An Analysis of Reading Comprehension Questions in English Textbook Based on Revised Bloom's Taxonomy

Izzatul Laila

izzalaila37@gmail.com

Institut Agama Islam Negeri Kediri, Kediri, Indonesia

Ima Fitriyah

imafitria@iainkediri.ac.id

Institut Agama Islam Negeri Kediri, Kediri, Indonesia

Abstract

Reading implies something complex which needs the students to experience, foresee, examine, and admit information based on their background of knowledge. It will be more complex if they lack of Higher Order Thinking Skill (HOTS). HOTS improves reading comprehension and in consequence, the teachers must create a teaching and learning activities that encourage the implementation of HOTS by giving the students high questions found in a suitable textbook. This research was done in order to know the number of reading comprehension questions' level between HOTS and LOTS. This research conducted using qualitative research approach and content analysis research design because this research focused on analyzing a textbook entitled *"Bahasa Inggris"* *SMA/MA/SMK/MK* for 12th grade students published by Ministry of Education and Culture in 2018. The result of this research found 142 reading comprehension questions in total and 83% of them are categorized as LOTS while 17% categorized as HOTS. It indicated that this textbook concentrated more on lower-level than higher-level thinking questions. In conclusion, the teacher must construct their own reading comprehension questions in order to fill the need of the students' HOTS.

INTRODUCTION

As a part of receptive skill in English language, reading is a critical life skill that every society in our globalized world must possess (Li and Clariana, 2019). It also one of the main significant element to develop language ability. The students require to involve sufficient reading skill to assist them in order to extract and absorb information from available sources. The benefits of this activity i.e. improve spelling, writing, comprehension, and vocabulary. Furthermore, Nunan (2003) claimed that reading is an action that merge information from the text and the reader's background of knowledge to construct a new meaning. The main purpose of reading is to comprehend the text. This activity usually done by the use of newspaper, article, English textbook, and etc. According to Safitri and Tyas (2019) textbook facilitates the teacher to determine the students' material, plan appropriate classroom activity, and construct language assessment. While for the students, textbook can enhance their knowledge about material being studied.

Even though the students have been introduced to numerous kinds of text. On the other hand, Indonesia's English mastery is quite low. This report announced by English First's English Proficiency Index in 2018. Indonesia was in the 51st position out of 80 countries included in the research. The result of this research could be affected by the complexity of reading. Reading implies something complex which requires the students to experience, foresee, examine, and admit information based on their background of knowledge. The purpose of those actions are to reach the goal of reading i.e. finding main idea, supporting details, and etc. Reading could be more complex if the students lack of Higher Order Thinking Skill (HOTS) (Atiullah, Fitriati, and Rukmini, 2019).

In this 21st century education, critical thinking or HOTS is highly needed in order to be successful person in this era (Hargreaves, 2003). Doyle (2018) declared that critical thinking is a competence to examine information in an objective way to construct reasoned judgment. Various current studies revealed that the promotion of critical thinking in EFL learning seems more crucial (Pardede, 2020). In addition, Barak and Dori (2009) informed that numerous of countries around the world indicate a transformation in its education system, they switch their learning system from the use of Lower Order Thinking Skill (LOTS) to the use of HOTS. Related to HOTS, Surtantini (2019) declared that learning and teaching process at education field must construct activities that encourage the students to develop their HOTS. 2013 curriculum demands is also one of the reason why the implementation of HOTS is a must. The current curriculum emphasizes the development of thinking habit as the center of attention and requires the students to think more critically to face the challenge brought by the progress of time. The existence of the curriculum development proven by the implementation of HOTS to construct reading comprehension questions in the textbook. In consequence, the teachers as an executor of education are supposed to give HOTS instead of LOTS elements to encourage deeper thinking activities for the students (Collins, 2014). Moreover, they are also expected to assist the students to acquire and use in-depth knowledge, skills, and attentional dispositions to complete high-level tasks. In addition, the implementation of HOTS in reading lesson is significant. This statement is supported by Acosta (2010) who implied HOTS in his reading class. He found three benefits by using HOTS i.e. it could activate the student's prior knowledge, the students' could implement their higher-level of thinking, also it could enhance the student's interest and participation in the class. Further, Nourdad, Masoudi, and Rahimali (2018) also showed that the use of HOTS in

learning and teaching process could improve the students' reading comprehension. Another research found that by the use of HOTS, the students can think creatively and critically in order to solve their learning problems (Heong et al., 2012; Munawati and Nursamsu, 2019). Those statements do not mean that LOTS levels are not important. Precisely, the students need to pass through the LOTS levels first in order to advance to the next level. The higher it is, the harder it is to acquire.

