RUNNING HEAD: THE COMPATIBILITY OF READING QUESTIONS Chapter 5

Conclusion and Suggestion

The chapter summarized data and findings, and suggestions for the future research and developments.

5.1 Conclusion

The overall findings of this study indicated that the most of the reading questions in the course book were in the lower order thinking levels (from level 1 to level 3).

Moreover, the higher order questions are not well covered.

Even though the reading questions were already well treated or well distributed. It can be seen that lower order questions had 70 % and the rest were higher order questions.

Moreover, the questions are compatible with the K-13. It can be seen in table 4.5, the total number of questions were in the level of LOTS and a few of analyzing or HOTS. Therefore the reading questions are compatible with K-13

5.2 Suggestion

The findings showed that there was a great difference between the number of lower-order questions and higher-order questions. Therefore, the researcher suggests that the teachers should pay attention in choosing some exercises for the students based on the level of the students.

Thus, the researcher further suggests that schools or educational institutions should organize some workshops in writing course books. Therefore, the teachers are able in making course book for their own students by considering their students level and also compatible with the curriculum.

References

- Alderson, J. C. (2000). *Assessing Readiing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- al-Kafarna, R. D.-R. (2015). The Impact of Using Question Answer Relationships Strategy on Enhancing Sixth Graders' Higher Order Thinking Skills in Reading and Their Attitudes Toward it. Gaza: The Islamic University-Gaza.
- Anderson, L. W. (2001). *A Taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing, Abridged Edition*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Andros, H. (2012, February 27). *Bloom.pdf*. Retrieved May 5th, 2016, from Bloom's Taxonomy: www.bloom's taxonomy.html
- Bernhardt, E. (1991). Reading development in a second language theoretical, empirical and classroom perspectives. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Birch, B. M. (2007). English L2 Reading: Getting to the Bottom (second edition). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bloom, B. (1956). Taxonomy of Educational Objectives; The Classification of Educational Goals: Handbook I Cognitive Domain. . New York: David McKay.
- Bloom, Engelhart, Furst, Hill, & Krathwohl. (1956).
- Brewster, J. c. (2007). Materials evaluation and materials design. In J. c. Brewster, *The Primary English Teacher's Guide* (pp. 151-161). Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

- Campbell, D.T. and Fiske, D.W. (1959). *Convergentand discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix* (Vol. 56). Psychological Bulletin.
- Chadwell, G. (2009, August). *Twelve Assignments Every Middle School Student Should Write*. Retrieved February 22nd, 2016, from www.collinsed.com
- Chaffee, J. (2003). *Thinking critically 3rd edition.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- CITL. (n.d.). Retrieved February 23rd, 2016, from Center of Innovation in Teaching & Learning: www.
- Cohen L, Manion L and Morrison K. (2007). Research Methods In Education Sixth Edition. New York: Routledge.
- Creswell, J. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design:*Choosing among five designs. California: Thousand Oaks,
 CA: Sage.
- Dr. Jack Truschel, E. P. (n.d.). What tutors can do to enhance critical thinking skills through the use of Blomm's Taxonomy. *The association for the tutoring profession*.
- Gall, M.D., Borg, W.R., & Gall, J.P. (1996). *Educational Research: An Introduction (6th ed)*. New York: Longman.
- Giles, J. (1987). *The English Handbook.* South Monash: Education Department of South Monash: Publication Branch.
- Gina Griffiths, McKay Moore Sohlberg, and Gina Biancarosa. (2011).

 A Review of Models of Reading Comprehension with

 Implications for Adults with mTBI and the Campus Reader.

 CampusReader, 1-23.

- International English Language Testing System Handbook. (1999).
- Krathwohl, D. A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy : An Overview.
 Theory into Practice.
- Krathwohl, D. R. (2002). A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy : An Overview. *Theory into Practice*, 213-215.
- Krathwohl, L. A. (Revised 2006). A taxonomy for learning, teaching and assessing. *Georgetown University School of Medicine*.
- Learning Taxonomy_Cognitive.pdf. (n.d.). Retrieved February 26th, 2016, from Learning Taxonomy Bloom's Cognitive Domain: assessment.uconn.edu
- Lee, D. E. (2015). Using questions to develop students' higher-order thinking skills: a primary English teacher's beliefs and practices. Hongkong: The HKU Scholars Hub.
- M. Chang & L. Cutrone. (2010). Automarking: Automatic Assessment of Open Questions. 10th IEEE International Conference on Advance Learning Technologies , 143-147.
- Macmillan Dictionary. (2009 2016). Retrieved July 24, 2016, from (c) Macmillan Publishers Limited:

 www.macmillandictionary.com
- Marier, R. (2000). Reading Comprehension Techniques for Improving Students' Success in Extracting Useful Knowledge from Text.

 New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Moreillon, J. (2014). Inquiry Learning and Reading Comprehension Strategy Instruction: Processes That Go Hand in Hand. Knowledge Quest, 1-4.

- Mundhe, G. B. (Sept-Oct 2015). Teaching receptive and productive language skills with the help of techniques. *Pune Research* "An International Journal in English" Vol 1, Issue 2, 4.
- Nasser M. Freahat & Oqlah M. Smadi. (2014). Lower-order and Higher-order Reading Questions in Secondary and University Level EFL Textbooks in Jordan. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1804-1813.
- Nazlia Omar, Syahidah Sufi Haris, Rosilah Hassan, Haslina Arshad, Masura Rahmat, Noor Faridatul Ainun Zainal & Rozli Zulkifli. (2011). Automated Analysis of exam questions according to Bloom's taxonomy. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 297-303.
- Nuttall, C. (2005). *Teaching reading skills in a foreign language*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.
- O'neill, R. (1982). Why use textbooks? *ELT Journal Volume 36/2*, 104-111.
- Pell, C. (2015, March 4th). *IELTS Reading Matching Headings Tips and Strategy*. Retrieved March 11, 2016, from ieltsadvantage: ieltsadvantage.com
- Pratiwi, N. (2014). An Analysis of Reading Exercises in Pathway to
 English Textbook for the Elevent Grade of Senior High School
 Students. Jakarta: The Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic
 University Jakarta.
- R. Lister & J. Leaney. (2003). Introductory Programming, Criterion-referencing and bloom. SIGCSE'03: Proceedings of the 34th SIGCSE Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education, 143-147.

- Rebecca K. Frels, B. S. (2011). The Use of a Checklist and Qualitative Notebooks for an Interactive Process of Teaching and Learning Qualitative Research. *The Journal of Effective Teaching*, Vol.11, No.1, 62-79.
- Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seif, A. A.-Q. (2012). Evaluating the higher order thinking skills in reading. Gaza: The Islamic University Gaza.
- Sheridan, E. M. (1981). Theories of Reading and Implications for Teachers. *Reading Horizons*, 66-71.
- Simon. (2012, May). *ielts-simon.com. Daily Lesson with Simon.*Retrieved March 11th, 2016, from ielts-simon.com: ielts-simon.com
- Specimen Materials. (1997).
- (2013). *The document of K-13*. Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Indonesia.
- Tone and Purpose Handout. (2009, January). Retrieved March 11th, 2016, from ASC Eng Read: www.centergrove.k12.in.us/cms
- Ur, P. (2009). *A Course in Language Teaching Practice and Theory.*Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- W.S, G. (1960). *The major aspects of reading*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Wei-Hua Lan, C.-L. C. (2010). Using revised bloom's taxonomy to analyze reading comprehension questions on the SAET and

the DRET. *Contemporary Educational Research Quarterly* , 165-206.