

# AN EVALUATION OF WH-QUESTION IN ENGLISH IN MIND TEXTBOOK AN BRIGHT AN ENGLISH TEXTBOOK SEEN IN TERMS OF BLOOM'S NEW TAXONOMY

**Intan Kristen G. Takasana**

*English Education Department, Faculty of Language and Arts*

*Universitas Negeri Manado*

*Tondano, Indonesia*

*Email: [itakasana@gmail.com](mailto:itakasana@gmail.com)*

**Abstract** : The study aimed at identifying and analyzing the types and levels of WH-question in two English Textbooks namely, English in Mind Textbook (EIM) and Bright An English Textbook (BAE) for eighth grade junior high school. The objective of the analysis was to evaluate the WH –questions in the light of the Bloom's New Taxonomy (1956) Taxonomy learning objectives ( Remembering, Understanding, Applying, Analyzing, Evaluating, Creating).Content analysis was used to conducted all the WH-questions in the two textbooks. All the WH-questions were collected, listed, and analyzed according to Bloom's New Taxonomy. The result from a total of 140 questions (70 questions in EIM and 70 questions in BAE) showed that most of the questions were align with remembering , understanding, and applying as the three lower – level categories, while analyzing, evaluating, and creating as the three higher-level categories constitute the lowest frequency in the two textbooks. Another result also for the proportion of higher-order questions in both Textbook showed that EIM received higher distribution while BAE constitute the highest distribution on lower-order questions. The result indicate that the textbooks failed to engage learners in the questions requiring higher levels of cognitive learning objectives. In the light of the results, the researcher suggested to modified the questions in the textbooks to cover the six levels of Bloom's new Taxonomy and to train teachers and author of textbook to use and write question following the Bloom's new Taxonomy.

**Keywords** : *Bloom's New Taxonomy, Content Analysis, English Textbook*

## INTRODUCTION

Questions are one of the important aspects in developing thinking skills. Thinking activity begins with the questions. As Aslan (2011) stated that “ Questions are parts of a textbook that openly interact with the students, and are directly posed to students”. Its stimulates the students to a deeper thinking process and develop their analytical, creative thinking and problem solving abilities and As an important element of textbook it also depends on how good the textbook is. In English language teaching especially textbook become an important instrument in teaching. It is serve as a guide for teachers and students of any level of education to be actively engaged in classroom practices. But the question is : Do

question in textbook help in engaging the students in developing their higher order thinking skill ? some findings have shown that questions in textbooks promote only lower-order thinking skills. As Ayaturochim (2014) who investigate the dominant of Cognitive Domain of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy in Reading Task of “English in Focus” textbook, found that there are only 2 component of cognitive domain were used while the other levels are not exist and Remembering level was the dominant component in the textbook. Moreover, Katemba and Marrie (2016) who analyzed teacher's questioning and student critical thinking in classroom, revealed that most of the questions were dominated of lower cognitive questions and had small number in higher cognitive questions.

Consider, the significance of higher order question in textbook, it is really important to evaluate the question and examine its contribution to the educational system in general and to the area of students' higher order thinking in particular. In order to help the students to achieve the higher order thinking process it would not be succeed without teachers role as a facilitator. Indonesian 2013 curriculum demanded that teachers should be a facilitator in the classroom for students. As Liando (2010) stated that "Students and teachers were two impact figures in the teaching and learning process. In this situation such in Indonesia, less student-centered but more teacher-centered was the common approach applied in the classroom all across subject areas". As Maru (2009) also argued that " Teachers solely employ a textbook as a learning source and rarely express themselves in English even for simple converse during the teaching session as well as act as the only one knows the text material used in the class position students as passive objects who have no opportunity to express their ideas, response and thought flourish the teaching and learning of English". In addition Liando (2010) also stated that " Despite the efforts of promoting students centered approach, the practice was clearly showing that teacher still held more dominant role as far as teaching English was concerned".

That is why teachers have a role to create opportunity for students to be active in learning process and learn in a more responsible and challenging manner but most importantly teachers must teach their student how to think and how to use higher order thinking skill. But it can not be denied that when the researcher doing her teaching practice the researcher has observed and learned that most the teachers have tied demanded schedule and very limited time to make their own materials. Those problem made them really depends on the textbooks. That is why it is important to evaluate the textbooks in order to see how it really helps the teachers.

