENTS	V	
LIST	LIST OF FIGURES.			
LIST	OF TABLES.		ix	
ABS	ΓRACT		X	
CHA	PTER I: INT	RODUCTION		
1.1.	The Backgro	ound of the Study	1	
1.2.	The Researc	ch Questions	4	
1.3.	The Objecti	ves of the Study	5	
1.4.	The Theoret	tical Framework	6	
1.5.	The Signific	cance of the Study	6	
1.6.	The Scope a	and Limitation of the Study	7	
1.7.	The Definiti	ion of Key Terms	8	
1.8.	The Organiz	zation of the Study	8	
CHA	PTER II: LI	TERATURE REVIEW		
2.1.	The Theoret	tical Framework	9	
	2.1.1.	The Nature of Reading.	9	
	2.1.2.	The Comprehension Taxonomy	10	
	2.1.3.	Barrett's Taxonomy	11	
		2.1.3.1. Literal Recognition or Recall	12	
		2.1.3.2. Inference	13	
		2.1.3.3. Evaluation	14	
		2.1.3.4. Appreciation	16	
2.2.	The Previou	us Study	16	
CHA	PTER III: RI	ESEARCH METHODOLOGY		
3.1.	The Resear	ch Design	19	
3.2.	The Source	of Data	21	
3.3.	The Instrun	nents of the Research	22	
3.4.	The Procedures of Collecting the Data		23	
3.5.	The Procedures of Analyzing the Data.			
CHA	PTER IV: FI	NDINGS AND DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS		
4.1.	Findings		27	
4.2.	Discussion of	of the Findings	50	

CHAP'	TER V: CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS	
5.1.	Conclusion.	53
5.2.	Suggestions	54
	5.2.1. Suggestions for the Authors	54
	5.2.2. Suggestions for English Teachers	55
	5.2.3. Suggestions for Further Researchers.	55
BIBLIC	OGRAPHY	
APPEN	NDICES	

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3.1	The Structure of the Research Design.	20
Figure 3.2	Tailor-made Checklist Based on Barrett's Taxonomy	22
Chart 4.1	The Occurrence of Each Level of Questions in Lesson One	
	Reading Text One.	. 29
Chart 4.2	The Occurrence of Each Level of Questions in Lesson One	
	Reading Text Two	. 30
Chart 4.3	The Occurrence of Each Level of Questions in Lesson Two	
	Reading Text One.	. 31
Chart 4.4	The Occurrence of Each Level of Questions in Lesson Two	
	Reading Text Two.	. 32
Chart 4.5	The Occurrence of Each Level of Questions in Lesson Four	
	Reading Text One	. 34
Chart 4.6	The Occurrence of Each Level of Questions in Lesson Four	
	Reading Text Two	. 35
Chart 4.7	The Occurrence of Each Level of Questions in Lesson Four	
	Reading Text Three	. 36
Chart 4.8	The Occurrence of Each Level of Questions in Lesson Five	
	Reading Text One, Part One	. 38
Chart 4.9	The Occurrence of Each Level of Questions in Lesson Five	
	Reading Text One, Part Two	39
Chart 4.10	The Occurrence of Each Level of Questions in Lesson Five	
	Reading Text Two	40
Chart 4.11	The Occurrence of Each Level of Questions in Lesson Seven	
	Reading Text One	41
Chart 4.12	The Occurrence of Each Level of Questions in Lesson Five	
	Reading Text Two	. 43
Chart 4.13	The Occurrence of Each Level of Questions in Lesson Seven	
	Reading Text Three	. 44
Chart 4.14	The Occurrence of Each Level of Questions in Lesson Eight	
	Reading Text One	. 46
Chart 4.15	The Occurrence of Each Level of Questions in Lesson Eight	
	Reading Text Two	. 48
Chart 4.16	The Recapitulation of the Occurrence of All Levels of Ques-	
	tions from Lesson One, Two, Four, Five, Seven and Eight	49