HOTS is connected with the cognitive level of Bloom's taxonomy. This taxonomy is created by Benjamin Bloom in 1956. Bloom et al. (1956) defined six different levels in the cognitive domain i.e. knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. The cognitive domain is divided into two parts: LOTS which contains knowledge, comprehension, and application, and HOTS which contains analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. However, in this study, the writer uses the newest taxonomy revealed in 2001 which is Revised Bloom's taxonomy by Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) that consists of creating, evaluating, and analyzing categorized as HOTS while applying, understanding, and remembering categorized as LOTS. This revised version is often used in formulating learning objectives which mentioned as C1-C6 (Lister and Leaney, 2003).

According to Seif (2012) there are three ways to implement HOTS in teaching and learning activity such as: giving high questions to the students during reading lesson, asking the students to make inference of what they have read, and teacher's role. The most effective method among those three is giving high questions to the students during reading lesson (Chiew et al., 2016; Charanjit et al., 2018; Verdina, Gani, and Sulastri, 2018), while Lewis (2015) claimed that this method facilitates the teachers to know the students' level of thinking. This method could be done by the teachers by giving the students HOTS questions made by themselves or they can choose it from some textbooks. Hence, textbooks that provided for the students are expected to fulfill the need of HOTS questions. However, not all textbooks produced meet the criteria to use as the supporter to implement HOTS in teaching and learning process. Therefore, textbook's author should consider about making a balance frequency of questions in the three up and down levels of cognitive domain of Revised Bloom's taxonomy (Febrina, Usman, and Muslem, 2019).

Most of High School teachers in Indonesia assess LOTS which did not fit the 2013 curriculum's requirements. The problem is not only experienced by the teachers in Indonesia but in another country as well such as in Abu Dhabi, 86% of teachers are still assessing the level of remembering (C1) in cognitive domain (Abosalem, 2016). Furthermore, numerous of textbook analysis used Bloom's taxonomy or it is revised version as a theoritical framework were also conducted such as NamazianDoost and Hayavimehr (2017) compared reading comprehension questions found in Iranian High School English textbook and IELTS tests and found out that most of the questions from both documents are in the lower order thinking levels. Another research from Mizbani, Salehi, and Tabatabaei (2020) showed that all of the English skills questions inside the textbook for the 1st grade of Senior High School students in Iran did not present any question in higher order thinking levels. The next research from Atiullah, Fitriati, and Rukmini (2019) presented that among 158 reading comprehension questions found in the 1st grade of Senior High School student's textbook in Indonesia, only 24 of them are included in higher order thinking level. The next research conducted by Febrina, Usman, and Muslem (2019) informed that from grade 11th textbook for the 1st semester's reading

comprehension questions, there was a tendency towards the HOTS questions with 66,8% out of 100% while 33,4% was in the level of LOTS questions. The result of this research was quiet surprisingly considering that most of the analysis related to this topic always produce results with more LOTS than HOTS questions. Another research carried out by Febriyani, Yunita, and Damayanti (2020) claimed that the instructions of the questions studied from 12th grade student's English textbook are mostly in the level of LOTS.

Research about textbook analysis above informed that there are still textbooks that are not feasible enough that does not encourage the implementation of HOTS indicated by only few questions that are in the three up levels of revised Bloom's taxonomy. Hence, it is necessary to conduct a research toward the textbook that soon to be used in order to see and choose an appropriate textbook whether the items composition of HOTS and LOTS are in balance or not. There are lot of ways to analyze the textbook, however this research uses qualitative content analysis to analyze the content of the textbook, which is reading comprehension questions and it will be analyzed use revised Bloom's taxonomy as the theoritical framework.

This research analyze an English textbook for 12th grade students published by *Kemendikbud RI* 2018. There are chapters inside the textbook such as; warmer, vocabulary builder, pronounciation practice, reading, grammar review, speaking, and etc. However, this research only focuses on reading comprehension questions since no study has analyzed this textbook's reading comprehension questions using the theory of revised Bloom's taxonomy and this is a notable gap that the writer need to fill.

