Examination of the questions in the primary school Turkish worksheets in terms of various classification systems

Burak Delican [a] *

[a] *Tokat Gaziosmanpaşa University, Faculty of Education, Department of Primary Education, Tokat and 60100, Turkiye*

Abstract

In this research, the questions in the Turkish Course (2,3,4) Worksheets were examined in terms of various classification systems. In this direction, the questions in the worksheets were evaluated with the document-material analysis technique in accordance with the structure of the qualitative research. During the research process, Turkish Course Worksheets consisting of 4 books prepared for primary schools by the General Directorate of Assessment, Evaluation and Examination Services of the Ministry of National Education, Turkey were determined as research material. During the research process, 121 questions in the books were examined, and the Question Analysis List/Chart (QAL) was used as the data collection tool. In line with the data collection tool, the questions were examined in terms of their types, their purpose of formation, and the sources of answer. In addition, the questions addressed during the research process were classified in terms of the levels of Barett's taxonomy and the cognitive process levels of the revised Bloom's taxonomy. According to the results of the research, in terms of question types, it was determined that Open-Ended and Gap-Filling question types were mostly included; Multiple Choice, Matching, True-False etc. types of questions were rarely included. In terms of the purpose of formation, questions such as Identity, Listing and Evaluation were frequently included; Prediction, Definition, Cause/Effect, Comparison etc. types of questions were less included. It has been determined that there were intratextual and extratextual questions in terms of answer source, but intertextual questions were not included. In terms of cognitive process levels of the Revised Bloom's taxonomy, it was concluded that there were questions that employ low-level cognitive processes for the Remembering, Understanding and Applying levels. In terms of Barrett's taxonomy, it was determined that the questions at the Literal Comprehension level were more intense in the Turkish Worksheets.

Keywords: Questions; Turkish course; worksheets; taxonomy

* Corresponding author: Burak Delican. ORCID ID.: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3187-0001
  E-mail address: burakdelican@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Reading and reading comprehension affect the individual, social and academic life of the individual in various ways as a means of constructing a meaning. Considering that the main purpose of reading is to establish meaning, it can be stated that reading will continue to have a critical impact in the future as it has been from the past as an important skill in the process of self-realization and in determining the roles that the individual will assume in society.

In the definitions on reading and reading comprehension (Akyol, 2013; Duke & Pearson, 2009; Rosenblatt, 1994, Al Khazaleh, 2021.), it is seen that reading is presented with a meaning-making perspective. Although various definitions have been made by many researchers on this subject, it can be stated that the content of meaning making is dominant in these definitions. In this respect, it can be said that it is not enough to express the concept of reading only as the pronunciation of letters, and it can be noted that reading is a meaning-making skill that requires high-level cognitive skills (Collins & Smith, 1980; Snow, 2002). When Turkish Course Curriculum (1-8) is examined in Turkey, it can be said that the concept of reading and comprehension is handled in this context.

There are various methods used to develop and evaluate reading comprehension skills (Ateş & Akyol, 2013; Ateş & Yıldırım, 2014; Miller, 2006). When the contents of these methods are investigated, it is seen that questions have an important place even though various techniques have been used. Thus, it can be stated that the questions are the basis of the activities used to support and assess the reading comprehension skills of the individual. In this regard, researchers emphasize that teachers use questions both as a teaching and as an assessment tool (Ateş, Döğmeci, Güray & Gürsoy, 2016; Erdoğan, 2007; Kocaarslan & Yamaç, 2018; Yıldırım, Rasinski & Kaya, 2017). Akyol, Yıldırım, Ateş, and Çetinkaya (2013) state that questions can be used for purposes such as catching attention, ensuring focus, making the student active, identifying learning difficulties, creating opportunities for students to express their thoughts, encouraging them to watch and follow the lesson, determining how much they have learned, and enabling them to think at higher levels and to understand deeply. However, it is also argued that teachers use questions for questioning and evaluation rather than supporting their understanding skills or making them think at a higher level.

When the concept of reading is considered from a meaning-making perspective, it can be stated that the questions have an important place in supporting and assessing reading comprehension skills. This situation caught the attention of many researchers (Akyol, 2013; Barett, 1968; Bloom, Engelhart, Furst, Hill, & Krathwohl, 1956; Aydoğan Koral & Mirici) and the questions used in the meaning-making process were classified in line with various titles, stages and levels (Akyol, 2013; Freeman, 2014; Gall, 1970; Guszak, 1967).

Akyol (2013) defined the questions in terms of their types, purpose of formation and sources of answers. In this classification, in terms of their types, the questions were defined under the titles of Gap-Filling, Open-Ended, Matching, Multiple Choice, True/False. In terms of their purpose of formation, they were categorized as Identity, Evaluation, Listing, Application, Main Idea, Comparison, Opinion Expression, Cause/Effect, Prediction and Definition type questions. In terms of sources of answer, the questions were classified as intratextual, extratextual and intertextual. Another classification was developed by Barett (1968). In the Barett taxonomy, instructional definitions of the questions used in the process of meaning making were made in terms of cognitive and affective dimensions and expressed in five levels. It is seen that the levels of Literal Comprehension, Reorganization, Inferential Comprehension, Evaluation, and Appreciation in Barett's taxonomy exhibit a hierarchical structure from questions requiring low-level cognitive processes to questions requiring high-level cognitive processes (Akyol, Yıldırım, Ateş, & Çetinkaya, 2013; Freeman, 2014; Yıldırım, 2012). In addition, Bloom's taxonomy, developed by Bloom (1956) and updated in 2001, is another widely used classification system in the classification process of questions. The taxonomy, which had the levels of Knowledge, Comprehension, Application, Analysis, Synthesis and Evaluation in its original form, was updated in 2001 and was leveled as Remembering, Understanding, Applying, Analyzing, Evaluating and Creating. In this classification, which is referred to as the Revised Bloom Taxonomy, it could be noted that the levels of Remembering, Understanding and Applying require low-level thinking skills; the levels of Analyzing, Evaluating and Creating require high-level thinking skills (Freeman, 2014). Furthermore, it is seen that various classification systems have been created in terms of classification of questions by different researchers (Day & Park; 2015; Nutall, 1996; Pearson & Johnson, 1978).