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1	The List of Reading Text and Number of Questions Classified in	
	this Study	23
Table 3.2	The Percentage of Reading Comprehension Questions in Each	
	Level in Every Lesson and Every Reading Text	25
Table 3.3	The Number of Reading Comprehension Questions of Each Level	
	of Questions	26
Table 4.1	The Occurrence of Each Level of Questions in Lesson One	
	Reading Text One	28
Table 4.2	The Occurrence of Each Level of Questions in Lesson One	
	Reading Text Two.	29
Table 4.3	The Occurrence of Each Level of Questions in Lesson Two	
	Reading Text One	31
Table 4.4	The Occurrence of Each Level of Questions in Lesson Two	
	Reading Text Two.	32
Table 4.5	The Occurrence of Each Level of Questions in Lesson Four	
	Reading Text One.	33
Table 4.6	The Occurrence of Each Level of Questions in Lesson Four	
	Reading Text Two.	34
Table 4.7	The Occurrence of Each Level of Questions in Lesson Four	
	Reading Text Three	36
Table 4.8	The Occurrence of Each Level of Questions in Lesson Five	
	Reading Text One, Part One.	37
Table 4.9	The Occurrence of Each Level of Questions in Lesson Five	
	Reading Text One, Part Two	38
Table 4.10	The Occurrence of Each Level of Questions in Lesson Five	
	Reading Text Two	39
Table 4.11	The Occurrence of Each Level of Questions in Lesson Seven	
	Reading Text One.	41
Table 4.12	The Occurrence of Each Level of Questions in Lesson Five	
	Reading Text Two.	42
Table 4.13	The Occurrence of Each Level of Questions in Lesson Seven	
	Reading Text Three	44
Table 4.14	The Occurrence of Each Level of Questions in Lesson Eight	
	Reading Text One.	45
Table 4.15	The Occurrence of Each Level of Questions in Lesson Eight	
	Reading Text Two.	47

Table 4.16	The Recapitulation of the Occurrence of Each Level of Ques-	
	tions from Lesson One, Two, Four, Five, Seven and Eight	48
Table 4.17	The Recapitulation of the Occurrence of All Levels of Ques-	
	tions from Lesson One, Two, Four, Five, Seven and Eight	49

#### **ABSTRACT**

Candra, Irene. 2014. The Classification of Reading Comprehension Questions in Senior High School Textbook Entitled "English" Using Barrett's Taxonomy. English Faculty of Teacher Training and Education. Widya Mandala Catholic University, Surabaya.

Advisors: (1) Drs. V. Luluk Prijambodo, M. Pd. (2) Johanes Leonardi Taloko, M. Sc.

**Keywords:** Barrett's taxonomy, reading comprehension, reading comprehension questions, levels of questions.

In the English classroom, students read with a purpose to achieve reading comprehension. To check the students' reading comprehension, English teachers usually use reading comprehension questions provided in the students' English textbooks.

According to Dupuis and Askov, students should be given questions of four levels of Barrett's taxonomy. 129 reading comprehension questions from the English textbook entitled "English" are classified using tailor-made checklist made based on Barrett's taxonomy to find out: (1) the levels of reading comprehension questions based on the Barrett's taxonomy found in the English textbook entitled "English" (2) the percentage of the occurrence of each of the levels of reading comprehension questions based on the Barrett's taxonomy in the English textbook entitled "English". Barrett's taxonomy is used as a parameter to classify four levels of questions: (1) literal recognition or recall (2) inference (3) evaluation (4) appreciation.

In this study, it was found that: (1) there were only three levels of questions covered: literal recognition or recall, inference and evaluation (2) there were 70 questions (54%) in literal recognition or recall level of questions (3) there were 58 questions (45%) in inference level of questions (4) there was 1 question (1%) in evaluation level of questions (5) there was no question in appreciation level of questions.

In conclusion, the English textbook entitled "English" is not a good textbook because the reading comprehension questions did not cover all levels of questions as it focuses mainly on literal recognition level of questions which is relatively easy. To support the use for this book, it is suggested that English teachers prepare reading comprehension questions which cover evaluation and appreciation levels of questions.