

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter presents the conclusion of this study and the suggestions:

5.1 Conclusion

This study aims (1) to know the cognitive levels of reading comprehension questions in the English textbook “ESPS English” published by Erlangga based on Revised Bloom’s Taxonomy and (2) to find out how are the questions in “ESPS English” textbook formulated.

Based on research findings, the textbook “ESPS English” for grade XI published by Erlangga (2019 edition) does not cover all cognitive levels in Revised Bloom's Taxonomy. There are six cognitive levels in Revised Bloom's Taxonomy such as remember, understand, apply, analyze, evaluate, and create. The “ESPS English” textbook only provides 4 cognitive levels, namely remember, understand, analyze, and create. The writer did not find any cognitive level apply and evaluate in this textbook. In the "ESPS English" textbook there are reading questions in the categories remember (102 questions), understand (52 questions), analyze (4 questions), and create (4 questions). The percentage results for remember is 62.9%, understand 32%, analyze 2.4%, and create 2.4%. The overall percentage results show that the “ESPS English” textbook consists of 95.1% LOTS questions and 4.9% HOTS. This concludes that the “ESPS English” textbook is dominated by LOTS questions with the highest percentage of 95.1% compared to HOTS. This means that the cognitive level in the “ESPS English” textbook published by Erlangga is LOTS with the highest category is remember level. The formulation of questions in this textbook is dominated by *literal comprehension of the text* questions which practice students' memory in answering questions with the highest number 102 of the total 162 questions. It can also be concluded that the formulation of questions in this textbook is LOTS question type.

All in all, it can be concluded that the "ESPS English" textbook is not suitable to develop the critical and creative thinking skills of grade XI students.

5.1 Suggestions

In this section, the writer would like to give some suggestions for the English teachers and the author of textbook. Here are the suggestions:

- For English teachers

For English teachers, the writer suggests that English teachers need to provide supplementary HOTS questions in the textbooks so that students are able to practice thinking critically and creatively. In addition, teachers can also add other reading texts from various sources and prepare LOTS and HOTS questions related to the text so that students can have more exercises to develop their HOTS.

- For the author of the textbook

The writer suggests that the LOTS and HOTS questions should be properly distributed in each chapter, with more HOTS questions for grade XI. In addition, the writer also suggests that all cognitive levels in the Revised Bloom's Taxonomy be used in making textbook questions. It would be better to cover all cognitive levels and increase HOTS questions than LOTS so that students are able to practice thinking critically and creatively in answering the question.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (2001). *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing*. Abridged Edition. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Cline, F., Johnstone, C., & King, T. (2006). *Focus Group Reaction to Three Definition of Reading (as Originally Developed in Support NARAP Goal (1)*. Minneapolis, M.N.: National Accessible Reading Assesment Project.
- Febrina, Bustami Usman, & Asnawi Muslem. (2019). Analysis of Reading Comprehension Questions by Using Revised Bloom's Taxonomy on Higher Order Thinking Skill (HOTS). *English Education Journal: Jurnal Pengembangan Pendidikan Dan Pengembangan Pengajaran Bahasa*, 10(1), 1–15.
- Grellet, F. (1981). *Developing Reading Skills: A Practical Guide to Reading Comprehension Exercise*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kondracki, Nancy., Nancy A Wellman., & Daniel R Amudson,. (2002). Content Analysis: Review of Method and Their Application in Nutrition Education. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior* 34, 4: 223-30.
- Mikulecky, B. S. & Jeffries, L. (2007). *Advanced Reading Power: Extensive Reading, Vocabulary Building, Comprehension Skills, Reading Faster*. New York: Longman.
- Nation, I.S.P (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL Reading and Writing*. New York: Routledge. Minneapolis, M.N.: National Accessible Reading Assesment Project
- Radiah, Hifzahtul. (2016). *An Analysis on the Readings Material and Questioning Comprehension of English Textbook Mount for Eight Grade of Junior High School Students*. Undergraduate thesis, State Islamic Institute of Palangka Raya, Palangka Raya.
- O'Donoghue, T., Punch K. (2003). *Qualitative Educational Research in Action: Doing and Reflecting*. London: Routledge.
- Olson, J.P and M.H Diller. (1982). *Learning to Teach Reading in Elementary School*. London: MacMillan Publishing Company.

Urquhart, A. H. & Weir, C. (1998). *Reading in a second Language*. London: Longman.

Woolley, G. (2011). *Reading Comprehension:Assisting Children with Learning Difficulties*. New York: Springer

Wulandari, A.I, (2016).*A Content Analysis of Reading Comprehension Revised Version of Bloom's Taxonomy*. Undergraduate thesis, Jember University, Jember.