When the relevant literature is reviewed, it is seen that the researchers carried out various studies on the questions. In this direction, it can be stated that research studies are carried out on the questions in the course books, workbooks, exams, achievement tests and other school activities based on assessment and evaluation. (Akyol, Yıldırım, Ateş & Çetinkaya 2013; Ateş, Döğmeci, Güray & Gürsoy, 2016; Baghaei, Bagheri & Yamini, 2020; Çalık & Aksu, 2018; Erdoğan, 2017; Kozikoğlu, 2018; Şanlı & Pınar, 2017; Ulum, 2016; Veeravagu, Muthusamy, Marimuthu & Michael, 2010). It is seen that the Revised Bloom Taxonomy is widely used in the examination of questions on reading comprehension in the national and international arena(Assaly & Smadi, 2015; Eroğlu & Kuzu, 2014; Febrina, Usman & Muslem, 2019; Luebke & Lorié, 2013; Sallabaş & Yılmaz, 2020; Sur, 2022; Yılmaz & Keray, 2012). Another widely used classification system is the Barrett's Taxonomy (Akyol, Yıldırım, Ateş & Çetinkaya 2013; Beck & McKeown, 1981; Freeman, 2014; Göçer, 2014; Yıldırım, 2012; Polat & Dedeoğlu, 2020; Sezgin & Özilhan, 2019). In addition to this, it can be mentioned that there are many national and international studies examining the question types, the purpose of formation of questions

and the sources of answer (Akyol, 2013). Moreover, it may be suggested that the questions in the course books in general and in the Turkish Course books in particular are defined by utilizing various classification methods. Accordingly, it might be argued that the text-based questions in Turkish Course books are examined with various classification methods. When the results of these studies are examined, it may be put forth that the questions that employ low-level cognitive processes are widely used in all fields (Akyol, 2001; Akyol, Yıldırım, Ateş & Çetinkaya 2013; Balci & Baki, 2022; Çeçen & Kurnaz, 2015; Durukan, 2009; Eroğlu & Kuzu, 2014; Kana & Güney, 2020; Kaplan, 2021; Kaya, İpek & Aydın, 2021; Kurt, 2020; Kutlu, 1999; Kuzu, 2013; Polat & Dedeoğlu, 2020; Sallabaş & Yılmaz, 2020; Sarıkaya & Şakiroğlu, 2021; Sezgin & Özilhan, 2019; Sur, 2022; Oryaşın, 2021; Uğur, 2019; Ulum & Taşkaya, 2019; Yıldırım, 2020). On the other hand, it could be noted that no research, which investigates the questions in the Turkish Course Worksheets prepared for the 2nd, 3rd and 4th grade students of Primary Education by the General Directorate of Assessment, Evaluation and Examination Services of the Ministry of National Education, has been found. It is thought that investigating the questions in the Worksheets used in the process of evaluating and supporting reading comprehension and evaluating them in terms of various classification systems will provide information about the quality of the questions currently in use and will also contribute to the questions to be included in the new course book, work book and exercise books etc. In this context, the main purpose of the research conducted is to examine the questions in the Turkish Course Worksheets prepared for primary schools by the General Directorate of Assessment, Evaluation and Examination Services in terms of various classification systems. In line with this main purpose, answers to the following questions were sought;

1. What is the distribution based on question types?
2. What is the distribution based on their purpose of formation?
3. What is the distribution based on their sources of answers?
4. What is the distribution of questions based on cognitive process levels of the revised Bloom's taxonomy?
5. What is the distribution of questions based on the levels of Barrett's taxonomy?

2. Method

2.1. Research model

In this research, the questions in the Worksheets created by the Ministry of National Education to be used in Primary School Turkish Courses (2, 3 and 4) were examined with the document-material analysis technique according to the sources of answer, the question types, the purpose of formation, the Barrett's Taxonomy, the Revised Bloom

Taxonomy. Document-material analysis includes the analysis of written and visual materials containing information about the facts and events that are aimed to be investigated (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011). In this study, the Primary School Turkish Course (2nd, 3rd and 4th Grade) Worksheets, which were determined as the research material, were examined and analyzed in line with the sub-problems of the research

2.2. Research material

During the research process, the questions in the Primary School Turkish Course (2nd, 3rd and 4th Grade) Worksheets were analyzed. 4 different books prepared for the 2nd, 3rd and 4th grade students of Primary Education by the General Directorate of Assessment, Evaluation and Examination Services of the Ministry of National Education were examined as research materials. The grade levels of the books examined as research material and the distribution of the questions in books are provided in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of the questions in the worksheets examined as research material

Grade	Number of Books	Number of Questions	Number of Sub-Questions	Percentage
2nd Grade	2	45	55	45.45
3rd Grade	1	20	38	31.40
4th Grade	1	20	28	23.14
Total	**4**	**85**	**121**	100.00

Turkish Course Worksheets, which are considered as research material, were created with 2 books for the second grade, 1 book for the third grade and 1 book for the fourth grade. There are 45 questions in the worksheets created for the second grade, and 20 questions in the worksheets created for the second and third grades. When the sub-questions included in the question structures are examined, it is seen that there is a total of 121 questions, 55 for the second grade, 38 for the third grade and 28 for the fourth grade. During the research process, a total of 121 questions was examined according to the source of answers, the question types, the purpose of formation, the levels of Barett's Taxonomy and the levels of the Revised Bloom Taxonomy.

2.3. Data collection tools and procedure

Question Analysis List (QAL), which was created as a data collection tool, was used in the research. QAL consists of two parts. In the first part, there are the classifications made by Akyol (2006) for the questions, and in the second part, there are the levels of Barett's Taxonomy and the levels of the Revised Bloom's Taxonomy. The structure of QAL used as a data collection tool is given in the table below.

Table 2. Content of question analysis list (QAL)

Question Types	Purpose of Formation	Source of Answer	The Revised Bloom's Taxonomy	The Barett's taxonomy
Gap-Filling Open-Ended Matching Multiple Choice True/False	Identity Evaluation Listing Application Main Idea Comparison Expressing Opinion Cause/Effect Prediction Definition	Intratextual Extratextual Intertextual	Remembering Understanding Applying Analyzing Evaluating Creating	Literal Comprehension Reorganization Inferential Comprehension Evaluation Appreciation

121 questions in the Primary School Turkish Course Worksheets were examined in line with the titles within the scope of QAL. Each question was coded and classified in terms of the question types, the purpose of formation, and the source of the answer. Furthermore, the questions were examined in terms of the levels of Barrett's Taxonomy and the levels of the Revised Bloom's Taxonomy. In this process, the definitions made by those who created the classification systems were taken into account.