Taxonomy Bloom's is one of the instrument that can be use to evaluate the questions in textbook. As Musial claims that " This Taxonomy has been extremely influential in education fo the past 50 years" (as cited in

Nana Pratiwi, 2015). Hence, Bloom's Taxonomy is still considered as a helpful teaching tool today. However in this study, the writer employs Revised edition of Bloom's Taxonomy by Krathwohl and Anderson. This revised edition is an updated version of original Bloom's Taxonomy. In this research English in Mind Textbook and Bright an English was chosen to be object of the research. Therefore, this has led the researcher decide to evaluate the WH-Question in English in Mind Textbook and Bright an English Textbook for eight grade junior high school students based on Bloom's New Taxonomy to make sure that the textbook has been support the students in developing their thinking level by providing higher cognitive question.

## RESEARCH METHOD

In this research, the writer used the content analysis method because the writer analyzed the contents of the textbook. As Ary (2010) states that "content or document analysis is a research method applied to writteb or visual materials for the purpose of identifying specified characterisation of the material". the writer also employs statistical calculation to determine the frequency of each level of cognitive domain based on Revised Bloom's Taxonomy.

The researcher prepared a guide for the levels of questions based on the cognitive domain in Revised Bloom's Taxonomy. This guide included a description of the level of each question together with it's criteria. Moreover, for the purpose of the research, a simple a table with four columns has been used to record the data. The first column contained the serial number of the questions, the second contained the question and the third and fourth column wer used for recording the level of the question and the page number in the book which the question appeared.

After the data collected the researcher was aided by two English Education Department of UNIMA Lecturers who are considered expert in language testing to help the researcher to do the categorization. Finally, the data then been analyzed quantitavely to determine the frequency and percentage of each category and the proportions of LOQs and HOQs. The analysis been using this formula :

$$\frac{(\%) \text{ kemunculan}}{\Sigma \text{seleuruh soal di dalam buku}} \times 100 \%$$

(Arikunto, 2013)

Despite the fact that all the researcher know about the validity of Bloom's Taxonomy, the researcher gave it to a jury of 2 lecturers from English Education Department. The jury confirmed that the instrument was suitable to achieve the purpose of the study and answer its questions. Furthermore, in order to establish reliability for the analysis, the researcher computed the agreement coefficient between the findings of the two analysis using Holsti's (1969) equation to calculate the reliability coefficient. According to the percentage of agreement between the first and second analyst, the agreement coefficient was 83.58 % which is accepted. The reliability was therefore high in relation to categorization of the question within the cognitive domain according to Bloom's Taxonomy. This also shows that the research tool that being used was reliable.

### FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

**Table 1. Frequencies And Percentages Of WH-Questions In The Six Levels Of The Cognitive Domain In Bloom's Taxonomy In English In Mind Textbook**

| Cognitive Domain    | English In Mind |            |
|---------------------|-----------------|------------|
|                     | Frequence       | Percentage |
| <b>Lower-Level</b>  |                 |            |
| Remembering         | 51              | 72.86 %    |
| Understanding       | 11              | 15.72 %    |
| Applying            | -               | -          |
| <b>Higher-Level</b> |                 |            |
| Analyzing           | 5               | 7.14 %     |
| Evaluating          | 2               | 2.85 %     |
| Creating            | 1               | 1,42 %     |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>70</b>       | <b>100</b> |

**Table 2. Frequencies And Percentage Of WH- Questions In The Six Levels Of The Cognitive Domain In Bloom's New Taxonomy In Bright An English**

| Cognitive Domain | Bright An English |            |
|------------------|-------------------|------------|
|                  | Frequence         | Percentage |

| <b>Lower-Level</b>  |           |            |
|---------------------|-----------|------------|
| Remembering         | 38        | 54.28 %    |
| Understanding       | 22        | 31.43 %    |
| Applying            | 2         | 2.86 %     |
| <b>Higher-Level</b> |           |            |
| Analyzing           | 3         | 4.29 %     |
| Evaluating          | 4         | 5.72 %     |
| Creating            | 1         | 1,42 %     |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>70</b> | <b>100</b> |

**Table 3. Proportion Of Low-Order And High-Order Question In English In Mind Textbook And Bright An English Textbook.**

| Level                 | EIM       |            | BAE       |            | Total      |            |
|-----------------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|
|                       | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency  | Percentage |
| Low-order Question    | 60        | 85.72 %    | 62        | 88.28 %    | 122        | 87.15      |
| Higher-order Question | 10        | 14.28 %    | 8         | 11.42 %    | 18         | 12.85      |
| <b>Total</b>          | <b>70</b> | <b>100</b> | <b>70</b> | <b>100</b> | <b>140</b> | <b>100</b> |

The result showed that higher-order question obtains lower distribution that the lower ones in two aforementioned textbooks. This proved by remembering level that was appeared as the most frequently among the six levels with 72.86 %. Followed by understanding level processes that come as the second with 15.72% while the applying was found no exist in the English in Mind textbook. This finding is in agreement with the findings of the previous studies conducted by Ayaturochim (2014) and Katemba and Marrie

(2016) who also found that the lower-order cognitive processes dominates the higher ones. It appeared that the author of the textbook was emphasized more on lower-order thinking processes and vocabulary and grammar. The same result also found in Bright an English textbook that show the dominations of Remembering and Understanding level processes 54.28 % and 31.43 % respectively.