The current research is important in light of the fact that it is necessary to know whether a textbook is worth to use based on the composition of high and low level of reading comprehension questions with respect to the revised Bloom's taxonomy as the theory. In addition, it could be a guideline for the teacher to implement HOTS effectively that it would improve the students' reading comprehension. Therefore, based on the description above, the objective of this research is to find out the levels of reading comprehension questions in English textbook for 12th grade students published by *Kemendikbud RI* 2018 by conduct a research using qualitative research approach which is content analysis research design. In respect to the objective, the writer formulated the research question as *"What level of revised Bloom's taxonomy is used in constructing reading comprehension questions stated in the textbook?"*

METHOD
Research Design
This research used content analysis as the research design to analyze the textbook. Cohen et al. (2007) informed that the purpose of this research design is to understand certain characteristics of the material. The material analyzed by this research design can be in the form of textbook, newspaper, web pages, speeches, television programs, advertisement, musical composition, or any of a host of other types of documents (Ary et al., 2010). While this research uses textbook as the main material under the research.

Data Source
The source of data in this research were taken purposively from English textbook entitled *Bahasa Inggris SMA/MA/SMK/MK* for 12th grade students published by Ministry of Education and Culture in 2018. It includes the materials in all four basics English skills such as listening, reading, speaking, and writing. The language components such as

grammar and vocabulary. However, this research focused the content analysis only on the reading comprehension questions stated in each chapter. There are 142 reading comprehension questions being evaluated in this research.

Instrument
Checklist
According to Ary et al. (2010) qualitative research put the researcher itself as the main instrument that has to understand the method of conducting the research. Therefore, the data collection and analysis technique for this study were done by the researcher itself. The researcher collect the data by using an instrument called checklist table adapted from (Pratiwi, 2014). Checklist table as the instrument will be used to answer the research question and fulfill the objective of the research. There were several categories written on the rows of the checklist table i.e. reading comprehension questions and the six levels of revised Bloom's taxonomy. The detailed form of checklist is provided in Table 1 as follows.

Table 1. *Checklist table*

Ch.	No	Reading Comprehension Question	Cognitive Domain of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy					
			Lower Order Thinking Skill (LOTS)			Higher Order Thinking Skill (HOTS)		
			C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6
2	1.	If you visit Seattle, the first thing to do is ...	✓					

Each question listed on the checklist table were examined by obeying the criteria stated in the analysis card adapted from Anderson and Krathwohl (2001). Later, the researcher used expert validation to get the validity of data.

Procedures
To find out the results, the researcher followed the process of seven stages from content analysis stated by Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2018) i.e. a) determine the research questions, b) determine the population, c) determine the sample, d) create categories for analysis, e) start analyzing, f) summarizing, and g) construct speculative inferences.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION
Applying the theory of revised Bloom's taxonomy, the current research discovers 142 reading comprehension questions from 8 chapters presented in the textbook entitled *Bahasa Inggris SMA/MA/SMK/MK* for 12th grade students published by Ministry of Education and Culture in 2018. Meanwhile chapter 1, 8, and 11 did not have reading comprehension question. The further tables below show the examples of the findings of each levels.

Table 2. *The examples of Remember (C1) reading comprehension questions presented in English Textbook for Grade XII*

Questions	Units
If you visit Seattle, the first thing to do is...	Chapter 2
What kind of personality is difficult to handle?	Chapter 3
What is Lilis's current position?	Chapter 4
Which one is the headline? Write it down	Chapter 5
Why do people prefer public schools to private schools?	Chapter 6
Why was Surabaya selected to be the conference venue?	Chapter 7
How many materials are needed to make?	Chapter 9
How many Photoshop tools are introduced in the text above?	Chapter 10

As the characteristic of C1 Remember is locating memory of previous learned material by recognizing and recalling facts, terms, basic concepts, and answers (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). This type of questions are quite easy to make and to answer. The students could find the answer easily in the text without requiring them to examine, identify, make inference, and etc that need their critical thinking. For example, as for the question "What is Lili's current position?" could be answered directly by finding the answer that obviously stated in the text. The answer of this question is "managing the local branch of a national shoe retailer". As expected, all of the 8 chapters inside the textbook being examined have this type of question. Chapter 2 has the highest frequency with 17 questions while chapter 4 has the lowest frequency with only 4 questions for this level.