In the classification made by Akyol (2001: 172), the questions were defined in terms of the question types, the purpose of formation, and the sources of answer. In terms of the question types, they are discussed in five groups as Gap-Filling, Open-Ended, Matching, Multiple Choice and True/False. 14 classifications have been made in terms of the purpose of formation. These titles are defined below;

- Identity type questions are those that require using basic level thinking skills (recognition and preparation).
- Listing type questions are also questions that require using basic level thinking skills.
- Opinion expression questions require the reader to use the power of interpretation based on the text.
- Evaluation questions are those that require using high-level cognitive processes (analysis, synthesis, etc.).
- Cause-effect questions are those that aim to reveal the cause or effect of an event, or both.
- Definition questions aim to explain the event in an orderly manner as it occurs in the text.
- Characterization questions aim to describe the event or people in terms of their emotions and actions and reach a conclusion.
- Exemplification type questions are questions asked to better understand an event that is taught or explained.

- Comparison and contrast questions are questions that aim to reveal the similar or dissimilar aspects of objects or events.
- Main idea questions are those that aim to reveal the message and judgment that the text wants to convey.
- Summarizing questions are questions that aim to retell what the author has told with the words of the reader, without breaking the essence of the text.
- Homework questions are those that aim to prepare a topic by researching it outside of the classroom.
- Practice questions are questions that aim to find out in which section and in which verses what is told in the text, or questions that ask for a task to be done.
- The questions based on predicting the result are those that aim to predict what might happen in the future based on the information and explanations given in the paragraph or text.

Three different classifications were made according to the sources of answer. These titles are defined below;

- Intratextual questions are based on recognition and recall. The answers to these questions can be in a paragraph, between paragraphs, in a picture related to the text, in a table or in a single sentence.
- Extratextual questions are questions that can be answered without reading the text, using prior information based on the text.
- Intertextual questions, on the other hand, are questions that require the reader to find answers by aiming at more than one source. Here, there is an effort to create an answer with a synthesis approach based on different sources.

According to Barrett's Taxonomy, the affective and cognitive dimensions and definitions of reading comprehension are as follows (Yıldırım, 2012);

- Literal Comprehension: this comprehension process focuses on the ideas and information directly expressed in the text. Reading objectives and teacher questions are organized to achieve this level of understanding. The indicators of the Literal Comprehension level are as follows, noticing and remembering details / noticing and remembering the main ideas/ noticing and remembering the sequence of events / noticing comparisons / noticing and remembering cause-effect relationships / remembering similarities and differences / noticing and remembering the behavior of characters
- Reorganization: this level of understanding requires the student to analyze, synthesize or reorganize information or ideas clearly expressed in the text. The indicators of Reorganization are as follows; classification / outlining / summarizing / synthesizing.
- Inferential Comprehension: at this level of understanding, the student makes predictions and hypotheses based on their intuition and personal experience, using ideas or information clearly expressed in the text. Indicators of Inferential

Comprehension are as follows; making inferences about the details supporting the text / inferring about the main idea / inferring about the sequence of events or actions / inferring about comparisons / inferring about cause-effect relationships / inferring about character behaviors / predicting outcomes.

• Evaluation: at this level of comprehension, reading objectives and teacher questions require the student to compare the ideas presented in the text with an external criterion provided by the teacher, other experts, or written sources. The indicators of the evaluation phase are as follows; evaluating imagination and reality / evaluating facts, ideas and beliefs / evaluating adequacy and validity / evaluating relevance / evaluating the value, attractiveness and acceptability of the text.

• Appreciation: this level of understanding includes all the cognitive dimensions of the previously expressed understanding and deals with all the psychological and aesthetic effects of the text on the reader. The indicators of the satisfaction level are as follows; emotional response to content / reactions to characters or events / reactions to author's language / description.

The cognitive process dimensions of the Revised Bloom Taxonomy are as follows (Anderson et al., 1985, as cited in Bümen,2006);

• Remembering: retrieval of relevant information from long-term memory. Recognizing / Recalling.

• Understanding: creating meaning from the instructional message as a verbal, written or graphical communication. Interpreting / Exemplifying / Classifying / Summarizing / Inferencing / Comparing / Explaining.

• Applying: applying or using the action in a given situation. Execution / Implementation.

• Analyzing: separating the material into its components and determining how the parts relate to each other / to the whole. Dividing / Organizing / Discussing.

• Evaluating: making judgments based on criteria and standards. Supervising / Criticizing

• Creating: combining elements into a coherent or functional structure, rearranging elements into a new pattern or structure. Building / Planning / Generating.

After waiting for two months after the first examination in the research process, the questions were re-evaluated in terms of the same criteria. In this process, another study was conducted by a second researcher who is an expert in literacy teaching and Turkish education, in line with QAL. Consistency between the evaluations of the researcher and the evaluation of the second researcher was examined, and it was determined that the results between the evaluations of two different researchers were consistent (Cohen kappa coefficient 0.93).

2.4. Data analysis

In the data analysis process of the research, the data obtained from the Question Analysis List (QAL) created in line with the classification systems created by Akyol, Bloom and Barret were first transferred to the Excel program and defined under the relevant headings. In the research process, the data were described in line with the sub-problems that were sought to be answered. The obtained results were converted into tables by calculating percentage and frequency.

2.5. Ethical consent of the research

Document analysis technique was used in the research process. The information of the worksheets examined as research material is presented in the research material section. Ethics committee approval is not required as no research has been conducted on humans. However, in this study, all the rules stated to be followed within the scope of "Higher Education Institutions Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Directive" were followed. None of the actions specified under the title of "Actions Contrary to Scientific Research and Publication Ethics", which is the second part of the directive, were carried out.

3. Results

In this part of the research, the findings obtained as a result of data analysis are presented in line with the sub-problems of the research. Findings related to types of the questions in the Primary School Turkish Worksheets, the purpose of formation, the source of answer, the levels of Barett's Taxonomy, the cognitive process levels of the Revised Bloom's Taxonomy were expressed and interpreted in tables by adding frequency and percentage results.

