

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This chapter concludes what have been discussed so far and gives some suggestion relevant to the findings of the study under report.

5.1. Conclusion

As mention in the earlier chapter, the major problem is: To what extent are the reading questions in “Headlight” constructed according to Bloom’s taxonomy of cognitive domain? Specifically, the mentioned major problem above can be subdivided into the some minor problems as follow: (1). To what extent are the reading questions in “Headlight” constructed to check the students’ knowledge of the text? (2). To what extent are the reading questions in “Headlight” constructed to check the students’ comprehension of the text? (3). To what extent are the reading questions in “Headlight” constructed to check the students’ application of the text? (4). To what extent are the reading questions in “Headlight” constructed to check the students’ the analysis of the text? (5). To what extent are the reading questions in “Headlight” constructed to check the students’ synthesis of the text? (6). To what extent are the reading questions in “Headlight” constructed to check the students’ evaluation of the text?

The answer of the major problems is the reading questions in “Headlight” are constructed according to Bloom’s taxonomy of cognitive domain in a large extent. It applies 5 levels of intellectual skill: knowledge, comprehension,

application, analysis, and evaluation. In order to verify the result, the writer presents the findings as follow: (1). There are 246 questions in the knowledge level which is equivalent to 41.70% of the entire questions. (2). There are 214 questions in the comprehension level which is equivalent to 35.29% of the entire questions. (3). There are 14 questions in the application level which is equivalent to 2.64% of the entire questions. (4). There are 116 questions in the analysis level which is equivalent to 19.97% of the entire questions. (5). There is no question in the synthesis level (6). There are 2 questions in the evaluation level which is equivalent to 0.40% of the entire questions.

5.2. Recommendation

Related to what have been discussed in the study, the writer would like to present some suggestions:

The ones who construct questions should consider that questions are not only to test students' comprehension to the material, yet particularly the tools in leading the students to experience all levels of intellectual skill in learning. Thus, the question's constructor should have adequate knowledge and guidance in how to make good questions.

Questions are more worthwhile if they are created according to the taxonomy (see fig. 1 ch. 4). Bloom's taxonomy is one taxonomy which help the students to recognize all aspects of cognitive domain. It gives the students the enrichment in understanding the material because taxonomy leads them to answer all kinds of questions from the simplest to the most complex one.

The teachers of reading should lead the students to acquire the material through the careful use of questions. It gives the students the experience in self-study. It is better for the teachers—who find that the book used do not cover all level of cognitive domain—to create their own questions to complete the missing part of the intellectual skill.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agustina, M.L. 1991. *An Analysis on Reading Comprehension Questions in Bahasa Inggris 2A by Depdikbud Used in SMU*. Surabaya: Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan—Universitas Katholik Widya Mandala.
- Bloom, B. S. (Ed.). 1956. *Taxonomy of educational objectives, Vol.1: The cognitive domain*. New York: McKay.
- Carney, Thomas F. 1972. *Content Analysis: a Technique for Systematic Inference from Communication*. Canada: University of Manitoba Press.
- Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. *Kurikulum Bahasa Inggris 2004*. 2003. Jakarta: Pengarang.
- Fisher, Dennis F. & Charles W. Peters. 1981. *Comprehension and the Competence Reader*. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Gronlund, Norman E. 1985. *Measurement and Evaluation in Teaching 5th ed.* New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Harris, Larry A. & Carl B. Smith. 1986. *Reading Instruction (Diagnostic teaching in the Classroom) 4th ed.* New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Knuth, R.A. & B.F. Jones. *What Does Research Say About Reading?*. Online. Available at: http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/stw_esys/str_read.htm
Retrieved on: October 23, 2001.
- Lien , Arnold J. 1980. *Measurement and Evaluation of Learning 4th ed.* Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers.
- Lukman, Emalia Iragiliati et. al. 2004. *Headlight (An Extensive Exposure to English Learning for SMA Students) 1*. Jakarta: Penerbit Erlangga.

Maynard, John. 2000. *Bloom's Taxonomy's Model Questions and Key Words*. The University of Texas. Online. Available at: <http://utlc@www.utexas.edu>
Retrieved on: September 7, 2004.

McCullough, Constance. 1963. *Readings on Reading Instruction*. New York: David McKay Company, Inc.

Myers, Shirley S. & Carie Palmer. 2002. *Types of Reading Questions*. Gallaudet University English Department. Online. Available at: <http://www.english.works@gallaudet.edu,terry.coye@gallaudet.edu,ellen.beck@gallaudet.edu> Retrieved on: September 7, 2004.

Preston, Ralph. 1968. *Teaching Social Studies in the Elementary School* 3rd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Sanders, Norris M. 1966. *Classroom Questions: What Kinds?* New York: Harper and Row Publisher, Inc.

Stones, Edgar. 1984. *Psychology of Education (A Pedagogical Approach)*. London: Methuen.

Tanzil, J. Evelinne. 1998. *An Analysis on the Reading Comprehension Questions in Bahasa Inggris 3 by Ganecha Based on Bloom's Taxonomy of the Cognitive Domain*. Surabaya: Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan—Universitas Katholik Widya Mandala.

Vacca, Richard T. 1981. *Content Area Reading*. Boston. Toronto : Little Brown and Company.