Table 3. *The examples of Understand (C2) reading comprehension questions presented in English Textbook for Grade XII*

Questions	Units
The 'Soul of Seattle' is the name for ... because ...	Chapter 2
What messages are sent by the writers? Where can you find these captions?	Chapter 3
Do you know the names of the parts of the text marked by the numbers and the meaning of the words in italics in the text?	Chapter 4
Do you know reported speech? In which text did you find reported speech?	Chapter 5
Mention some technical problems in the registration using the online system.	Chapter 6
What did Rismahani believe to be the best municipal waste management?	Chapter 7
Do you think the steps have to be put in order? Why do you think so?	Chapter 9
Do you think Custom Brushes & The Brush Tool determine the position of the text?	Chapter 10

The definition of C2 Understand is building a meaning from instructional messages, including oral, written, and graphic communication (Anderson & Krathwohl,

2001). This type of question is one level higher than C1 Remember and still included in LOTS. Basically, this type of question require the students to interpret, exemplify, classify, summarize, infer, compare, or explain. For example, as for the question "Do you know reported speech? In which text did you find reported speech?" could be answered by explaining the definition of reported speech and compare the text stated above this question. The answer for this question is "when we tell someone what another person said, the second text". Same as the previous level, all of the 8 chapters inside the textbook being examined have this type of question. Chapter 3 has the highest frequency with 18 questions while chapter 2 and 6 have the lowest frequency with only 1 question in each chapter.

Table 4. *The examples of Apply (C3) reading comprehension questions presented in English Textbook for Grade XII*

Questions	Units
Imagine you are visiting Lake Toba with your classmates. Your friends want to go canoeing but do not know how to do it. What would you say to help them ...	Chapter 2
Explain your quotes to your friends ...	Chapter 3
If you were one of the parents, what would you do to deal with the problems in the online system?	Chapter 6
What should we do if we want to have male or female leopard geckos?	Chapter 9
If you want to show only part of your picture, what tool will you use?	Chapter 10

The definition of C3 Apply according to Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) is perform or applying a procedure through executing, or implementing. Applying connects to or points to circumstances where learned material is used through products like models, presentations, interviews or simulations, and other activities. This type of questions involve the students capability to apply learned material in new and concrete conditions. For example, as for the question "Imagine you are visiting Lake Toba with your classmates. Your friends want to go canoeing but do not know how to do it. What would you say to help them" could be answered by applying learned material in that question's situation. The answer for this question is "I can do canoe let me show you how to do it". Not like the previous level, there are only 5 chapters inside the textbook being examined that have this type of question. Chapter 6 has the highest frequency with 2 questions while chapter 2,3,9, and 10 have only 1 question.

The description of C4 Analyze leads to separating materials or concepts into sections, deciding how the sections connect to one another or how they interconnect, or how the sections connect on the whole form or objective (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). This type of questions included in the first level of HOTS. The point of this question is the competence of the students to differentiate the sections or material into its components so that its arrangement might be better. For example, as for the question "Do you think that reported speech is commonly found in texts like Text 2? Why do you think so?" could

be answered by differentiate the 2 texts into its components. The answer for this question is "yes, because text 2 contain a reported speech stated in the last sentence of the last paragraph". There are only 4 chapters contained C4 Analyze. Chapter 9 has the highest frequency for this level with 4 questions while chapter 4 has only 1 question.

Table 5. *The examples of Analyze (C4) reading comprehension questions presented in English Textbook for Grade XII*

Questions	Units
Compare your quotes and the quote in the caption.	Chapter 3
What is the type of the following text?	Chapter 4
Do you think that reported speech is commonly found in texts like Text 2? Why do you think so?	Chapter 5
Do the texts contain time sequences (e.g., first, second, next, then, etc.)? What are their functions?	Chapter 9

C5 Evaluate could be described as creating judgments build upon criteria and standards through checking and critiquing. Critiques, recommendations, and reports are some of the forms that can be constructed to present the actions of this level (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). In revised Bloom's taxonomy, evaluating presents before creating. For example, as for the question "Do you think that Lili is confident about her competence? How do you know?" could be answered by the use of the student's opinion after reading the passage based on some criterias and standards from the question itself. The answer for this question is "Lilis is extremely confident towards her ability. This statement based on the passage (6), it is written "I am looking forward to the opportunity to personally discuss why I am particularly suit for the position." This sentence indicates that Lilis wants to step on the next level, to meet Mr. Frank Peterson for introducing more about herself so that she can persuade Mr. Frank Peterson that she is the right person for the available position". This type of question only available in 5 chapters. Chapter 3 has the highest frequency with 6 questions while chapter 4,5,6, and 7 only have 1 question for each chapter.