Within the scope of the first sub-problem of the research, the types of questions in the Primary School Turkish Course Worksheets was examined. Accordingly, the questions were classified in terms of Gap-Filling, Open-ended, matching, multiple choice and true/false question types. The findings are defined in terms of class grades and are expressed in Table 3 with frequency and percentage calculations.

Table 3. Distribution of the questions in the primary school Turkish lesson worksheets based on the question types

Grade / Question Types	2nd Grade		3rd Grade		4th Grade		Total	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Open-Ended	22	40.00	21	55.26	13	46.43	56	46.28
Gap-Filling	24	43.64	14	36.84	9	32.14	47	38.84
Matching	3	5.45	3	7.89	3	10.71	9	7.44

Multiple Choice	5	9.09	0	0.00	3	10.71	8	6.61
True/False	1	1.82	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.83
Total	55	100	38	100	28	100	121	100

When Table 3 is addressed, it is seen that questions in the Turkish Worksheets included 46% of Open-Ended, 38% of Gap-Filling, 7.5% of Matching, 6.7% of Multiple Choice, 0.83% of True-False question types. Open-Ended and Gap-Filling question types corresponded to approximately 85% of all questions. This finding can be interpreted as the majority of the questions in the Turkish Course Worksheets consisted of Open-Ended and Gap-Filling questions. It is seen that the Open-Ended question type took place at the 2nd, 3rd and 1st grade levels, from high to low in terms of percentage. This finding can be interpreted as Open-Ended questions appeared more frequently in the worksheets after the 2nd grade. It is observed that the Gap-Filling type of questions decreased proportionally as the grade level increased. This situation may have been created to increase writing activities with the progress of literacy skills. It can be stated that the question types in the form of Matching, Multiple Choice and True/False are given less space in the Turkish Course Worksheets.

Within the scope of the second sub-problem of the research, the purpose of formation of the questions in the Primary School Turkish Course Worksheets were examined. Accordingly, the questions were classified in terms of Identity, Evaluation, Listing, Application, Main Idea, Comparison, Expressing Opinion, Cause/Effect, Prediction and Definition.

The findings are defined in terms of class grades and expressed in Table 4 with frequency and percentage calculations.

Table 4. Distribution of the questions in the primary school Turkish course worksheets based on the purpose of formation

Grade /Purpose of Formation	2nd Grade		3rd Grade		4th Grade		Total	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Identity	25	45.45	10	26.32	0	0.00	35	28.93
Evaluation	4	7.27	7	18.42	8	28.57	19	15.70
Listing	5	9.09	6	15.79	8	28.57	19	15.70
Application	8	14.55	9	23.68	0	0.00	17	14.05
Main Idea	0	0.00	4	10.53	7	25.00	11	9.09
Comparison	9	16.36	1	2.63	1	3.57	11	9.09
Expressing	2	3.64	0	0.00	1	3.57	3	2.48
Cause/Effect	2	3.64	0	0.00	1	3.57	3	2.48
Prediction	0	0.00	1	2.63	1	3.57	2	1.65
Definition	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	3.57	1	0.83
Total	55	100	38	100	28	100	121	100

Provide dates defining the periods of recruitment and follow-up and the primary sources of the potential subjects, where appropriate. If these dates differ by group, provide the values for each group.

When Table 4 is taken into consideration, it is noticed that questions in the Turkish Worksheets included 29% of Identity, 16% of Evaluation, 14% of Application, 9% of Main Idea, 9% of Comparison, and approximately 5% of Cause/Effect, Expressing Opinion, Prediction and Definition type of questions. On the other hand, Identity type questions were of considerable amount (45.45%) at the 2nd grade level, and it was seen as the most common question type at the 3rd grade level. However, it may be noted that identity type questions were not included at the 4th grade level. It could be mentioned that as the grade level increased, the identity type questions also decreased. It might be put forth that the listing type questions increased as the grade level increased. Similarly, it can be argued that a similar increase was also seen in the Evaluation type questions. It is seen that the Main Idea questions did not take place at the 2nd grade level, but they took place mostly at the 4th grade level. That is, it is observed that the Main Idea type questions increased as the grade level increased. On the other hand, it could be suggested that the Comparison type questions were intensively involved in the 2nd grade level and very little in the 3rd and 4th grade levels. Moreover, it could be argued that questions such as Cause/Effect, Prediction, Definition and Expressing Opinion were given very little place at the level of all classes.

Within the scope of the third sub-problem of the research, the questions in the Primary School Turkish Course Worksheets were examined in terms of sources of answer. In this direction, the questions were classified as intratextual, extratextual and intertextual in terms of sources of answer. The findings are defined in terms of class grades and expressed in Table 5 with frequency and percentage calculations.

Table 5. Distribution of the questions in the primary school Turkish lesson worksheets based on the source of answer

Grade/Source of Answer	2nd Grade		3rd Grade		4th Grade		Total	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Intratextual	34	61.82	18	47.37	4	14.29	56	46.28
Extratextual	21	38.18	20	52.63	24	85.71	65	53.72
Intertextual	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total	55	100.00	38	100.00	28	100.00	121	100.00

When Table 5 is addressed, it is seen that questions in the Turkish Worksheets included 53.72% of Extratextual and 46.28% of Intratextual type of questions. There is no intertextual question type in terms of sources of answer. Considering the distribution of the intratextual questions in terms of grade level, it is observed that they took place at

the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th grade levels, from high to low, respectively. This finding can be interpreted as intratextual questions decreased as the grade level increased. Looking at the distribution of non-text questions, it is noticed that they took place at the 4th, 3rd, and 2nd grade levels, from most to least. Based on this finding, it could be claimed that as the grade level increased, extratextual questions also increased. In terms of source of answer, intertextual questions were not included in Turkish Course Worksheets.

Within the scope of the fourth sub-problem of the research, the questions in the Primary School Turkish Course Worksheets were examined in line with the cognitive process levels of the Revised Bloom's Taxonomy. In this direction, the questions were classified in terms of the levels of Remembering, Understanding, Applying, Analyzing, Evaluating and Creating, which are in the cognitive process levels of the Revised Bloom Taxonomy. The findings are defined in terms of class grades and expressed in Table 6 with frequency and percentage calculations.

