

## **CHAPTER V**

### **SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION**

This chapter consists of two sections. The first section deals with summary of the study and the second section deals with recommendation.

#### **5.1 Summary of the Study**

Reading is an important activity for students because it influences their academic success. There is an active thinking process that happens while reading because it provides knowledge for students. As educators, teachers need to help students to improve their reading skills. It can be done by giving them reading comprehension questions that covers all the thinking levels in the cognitive domain of Bloom's Digital Taxonomy after the reading process to make sure that the students really comprehend the text. It also helps students to be more critical in thinking.

The cognitive domain of Bloom's Digital Taxonomy consists of six thinking levels, namely remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating. Remembering requires students to retrieve, recall, or reorganize knowledge from their memory. Understanding requires students to construct meaning from the content of the text. Applying requires students to carry out or using a procedure through executing or implementing. Analyzing requires students to break a concept into parts and determine how the parts related or interrelate to one another or to an overall structure or

purpose. Evaluating requires students to make judgments based on criteria and standards through checking and critiquing. Creating requires students to put elements together to form coherent or functional whole and reorganize elements into a new pattern or structure through generating, planning, or producing.

This study focuses on finding the reading comprehension question types and the proportion of each question type in *Mandiri: English on Target*. There are 9 chapters, 81 reading texts, and 225 reading comprehension questions in the course book which become the data source of this study. The writer used the cognitive domain of Bloom's Digital Taxonomy as a parameter to find the question types in the course book. She categorized all comprehension questions using a checklist.

The findings of the study shows that the biggest proportion was remembering question type. There are 100 questions or 44.44% of remembering level, 75 questions or 33.33% of understanding level, 46 questions or 20.44% of analyzing level, 4 questions or 1.78% of evaluating level and 0% of applying and creating question types. It means that out of six question types, the reading comprehension questions in *Mandiri: English on Target* only supply four types of comprehension questions (remembering, understanding, analyzing, and evaluating). Two other question types (applying and creating) are out of attention; no reading comprehension questions of applying and creating are available in the course book. With such a portion which focuses more on remembering and understanding level, *Mandiri: English on Target*

pays more attention to the development of students' recalling and understanding, rather than to the development of their critical thinking. Thus, it can be argued that the objective of the study could not be achieved because *Mandiri: English on Target* has not met the demand of Curriculum 2013.

## 5.2 Recommendation

Related to the findings of the study, the writer proposes some recommendations as follow.

- Teachers who want to buy a course book which provide reading section should consider whether the reading comprehension questions presented in the course book can help readers to comprehend reading texts well. Teachers should also look at the basic competence written in the course book to consider whether the course book has been really written based on the curriculum.
- Teachers who use *Mandiri: English on Target* should give students more comprehension questions, especially questions at applying and creating levels due to the incompleteness of the question types presented in the course book.
- Teachers who give reading exercises to students should consider that the comprehension questions cover all the thinking levels in the cognitive domain of Bloom's Digital Taxonomy. If they only cover low thinking levels, teachers need to add some comprehension questions in higher thinking levels so that it can stimulate students' critical thinking.

- Book writers who want to construct reading comprehension questions should consider balance proportion for the question types so that the questions can lead students to be more creative and critical in thinking.
- Researchers who want to conduct a study should consider examining other books used in Senior High School.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Boss, J.A. (2010). *Think: Critical Thinking and Logic Skills for Everyday Life*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Daiek, D.B., & Anter, N.M. (2004). *Critical Reading for College and Beyond*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fisher, D.F., & Peters, C.W. (1981). *Comprehension and the Competent Reader: Inter-Specialty Perspectives*. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Forehand, M. (2005). *Bloom's Taxonomy: Original and Revised*. Retrieved November 15, 2014, from <http://www.coe.uga.edu/epltt/bloom.htm>.
- Krathwohl, D. R. (2002). *A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy: An Overview*. Retrieved March 18, 2015, from [http://www.unco.edu/cetl/sir/stating\\_outcome/documents/Krathwohl.pdf](http://www.unco.edu/cetl/sir/stating_outcome/documents/Krathwohl.pdf)
- (n.d.) *Instrumen Lengkap Penilaian Buku Teks Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris SMA/MA*. Retrieved February 15, 2015, from [https://www.academia.edu/7373077/02.\\_Instrumen\\_Buku\\_Teks\\_oleh\\_Kemendiknas](https://www.academia.edu/7373077/02._Instrumen_Buku_Teks_oleh_Kemendiknas)
- (n.d.) *Salinan Lampiran Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Nomor 69 Tahun 2013 tentang Kerangka Dasar dan Struktur Kurikulum SMA/MA*. Retrieved January 23, 2015, from <https://rayon116unej.files.wordpress.com/2013/08/07-b-salinan-lampiran-permendikbud-no-69-th-2013-ttg-kurikulum-sma-ma.pdf>
- Ningsih, R.M. (2009). *Reading Comprehension Questions in Second Grade of Senior High School English Text Book "Look Ahead" by Erlangga Based on Bloom Taxonomy Cognitive Domain*. Surabaya: Unpublished Thesis, Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya, FKIP.

- Nurdiyantoro, B. (1988). *Dasar-Dasar Pengembangan Kurikulum Sekolah: Sebuah Pengantar Teoritis dan Pelaksanaan*. Yogyakarta: BPFE.
- Patton, M.Q. (1999). *Enhancing the Quality and Credibility of Qualitative Analysis*. Retrieved April 12, 2015, from <https://www.uic.edu/sph/prepare/courses/chsc433/patton.pdf>
- Paulston, C.B., & Bruder, M.N. (1976). *Teaching English as a Second Language: Techniques and Procedures*. Cambridge: Winthrop Publishers, Inc.
- Ruggiero, V.R. (1988). *The Art of Thinking: A Guide to Critical and Creative Thought 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc.
- Soetikno, W.R. (2013). *Disain Kurikulum Digital*. Yogyakarta: Smart Writing.
- Spears, D. (2004). *Improving Reading Skills: Contemporary Readings for College Students 5<sup>th</sup> Edition*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Swan, M. (1976). *Understanding Ideas: Advance Reading Skills*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tanzil, J.E. (1998). *An Analysis on the Reading Comprehension Questions in Bahasa Inggris 3 by Ganecha Based on Bloom's Taxonomy of the Cognitive Domain*. Surabaya: Unpublished Thesis, Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya, FKIP.
- TEFLIN. (2013). *Pokok Pikiran dan Rekomendasi Kurikulum 2013*. Retrieved November 15, 2014, from [http://file.upi.edu/Direktori/FPBS/JUR.\\_PEND.\\_BAHASA\\_I\\_NGGRI/196706091994031-DIDI\\_SUKYADI/POKOK%20PIKIRAN%20DAN%20REKOMENDASI%20Kurikulum%202013%20final.pdf](http://file.upi.edu/Direktori/FPBS/JUR._PEND._BAHASA_I_NGGRI/196706091994031-DIDI_SUKYADI/POKOK%20PIKIRAN%20DAN%20REKOMENDASI%20Kurikulum%202013%20final.pdf)
- Widyanata, O.T. (2004). *An Analysis on Reading Questions of Senior High School English Textbook Based on Bloom's*

*Taxonomy of Cognitive Domain*. Surabaya: Unpublished Thesis, Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya, FKIP.