Table 6. *The examples of Evaluate (C5) reading comprehension questions presented in English Textbook for Grade XII*

Questions	Units
What do you think about the quote in this caption?	Chapter 3
Do you think that Lilis is confident about her competence? How do you know?	Chapter 4
Why do you think living in an apartment is getting popular?	Chapter 5
What do you think about the acting governor's response to the parents' protests?	Chapter 6
What do you think about the mayor's concept on municipal waste management?	Chapter 7

The definition of C6 Create according to Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) is placing elements simultaneously to construct a coherent or functional whole; reorganizing elements into a new system or format through generating, planning, or producing. Create asks the students to place sections at the same time in a different way, or synthesize sections into something new. Since this level is the last level and occupies the highest position in the newest taxonomy, it could be concluded that this level is the most difficult to construct or even to answer for both the teacher and the student (Daeik & Anter, 2004). For example, as for the question "Make some quotes about nature." could be answered by making some quotes about nature. The answer for this question is "I love not man the less, but nature more, time spent amongst trees is never wasted time, and etc". This type of question only presented in 3 chapters. Chapter 3 has the highest frequency with 3 questions while chapter 7 has the lowest frequency with only 1 question. A final table below is presented to simplify all findings.

Table 7. *The examples of Create (C6) reading comprehension questions presented in English Textbook for Grade XII*

Questions	Units
Make some quotes about nature.	Chapter 3
Create your own questions about the two texts.	Chapter 5
Make a script for a news broadcast.	Chapter 7

Table 8 and all the findings above informs that the distribution of reading comprehension questions are uneven at each level. The result shows that more than a half of the whole reading comprehension questions included in LOTS which not encourage the students' critical thinking with 117 questions or 82% and only 25 questions or 18% are included in HOTS. It shows that the textbook being analyzed emphasized more on lower order thinking questions. This result is in line with researchs from NamazianDoost and Hayavimehr (2017), Mizbani, Salehi, and Tabatabaei (2020), Atiullah, Fitriati, and Rukmini (2019), and Febriyani, Yunita, and Damayanti (2020) which informs that almost all the textbooks that have been examined mostly have more questions in the lower order thinking level. Regarding to the research question and the objective of the research, the level used by the author of the textbook in designing the textbook's reading comprehension questions could be seen in this table.

For the three down levels which are categorized as LOTS, Remember (C1) held the highest frequency with 69 questions out of 142 reading comprehension questions with the percentage of 48%. Furthermore, this level also became the most level used by the author in designing reading comprehension questions stated in the textbook. This result is in line with Zaiturrahmi, Kasim, and Zulfikar (2017) which informed that the most level of Bloom's Taxonomy used in constructing questions stated in the textbook for the 1st grade of Senior High School student is Knowledge (C1). Moreover, Apply (C3) as the highest level of LOTS held the lowest frequency among LOTS itself with only 6 questions.

For the three up levels which are categorized as HOTS, Analyze (C4) and Evaluate (C5) held the same amount of frequency with only 10 questions for each level. While Create (C6) has only 5 questions, although this type of question is needed to

prepare the students to enter the uni life because the lecture will ask them to think about something discrete with the aim of achieving a great comprehension (Daiek and Anter, 2004). The frequency of HOTS is the exact opposite from LOTS. The precentage of HOTS is only equal to 18%. This result affected by the complexity of these type of questions. The author of the textbook also thik about the limitation of time in teaching and learning process because in order to answer this type of questions, the students will take longer time than to answer lower order thinking questions. This statement supported by Airasian and Russel (2008) which informed that the higher level questions often cause the teachers to wait longer for the students to answer those questions.

Table 8. *Reading comprehension questions presented in English Textbook for Grade XII*

Level of Thinking		Number of Questions	Percentage
Lower Order Thinking Skills (LOTS)	C1 Remember	69	49%
	C2 Understand	42	30%
	C3 Apply	6	4%
Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS)	C4 Analyze	10	7%
	C5 Evaluate	10	7%
	C6 Create	5	4%
Total		142	100%

CONCLUSION
The research question and the objective of the research about the level of reading comprehension questions based on Revised Bloom's Taxonomy stated in English textbook for 12th grade students published by *Kemendikbud* RI 2018 showed that the reading comprehension questions inside the textbook were dominated by Remember (C1). It means that this textbook focused on LOTS rather than HOTS. This textbook's reading comprehension questions did not demand the students to use their analytic and critical thinking based on their own idea even though the goal of the current curriculum is to encourage the student's higher level of thinking.