Table 6. Distribution of the questions in the primary school Turkish course worksheets based on cognitive process levels of the revised bloom taxonomy

Grade/Revised Bloom's Taxonomy	2nd Grade		3rd Grade		4th Grade		Total	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Remembering	17	30,91	1	2,63	2	7,14	20	16,53
Understanding	18	32,73	17	44,74	6	21,43	41	33,88
Applying	13	23,64	6	15,79	6	21,43	25	20,66
Analyzing	3	5,45	1	2,63	5	17,86	9	7,44
Evaluating	2	3,64	10	26,32	8	28,57	20	16,53
Creating	2	3,64	3	7,89	1	3,57	6	4,96
Total	55	100,00	38	100,00	28	100,00	121	100,00

When Table 6 is examined, it is seen that questions in the Turkish Worksheets included 16% of Remembering, 34% of Understanding, 26% of Applying, 17% of Evaluating types of questions. The distribution of Analyzing type of questions was 7.5%, and the distribution of Create type of questions was 5%. This finding can be interpreted as the questions in the Turkish Worksheets focus on Remembering, Understanding and Applying type questions (approximately 70%). It can be put forth that Remembering type questions were intensively involved in the 2nd grade level and their frequency decreased as the grade level increased. It may be noted that the Understanding and Applying type questions were frequently included in all grade levels. Furthermore, it could be argued that the Evaluating type questions took place more intensively in the 3rd and 4th grades than in the 2nd grade. Also, it is observed that the questions about Analyzing and Creating were few (approximately 12%) at all grade levels.

Within the scope of the fifth sub-problem of the research, the questions in the Primary School Turkish Course Worksheets were examined in terms of Barett's Taxonomy. In this

direction, the questions were classified in terms of the levels of Baret's Taxonomy: Literal Comprehension, Reorganization, Inferential Comprehension, Evaluation and Appreciation. The findings are defined in terms of class grades and expressed in Table 7 with frequency and percentage calculations.

Table 7. Distribution of the questions in the primary school Turkish lesson worksheets based on Barrett's taxonomy

Grade/ Barett's Taxonomy	2nd Grade		3rd Grade		4th Grade		Total	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Literal Comprehension	35	63.64	26	68.42	10	35.71	71	58.68
Reorganization	5	9.09	4	10.53	8	28.57	17	14.05
Inferential Comprehension	11	20.00	5	13.16	7	25.00	23	19.01
Evaluation	4	7.27	3	7.89	3	10.71	10	8.26
Appreciation	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total	55	100.00	38	100.00	28	100.00	121	100

When Table 7 is addressed, it is noticed that questions in the Turkish Worksheets included 16% of Literal Comprehension, 19% of Inferential Comprehension and 14% of Reorganization type of questions.

It might be suggested that the Evaluation type questions were around 8%, while the Appreciation type questions were not included at all. In terms of grade level, it is observed that the Literal Comprehension type questions were common at all grade levels, while the Reorganization type questions increased as the grade level increased. Evaluation type questions, on the other hand, were proportionally more common at the fourth-grade level. Based on these findings, it might be argued that the majority (60%) of the questions in the Turkish Course Worksheets consisted of Literal Comprehension type questions.

4. Conclusion, Discussion and Implications

After presenting the results, you are in a position to evaluate and interpret their implications, especially with respect to your original hypotheses. Here you will examine, interpret, and qualify the results and draw inferences and conclusions from them. Emphasize any theoretical or practical consequences of the results. (When the discussion is relatively brief and straightforward, some authors prefer to combine it with the Results section, creating a section called Results and Discussion.)

In this study, the questions in the Primary School Turkish Course Worksheets were evaluated in terms of question types, the purpose of formation, the sources of answer, the

cognitive process levels of the Revised Bloom Taxonomy and the levels of Barrett's Taxonomy. The obtained results are as follows;

When the questions in the Primary School Turkish Course Worksheets were examined in terms of question types, it was seen that the questions in the worksheets focused on Open-Ended and Gap-Filling questions. In addition, it was determined that the Gap-Filling questions decreased as the grade level increased, while the classical question types increased proportionally. On the other hand, it was observed that the question types in the form of Matching, Multiple Choice and True/False had a low amount in the Turkish Course Worksheets. In the study carried out by Akyol (2001), it was determined that almost all of the questions in the Primary School 5th Grade Turkish Course Book consisted of Open-Ended questions. In the studies conducted by Kocaarslan and Yamaç (2015) and Polat and Dedeoğlu (2021), it was concluded that the questions created by the teachers based on the texts mainly focused on short-answer questions. In the research conducted by Şengül (2005) on 8th Grade Turkish Course Books, it was found out that all of the questions in the course books were formed in the Open-Ended question type. Considering that the questions in the Turkish Course Worksheets also focus on Open-Ended and Gap-Filling questions, it may be put forth that the results obtained are similar to the results of the studies conducted in previous years. Another result is that as the grade level increased, Open-Ended and multifaceted Open-Ended questions were included instead of short-answer questions in Turkish Worksheets. Hynds (1990) discusses that limiting it to short-answer questions rather than Open-Ended, multifaceted and student-centered questions in the meaning-making process also limits the meaning to be reached from the text (Akyol, 2013). For this reason, it can be expressed as an expected and desirable situation that the Open-Ended question type will increase as the grade level increases. However, it should not be ignored that including different types of questions (open-ended, multiple choice, etc.) in Turkish Worksheets will support reading comprehension, meaningful learning and critical thinking skills.

When the purpose of formation of the questions in the Turkish Course Worksheets is addressed, it is seen that the questions in the worksheets focused on questions such as Identity, Listing and Evaluation. It was determined that Comparison and Main Idea type questions were seldom included, and Cause/Effect, Expressing Opinion, Prediction and Definition type questions were very rarely included. In particular, it was determined that the Identity type questions took place at the 2nd and 3rd grade levels and they did not appear at the 4th grade level. Moreover, it was concluded that the main idea questions were concentrated at the 4th grade level, they were not included at the 2nd grade level, and they were very few in the 3rd grade level. Cause/Effect, Prediction, Definition and Expressing Opinion type questions were also found to be very limited in all grade levels. In the study conducted by Akyol (201), it was determined that 79% of the questions in the 5th Grade Turkish Course Books consisted of questions such as Identity, Summarizing, Cause/Effect and Listing. According to Akyol (2001), these question types require the use

of low-level cognitive processes; in other words, they are questions based on memorizing. The fact that the Identity and Listing type questions are also included in the Primary School Turkish Course Worksheets (approximately 50%) indicates that it consists of questions that require low-level cognitive processes and lead to memorization. On the other hand, as the grade level increased, it is seen that the rate of Identity and Listing type questions decreased, and the Main Idea, Evaluation and Comparison type questions that require high-level cognitive processes increased proportionally.