The dominations of lower-order processes in the two textbooks is likely to be Bloom's concern to the importance of knowledge and remembering. As Krathwohl (2002) argues that knowledge is frequently treated as a backbone to all the other educations objectives. Moreover, Marzano and Kendall (2007) stated that higher-order processes such as evaluating and creating must be based upon the previous knowledge of our realities, which is what we remember. On the other hand, proportions for English in Mind Textbook was found higher than Bright an English even though it seems should be the highest since it has been revised according to the recent curriculum which supposed to support the HOTS. While Bright an English textbook become the highest proportions for the lower-order questions. Despite all of that, consider how important High-order thinking processes the result indicate that the two books are failed to facilitate high-order questions in order to develop students thinking process

## CONCLUSION

This study come to the conclusion that the most prevalent level processes in two textbooks were lower-order, that is remembering, understanding, and applying. In other words, the majority of the questions were the three lower level cognitive domains and only a few questions were found to address higher cognitive processes among the six levels of Bloom's New Taxonomy.

It is proven by the result of the data which showed the distribution of the higher-order question and lower-order question in EIM Textbook obtains remembering, understanding (72.86 %, 15.72%) and analyzing, evaluating and creating (7.14 %, 2.85 %, 1.42 %). While in BAE, Remembering, Understanding, applying (54.28 %, 31.43 %, 2.86 %) and analyzing, evaluating, creating (4.29 %, 5.72 %, 1.42 %). On the other hand, for the Higher-order

questions EIM have higher proportioning than in BAE that is 10 (14.28%) and 8 (11.42 %). Furthermore, for lower-order questions BAE Textbook have 62 (88.28 %) which is the highest score while EIM textbook have 60 (85.72 %). Therefore, it can be concluded that, based on the results of this research, the main objectives of the two textbooks were the development of lower-order cognitive processes and both of the textbooks were fail in engaging the students to develop their higher thinking skill.

## REFERENCES

- Arikunto, Suharsimi. 2013. *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Ayaturochim. (2014). *The Analysis of Reading Tasks in "English in Focus" Textbook Based on Cognitive Domain of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy*. A Skripsi. English Language Education Study Program, Department of language and Arts, Faculty of Teacher and Training and Education, Universitas Bengkulu.
- Canan Aslan. 2011. *High Level Thinking Education in Mother Tongue Textbooks in Turkey and France*. The Journal of International Social Research. Vol 4.
- Holsti, O.R (1969). *Content Analysis for The Social Sciences and Humanities*. USA : Addison Wesley Publishing Company
- Katamba, Caroline V & Marie, Aprilia Rose. 2016. *Analysis of Teacher's questioning and Students' Critical Thinking in English Classroom*. Retrieved from file:///D:/Drive%20D/FARNI%20NANGABITO%20SKRIPSI/Documents/Downloads/277-697-1-SM%20(2).pdf
- Krathwohl, D. (2002). *A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy : An overview. Theory into Practice*.
- Kunjang, Suropati Sei. 2015. *An Analysis of Thinking Order of Reading Comprehension Questions in English Textbook for Young Foresters of Forestry Vocational School of Samarinda*. Jurnal Nalar Pendidikan ISSN: 2339-0794 Volume 3 Nomor 1 Hal. 314
- Liando, Nitha. 2010. *Students' VS Teachers Perspectives on Best Teacher Characteristics in EFL Classrooms*. Lembaga Penelitian Unima : Universitas

Negeri Manado.2010. *Students' VS Teachers Perspectives on Best Teacher Characteristics in EFL Classrooms*. Lembaga Penelitian Unima :Universitas Negeri Manado

Pratiwi, Nana. 2014. *Analysis of English Workbook for SMP/MTs by Using Revised Bloom Taxonomy*. A skripsi. Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Fakultas Tarbiya dan Keguruan, Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif

Hidayatullah, Jakarta <http://repository.uinjkt.ac.id/dspace/bitstream/123456789/30059/1/NANA%20PRATIWI-FITK.pdf>

Maru Mister Gidion.2009. Engaging Literary Text to Language Exposure for Foreign English Learners. 1st International Conference on TOEFL/ICOTEFL. Muhamadiyah University. Purwokerto.

Marzano, R., & Kendall, J. (2007). *The New Taxonomy of Educational Objectives (2ndEd)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.