This research might help the authors to be more varied in order to construct reading comprehension questions inside the English textbook for for every grade that soon to be distributed and used by the students. It will be better if each level of the questions distributed equally. Moreover, a well-made textbook should present 22% Knowledge (C1), 20% Comprehension (C2), 18% Application (C3), 17% Analysis (C4), 13% Synthesis (C5), and 15% Evaluation (C6) (Bloom et al., 1956). Teachers should also understand on how to encourage the students competence to reach higher thinking by attend seminars about teaching method classes and it will be more better if the teachers construct higher order thinking questions by themselves as a side questions aside from textbook to fulfil the need of the students' HOTS.

REFERENCES
Abosalem, Y. (2016). Assessment techniques and students' higher-order thinking skills. *International Journal of Secondary Education, 9*(1), 1-11. doi:10.11648/j.ijsedu.20160401.11

Acosta, Luz & Ferri, Maria. (2010). Reading Strategies to Develop Higher Thinking Skills for Reading Comprehension. *Profile Issues in Teachers` Professional Development. 12*, 107-123.

Afifah, I & Retnawati, Heri. (2019). Is it difficult to teach higher order thinking skills? *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*. 1320. 012098. 10.1088/1742-6596/1320/1/012098.

Airasian, P. & Russel, M. (2008). *Classroom assessment: Concepts and applications*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill.

Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R., (Ed.). Airasian, P.W., Cruikshank, K.A., Mayer, R.E., Pintrich, P.R., Raths, J., & Wittrock, M.C. (2001). *A Taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of educational objectives*. New York, NY: Longman.

Ary, Donald et al. (2010). *Introduction to research in education (8th ed.)*. United States of Amerika: Wadsworth.

Atiullah, K., Wuli Fitriati, S., & Rukmini, D. (2019). Using Revised Bloom's Taxonomy to Evaluate Higher Order Thinking Skills (Hots) in Reading Comprehension Questions of English Textbook for Year X of High School. *English Education Journal*, *9*(4), 428-436. https://doi.org/10.15294/eej.v9i4.31794

Bloom, B., Englehart, M., Furst, E., Hill, W., & Krathwohl, D. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. Handbook I: Cognitive domain.* New York, NY: Longmans, Green.

Cohen, L. Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research Methods in Education (6th ed.)*. London: Routledge

Cohen, L. Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education (8th ed.)*. London: Routledge

Collins (2014). Skills for the 21st Century: teaching higher-order thinking. *Curriculum and Leadership Journal*, *12*(14). Retrieved from http://www.curriculum.edu.au/leader/

Daiek, D., & Anter, N. (2004). *Critical reading for college and beyond*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Doyle, A. (2020). *What Is Creative Thinking? Definition & Examples of Creative Thinking*. thebalancecareers.com. Retrieved 11 August 2021, from https://www.thebalancecareers.com/creative-thinking-definition-with-examples-2063744.

Dwee, Chiew & Anthony, Elizabeth M. & Mohd, Berhannudin & Kamarulzaman, Robijah & Kadir, Zulida. (2016). Creating Thinking Classrooms: Perceptions and Teaching Practices of ESP Practitioners. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 232. 631-639. 10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.10.087.

Febrina, Usman, B., & Muslem, A. (2019). Analysis of Reading Comprehension Questions by Using Revised Bloom's Taxonomy On Higher Order Thinking Skill (HOTS). *English Education Journal (EEJ)*, *1*(10), 1–15.

Febriyani, Rezita & Yunita, Wisma & Damayanti, Indah. (2020). An Analysis on Higher Order Thinking Skill (HOTS) in Compulsory English Textbook for the Twelfth Grade of Indonesian Senior High Schools. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*. 4. 170-183. 10.33369/jeet.4.2.170-183.

Hargreaves, A. (2003). *Teaching in the knowledge society: Education in the age of insecurity*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Kasim, U., & Zulfikar, T. (2017). Analysis of Instructional Questions in An English Textbook for Senior High Schools. *EEJ*, *8*(4), 536-552.