When the source of answer of the questions in the Turkish Course Worksheets were analyzed, it was observed that the questions in the Worksheets focused on intratextual and extratextual questions in terms of the sources of answer. It was determined that intertextual questions were not included at any grade level. Besides, it was found out that the extratextual questions increased as the grade level increased, and the intratextual questions decreased as the grade level increased. In the research conducted by Akyol (2001) on the 5th Grade Turkish Course Books, it was concluded that there were relatively intratextual and extratextual questions, but almost no intertextual questions. In the study conducted by Çeliktürk Sezgin and Gedikoğlu Özilhan (2019), it was revealed that the questions in the 1st-8th Grade Turkish Course Books consisted of 78.3% intratextual questions, 21.7% of extratextual questions, and no intertextual questions. It is seen that similar results have been reached in different studies on Turkish Course Books (Savaşkan, 2016). Akyol, Yıldırım, Ateş, and Çetinkaya (2013) examined the questions prepared by the teachers for the texts, and it was concluded that 76% of the questions formed by the teachers were intratextual, 22% were extra-textual and 2% were intertextual questions. It is demonstrated that similar results have been achieved in various studies conducted with teachers and teacher candidates (Ateş, Döğmeci, Güray & Gürsoy, 2016; Kocaarslan & Yamaç, 2015; Polat & Dedeoğlu, 2020). The results obtained in the research process show consistency with the results of previous studies in the field. As in the Turkish Course Books used in primary schools in the previous years, it is noticed that the Turkish Course Worksheets included intratextual questions and extratextual questions frequently, but intertextual questions were not included at all. Intratextual questions are based on recognition and remembering, extratextual questions are questions that use background information, and intertextual questions are reader-oriented questions that provide answers by directing them to more than one source (Akyol, 2013). In this direction, as progressed from the first grade to the fourth grade, reducing the intratextual questions proportionally and increasing the intertextual questions can enable high-level cognitive processes to be employed and support critical thinking.

When the questions in the Turkish Course Worksheets are examined in terms of the cognitive process levels of the Revised Bloom Taxonomy, it is seen that 16% of the questions were about Remembering, 34% were about Understanding, 26% were about Applying, 17% were about Evaluating type questions. The distribution of Analyzing type

questions was 7.5%, and Creating type questions were 5%. It was determined that the questions in the Turkish Course Worksheets focused on Remembering, Understanding and Applying type questions. In terms of grade level, it was demonstrated that the Remembering type questions appeared intensively at the 2nd grade level and decreased as the grade level increased, and the Understanding and Applying type questions appeared at similar rates at all grade levels. Evaluating, Analyzing and Creating type questions were explored to be low in all grade levels. Sallabaş and Yılmaz (2020) concluded that 32% of the sub-text questions in the Secondary School 8th Grade Turkish Course Book were at the Remembering level and 35% at the Understanding level. In the study of Oryaşın (2021), in which the activities in the Turkish Course Books were examined, it was found out that 31.23% of the activities were from the activities at Remembering level, 27% of them were at Understanding level, 16.61% of them were at Applying level, 5% of them were at Analyzing level, 14% of them were at Evaluating level, and 5.5% of them were at Creating level. These results indicate that 75% of the activities in Turkish Course Books consist of exercises that meet low-level cognitive skills. In the results of the research conducted by Durukan and Demir (2017), it is emphasized that the activities in the 6th, 7th and 8th Grade Turkish Course Workbooks consisted of exercises that focused on the Remembering and Understanding levels and that employ low-level cognitive processes. It is seen that similar results have been reached as a result of many other studies on course books, especially Turkish Course Books. It has been determined that in the course books discussed in these studies, activities and questions, which require low-level cognitive processes in terms of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy such as Remembering, Understanding and Applying levels, were intensely included. In addition, it was found out that the questions in the course books did not show a balanced distribution in terms of the levels of the Revised Bloom Taxonomy (Balcı & Baki, 2022; Demir & Eryılmaz, 2021; Kuzu, 2013; Ulutaş & Kara, 2019; Oran & Karalı, 2019; Sallabaş & Yılmaz, 2020; Sur, 2022; Ulum & Taşkaya, 2019). This is also true for Primary School Turkish Course Worksheets. It has been evaluated that the results obtained in the research and the studies conducted in the relevant literature have similar results.

It was revealed that 58% of the questions in the Turkish Course Worksheets were Literal Comprehension, 19% Inferential Comprehension and 14% Reorganization type questions. It was demonstrated that the Evaluation type questions were around 8%, and the Appreciation type questions were not included at all. When the questions in the Primary School Turkish Course Worksheets were examined in terms of the levels of Barrett's Taxonomy, it was determined that the questions mainly consisted of Literal Comprehension, Inferential Comprehension and Reorganization type questions. It was asserted that Evaluation type questions were given very little place, and Appreciation type questions were not included at all. In terms of grade level, it was observed that the Literal Comprehension type questions were common at all grade levels, while the

Reorganization type questions increased as the grade level increased. Evaluation type questions, on the other hand, were proportionally more common at the fourth grade level. It was concluded by Çeliktürk Sezgin and Gedikoğlu Özilhan (2019) that 66.8% of the questions in the 1st-8th Grade Turkish Course Books were at Literal Comprehension level, 10.4% at Reorganization level, 8.8% at Inferential Comprehension level, 12.6% at Evaluation level and 1.4% at Appreciation level. In addition, in many studies examining the questions prepared by students, teachers and teacher candidates, it was found out that questions at the level of Literal Comprehension were more common (Akyol, Yıldırım, Ateş & Çetinkaya 2013; Ateş, Güray, Döğmeci & Gürsoy, 2016; Kocaarslan & Yamaç, 2018; Polat & Dedeoğlu, 2020). In the studies conducted on similar subjects in the related literature, it is presented that the questions used in Turkish Courses were at the level of Literal Comprehension in terms of Barrett's Taxonomy. That is, it can be commented that the results obtained in the research are consistent with the results of the studies in the literature.

In this study, the questions in the Primary School (2,3,4) Turkish Course Worksheets were evaluated in terms of various classification systems. First of all, in line with the classification made by Akyol (2013), the questions were evaluated in terms of their types, their purpose of formation and the sources of answer. Secondly, it was evaluated in terms of the levels of Remembering, Understanding, Applying, Analyzing, Evaluating and Creating, which are cognitive process levels in line with the levels of the Revised Bloom Taxonomy. Third, the levels of Barrett's Taxonomy were evaluated in terms of Literal Comprehension, Reorganization, Inferential Comprehension, Evaluation and Appreciation. When the results are evaluated together, as a result of the examination made with three different evaluation systems, the findings show that the questions in the Primary School (2, 3, 4) Turkish Course Worksheets mainly consisted of questions that employ low-level cognitive processes. In addition, it can be highlighted that it did not have a balanced distribution in terms of any classification system. In the light of the results of this research, the effect of questions on meaning making should be taken into account; the texts and questions in the teaching materials to be prepared such as course books, activity book, achievement test, worksheets etc. should be structured in line with the classification systems that define meaning making. In this study, classification systems developed by Akyol, Bloom and Barett were used. Furthermore, there are other classification systems (Day & Park; 2015; Nutall, 1996; Pearson & Johnson, 1978) created by different researchers. It is recommended to use the above-mentioned classification systems in teaching processes where questions and meaning-making are built, especially in Turkish Course Books, Workbooks and Worksheets.

References

Akyol, H. (2001). İlköğretim okulları 5. sınıf Türkçe kitaplarındaki okuma metinleriyle ilgili soruların analizi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, *26*(26), 169-178.

Al Khazaleh, S. (2021). The effect of digital reading on EFL learners' reading comprehension. *International Journal of Education, Technology and Science (IJETS), 1*(1), 59–70.

Assaly, I. R., & Smadi, O. M. (2015). Using bloom's taxonomy to evaluate the cognitive levels of master class textbook's questions. *English Language Teaching*, *8*(5), 100-110.

Ateş, S., & Akyol, H. (2013). Türkçe dersi öğrenme öğretme sürecinin anlama öğretimi açısından değerlendirilmesi. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, *11*(3).

Ateş, S., & YILDIRIM, K. (2014). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin okuma becerisine yönelik uygulamaları: strateji öğretimi ve anlama. *Ilkogretim Online*, *13*(1).

Ateş, S., Döğmeci, Y., Güray, E., & Gürsoy, F. F. (2016). Sınıf içi konuşmaların bir analizi: diyalojik mi monolojik mi? *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *17*(2), 603-625.

Aydoğan Koral, M. & Mirici, İ. H. (2021). Analysis of speaking skills in high school English language currıcula and coursebooks in Turkey. *International Journal of Education, Technology and Science (IJETS),1*(3), 61-77.

Baghaei, S., Bagheri, M. S., & Yamini, M. (2020). Analysis of IELTS and TOEFL reading and listening tests in terms of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy. *Cogent Education*, *7*(1), 1720939.

Balci, A. & Baki, Y. (2022). Türkçe dersi ilkokul 4. sınıf kitabındaki metin altı sorularının Yenilenmiş Bloom Taksonomisine göre incelenmesi. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (27), 32-57.

Beck, I. L., & McKeown, M. G. (1981). Developing questions that promote comprehension: The story map. *Language Arts*, *58*(8), 913-918.

Bümen, N. T. (2010). Program geliştirmede bir dönüm noktası: Yenilenmiş Bloom taksonomisi. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, *31*(142).

Collins, A., & Smith, E. E. (1980). Teaching the process of reading comprehension. *Center for the Study of Reading Technical Report; no. 182*.

Çalık, B., & Aksu, M. (2018). A systematic review of teachers' questioning in Turkey between 2000-2018. *Elementary Education Online*, *17*(3).

Çeçen, M. A., & Kurnaz, H. (2015). Ortaokul Türkçe dersi öğrenci çalışma kitaplarındaki tema değerlendirme soruları üzerine bir araştırma. *Karadeniz Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *7*(02).

Day, R. R., & Park, J. S. (2005). Developing reading comprehension questions. *Reading in a foreign language*, *17*(1), 60-73.

Demir, N., & Eryılmaz, R. (2021). Kosova'da Kullanılan 6. Sınıf Türkçe Ders Kitabının Türkçe Öğretim Programı ve Yenilenmiş Bloom Taksonomisi Açısından Değerlendirilmesi. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, *19*(1), 244-261.

Duke, N. K., & Pearson, P. D. (2009). Effective practices for developing reading comprehension. *Journal of education*, *189*(1-2), 107-122.

Durukan, E. (2009). 7. sınıf Türkçe ders kitaplarındaki metinleri anlamaya yönelik sorular üzerine taksonomik bir inceleme. *Milli Eğitim*, *38*(181), 84-93.

Erdoğan, T. (2017). İlkokul dördüncü sınıf öğrencilerinin ve öğretmenlerinin Türkçe dersine ilişkin sordukları soruların yenilenmiş Bloom taksonomisi açısından görünümü. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, *42*(192).

Eroğlu, D., & Kuzu, T. S. (2014). Türkçe ders kitaplarındaki dilbilgisi kazanımlarının ve sorularının yenilenmiş Bloom taksonomisine göre değerlendirilmesi. *Başkent University Journal of Education*, *1*(1), 72-80.

Febrina, F., 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*, *10*(1), 1-15

Freeman, D. (2014). Reading comprehension questions: The distribution of different types in global EFL textbooks. In *English Language Teaching Textbooks* (pp. 72-110). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Gall, M. D. (1970). The use of questions in teaching. *Review of educational research*, *40*(5), 707-721.

Göçer, A. (2014). The assessment of turkish written examination questions based on the text in accordance with the barrett's taxonomy. *Online Submission*, *3*, 1-16.

Guszak, F. J. (1967). Teacher questioning and reading. *The reading teacher*, *21*(3), 227-234.

Kana, F., & Güney, E. Z. (2020). Yabancılara Türkçe öğretimi ders kitaplarında bulunan metin altı soruların yenilenmiş Bloom taksonomisine göre analizi1. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (19), 141-161.

Kaplan, K. (2021). Ortaokul Türkçe ders kitaplarında yer alan dinleme/izleme becerisini ölçmeye yönelik soruların yenilenmiş Bloom taksonomisine göre incelenmesi. *Itobiad: Journal of the Human & Social Science Researches*, *10*(1).