Lewis, K. (2015). Developing questioning skills. Retrieved from https://inside.trinity.edu/sites/inside.trinity.edu/files/file _attachments/6056/gravett- questioningskillswithattachment.pdf

Li, P., & Clariana, R. B. (2019). Reading comprehension in L1 and L2: An integrative approach. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, *50*, 94105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroling.2018.03.005

Lister, R., & Leaney, J. (2003). Introductory programming, criterion-referencing, and bloom. Paper presented at the 34th SIGCSE Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education, Reno, NV.

Miri Barak & Yehudit Judy Dori (2009) Enhancing Higher Order Thinking Skills Among Inservice Science Teachers Via Embedded Assessment, *Journal of Science Teacher Education, 20*(5), 459-474, DOI: 10.1007/s10972-009-9141-z

Mizbani, M., Salehi, H., Tabatabaei, O. (2020). Content Evaluation of Iranian EFL Textbook Vision 1 Based on Bloom's Revised Taxonomy of Cognitive Domain. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Research, 8*(29), 11-24.

Munawati, A., & Nursamsu. (2019). The effectiveness of hots (higher order thinking skill) in teaching reading comprehension. *Journal of Education of English as a Foreign Language, 2*(1), 32–42. http://dx.doi.org/10.21776/ub.Educafl.2019.002.1.5

NamazianDoost, I. and HayaviMehr, M., 2017. A Comparative Study of Critical Thinking Skills in High School and Simulated IELTS Reading Comprehension Questions. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, *5*(6), 35-69.

Nourdad, Nava & Masoudi, Sanam & Rahimali, Parisa. (2018). The Effect of Higher Order Thinking Skill Instruction on EFL Reading Ability. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 7*. 231. 10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.7n.3p.231.

Novitasari, Rahayu, E. L. R., & Suryanto, B. . (2021). Literature Circles In Reading Class: Students' Participation And Perception. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, *8*(1), 65-77. https://doi.org/10.22219/celtic.v8i1.16138

Nunan, D. (2003) Nunan, David 2003. *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York : Mc Graw Hill

Pardede, P. (2020). Integrating the 4Cs into EFL Integrated Skills Learning. *Journal of English Teaching, 6*(1), 71-85

Pratiwi, N. U. R. (2014). Higher Order Thinking Skill in Reading Exercise (An Analysis of Reading Exercises in Pathway to English Textbook for the Eleventh Grade of Senior High School Students). In *Higher Order Thinking Skill in Reading Exercise*. the Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University.

Safitri, M., & Asrining Tyas, P. (2019). An Analysis of English Textbook Entitled "Bahasa Inggris SMA/MA SMK/MAK Kelas X". *JEES (Journal of English Educators Society), 4*(1), 17-22. doi:http://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v4i1.1777

Sari, S., Oktaviani, A., & Yulfi, Y. (2020). The Use Of Fives Strategy To Teach Reading Comprehension For Eleventh Graders. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, *7*(1), 74-82. https://doi.org/10.22219/celtic.v7i1.11503

Seif, A. (2012). Evaluating higher order thinking skills in reading exercises of English for Palestine Grade 8. Disertation. Gaza, The Islamic Universities.

Surtantini, R. (2019). Reading Comprehension Question Levels in Grade X English Students' Book in Light of the Issues of Curriculum Policy in Indonesia. *PAROLE: Journal of Linguistics and Education, 9*(1), 44-52. https://doi.org/10.14710/parole.v9i1.44-52

Swaran Singh, Charanjit & Singh, Rhasvinder & Singh, Tarsame & Mostafa, Nor & Mohtar, Tunku. (2018). Developing a Higher Order Thinking Skills Module for Weak ESL Learners. English Language Teaching. 11. 86. 10.5539/elt.v11n7p86.

Verdina, R & Gani, A & Sulastri, Sulastri. (2018). Improving students' higher order thinking skills in thermochemistry concept using worksheets based on 2013 curriculum. *Journal of Physics*: Conference Series. 1088. 012105. 10.1088/1742-6596/1088/1/012105.

Yee, Heong & Heong, & Yunos, Jailani & Othman, Widad & Hassan, Razali & Tee, Tze & Kiong, & Mohaffyza, Mimi. (2012). The Needs Analysis of Learning Higher Order Thinking Skills for Generating Ideas. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences. 59. 197-203. 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.265.