Kaya, E, İpek, M. A., & Aydın, Y. (2021). Ortaokul Türkçe ders kitaplarındaki metin sorularının çıkarım türlerine göre incelenmesi. *Dil Dergisi*, *172*(2), 77-95.

Kim, M. K., Patel, R. A., Uchizono, J. A., & Beck, L. (2012). Incorporation of Bloom's taxonomy into multiple-choice examination questions for a pharmacotherapeutics course. *American journal of pharmaceutical education*, *76*(6).

Kocaarslan, M., & Yamaç, A. (2018). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin Türkçe dersi sınavlarında sordukları metne dayalı anlama sorularının incelenmesi. *Trakya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *8*(2), 431-448.

Kozikoğlu, İ. (2018). The examination of alignment between national assessment and English curriculum objectives using revised Bloom's Taxonomy. *Educational Research Quarterly*, *41*(4), 50-77.

Krathwohl, D. R. (2002). A revision of Bloom's taxonomy: An overview. *Theory into practice*, *41*(4), 212-218.

Kurt, Ö. (2020). Kuzey Makedonya'da Türk öğrencilere yönelik hazırlanmış olan ilköğretim 5. sınıf Türkçe ders kitaplarında bulunan okuma metinlerindeki metin altı soruların yenilenmiş Bloom taksonomisi bilişsel süreç basamaklarına göre incelenmesi. *Balkanlarda Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Araştırmaları*, *2*(2), 31-4

Kutlu, Ö. (1999). İlköğretim okullarındaki Türkçe ders kitaplarındaki okuma parçalarına dayalı olarak hazırlanmış sorular üzerine bir inceleme. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, *23*(111).

Kuzu, T. S. (2013). Türkçe ders kitaplarındaki metin altı sorularının yenilenmiş bloom taksonomisindeki hatırlama ve anlama bilişsel düzeyleri açısından incelenmesi. *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *37*(1), 58-76.

Luebke, S., & Lorié, J. (2013). Use of Bloom's taxonomy in developing reading comprehension specifications. *Journal of Applied Testing Technology*, *1*(1), 1-27.

Miller, R. G. (2006). Unlocking Reading Comprehension with Key Science Inquiry Skills. *Science Scope*, *30*(1), 30-33.

Nuttall, C. (1996). *Teaching reading skills in a foreign language*. Heinemann, 361 Hanover Street, Portsmouth, NH 03801-3912.

Oran, M. & Karalı, M. A. (2019). Ortaokul 7. sınıf sosyal bilgiler ders kitabı değerlendirme sorunlarının Bloom taksonomisinde bilişsel alan basamaklarına göre incelenmesi. *Uşak Üniversitesi Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *5*(3), 88-104.

Oryaşın, U. (2021). Türkçe ders kitaplarındaki etkinliklerin Yenilenen Bloom Sınıflandırmasına göre incelenmesi. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, *9*(3), 820-832.

Polat, İ., & Dedeoğlu, H. (2020). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin hazırladığı metin altı sorularının incelenmesi. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, *8*(4), 1468-1482.

Rosenblatt, L. M. (1994). *The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work*. SIU Press.

Sallabaş, M. E., & Yılmaz, G. (2020). Türkçe ders kitabı'nda bulunan metin altı sorularının yenilenmiş Bloom Taksonomisi'ne göre incelenmesi. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, *8*(2), 586-596.

Sarıkaya, B., & Şakiroğlu, Y. (2021). KKTC Türkçe ders kitaplarındaki etkinliklerin Yenilenmiş Bloom Sınıflandırması'na göre incelenmesi: 6. sınıf Türkçe ders kitabı örneği. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (25), 273-296.

Sezgin, Z. Ç., & Özilhan, Y. G. G. (2019). 1.-8. sınıf Türkçe ders kitaplarındaki metne dayalı anlama sorularının incelenmesi. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, *7*(2), 353-367.

Snow, C. (2002). *Reading for understanding: Toward an R&D program in reading comprehension*. Rand Corporation.

Sur, E. (2022). Türkçe ders kitaplarında yer alan metin altı soruların yenilenmiş Bloom taksonomisine göre incelenmesi. *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *11*(1), 430-451.

Şanlı, C., & Pınar, A. (2017). Sosyal bilgiler dersi sınav sorularının yenilenen Bloom taksonomisine göre incelenmesi. *Elementary Education Online*, *16*(3).

Şimşek, H. & Yıldırım, A. (2011). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri*. Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Ugur, F. (2019). Evaluation of Activities in Secondary School Level Turkish Workbooks According to Types of Memory and Revised Bloom's Taxonomy. *International Education Studies*, *12*(4), 185-197.

Ulum, H. & Taşkaya, S. M. (2019). İlkokul 2, 3 ve 4. sınıf Türkçe ders ve çalışma kitaplarında yer alan etkinliklerin yenilenmiş Bloom taksonomisine göre incelenmesi. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, *27*(1), 107-118.

Ulum, Ö. G. (2016). A Descriptive Content Analysis of the Extent of Bloom's Taxonomy in the Reading Comprehension Questions of the Course Book Q: Skills for Success 4 Reading and Writing. *Qualitative Report*, *21*(9).

Veeravagu, J. V. J., Muthusamy, C., Marimuthu, R., & Michael, A. S. (2010). Using Bloom's taxonomy to gauge students' reading comprehension performance. *Canadian Social Science*, *6*(3), 205-212.

Yıldırım, K. (2012). Öğretmenlerin öğrencilerin okuduğunu anlama becerilerini değerlendirmede kullanabilecekleri bir sistem: Barrett taksonomisi. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *9*(18), 45-58.

Yıldırım, K., Rasinski, T., & Kaya, D. (2017). 4-8. sınıflarda Türk öğrencilerin bilgi verici metinlerde akıcı okuma ve anlamaları. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, *42*(192).

Yıldırım, Ö. K. (2020). 8. sınıf Türkçe ders kitabındaki yazma etkinliklerinin yenilenmiş Bloom taksonomisine göre incelenmesi. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, *8*(2), 315-325.8.

Yılmaz, E., & Keray, B. (2012). Söyleşi metinleri yoluyla sekizinci sınıf öğrencilerinin soru sorma becerilerinin yenilenmiş Bloom taksonomisine göre incelenmesi. *Sakarya University Journal of Education*, *2*(2), 20-31.

Copyrights