CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

4.1 The Description of the Data

The data that are analyzed in this research are reading tasks of English textbooks for Junior High School entitled Scaffolding for Grade VIII written by Joko Priyana et al. and known as one of BSE (*Buku Sekolah Elektronik*) which is published by Departemen Pendidikan Nasional (National Education Department) in 2008. This book has three series for three different grades; VII, VIII and IX. This book has been used for a period of time in Indonesian Junior High School. This textbook consists of nine units of one hundred and ninety nine pages. Unit 1 to Unit 5 covers the materials for the first semester while the materials for the second semester are covered in Unit 6 to Unit 9. The curriculum employed in this book is KTSP (*Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan*).

There are many tasks provided in the Scaffolding for Grade VIII textbook. However, this study focuses only on the reading tasks of the textbook. The reading tasks are analyzed by using the cognitive processes domain of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy proposed by Anderson and Krathwohl (2001). The following table 4.1 presents the distribution of tasks in all units of Scaffolding for Grade VIII textbook.

Table 4.1

The Distribution of the Tasks in all Units

Unit	Theme	Focus	Types of Text	Tasks in the Unit	Reading Tasks in the Unit
1	Describing Things and Animals	Asking for, giving and refusing goods and services	Descriptive text	21 tasks	7 tasks
2	My Gorgeous Idol	Congratulating and complimenting and responding to congratulations and compliments	Descriptive text	19 tasks	7 tasks
3	Wonderful Places	Agreeing and disagreeing something Inviting someone, accepting, and declining an invitation	Descriptive text	25 tasks	9 tasks
4	My Unforgettable Holiday	Asking for and giving opinions	Recount text	22 tasks	10 tasks
5	My First Experience	Denying and admitting facts	Recount text	21 tasks	9 tasks
6	Life Performances	Starting, extending, and ending a conversation on telephone	Recount text	24 tasks	7 tasks
7	Celebrations around the World	Asking for, giving goods and services, and refusing to do something	Narrative text	22 tasks	11 tasks
8	Once Upon a Time…		Narrative text	18 tasks	7 tasks
9	A Friend in Need is a Friend indeed	Asking for and expressing agreement/disagreement	Narrative text	18 tasks	8 tasks
Total	9 Units			190 tasks	75 tasks

The table above shows that there are total 190 tasks encompasses all the four language skills (speaking, listening, reading and writing) and the language components in the textbook. Furthermore, there are 75 tasks under

the reading skill. It can be seen that the distribution of the reading tasks in *Scaffolding for Grade VIII* textbook is considered high compared to the tasks under the other skills.

4.2 Findings of the Distribution of the Cognitive Levels in Reading Tasks

From total 190 tasks, there are 75 tasks practice the reading skill in the *Scaffolding for Grade VIII* textbook. Those reading tasks are analyzed by using checklist table adapted from the cognitive processes domain as proposed by Anderson & Krathwol (2001) in order to find out the distribution of the cognitive levels in each reading tasks. Bloom's Revised Taxonomy is a parameter to measure the level of thinking in cognitive domain. Bloom's Revised Taxonomy classified the level of learning activities into six; Remember, Understand, Apply, Analyze, Evaluate, and Create. These levels of learning activities are then classified into two major levels of thinking skill; Lower-Order Thinking (LOT) and Higher-Order Thinking (HOT). The first three levels of learning activities are classified into Lower-Order Thinking (LOT). While the other three levels of learning activities are classified into Higher-Order Thinking.

The researcher expects to know the distribution of the higher order thinking skill in the reading tasks by finding out how the cognitive levels are distributed in every reading tasks.

From the total of 75 reading task there are 20 tasks implemented the cognitive level of remember, 32 tasks implemented the cognitive level of understand, 20 tasks implemented the cognitive level of apply, only 3 tasks implemented the cognitive level of analyze, and none of the task implemented the cognitive levels of evaluate and create. Thus, it can be seen that the distribution of the cognitive levels of remember, understand, apply, analyze, evaluate, and create are not balance.

The following table 4.3 explains the percentage and the distribution of Lower-order thinking (LOT) and Higher-order thinking (HOT) in the reading tasks of *Scaffolding for Grade VIII* textbook.

Table 4.3

Distribution of Lower-order thinking (LOT) and Higher-order thinking (HOT) in the reading tasks

	Thinking skill					
	Lower-order thinking			Higher-order thinking		
	Remember	Understand	Apply	Analyze	Evaluate	create
Total	20	32	20	3	-	-
	72			3		

The table above shows that from total 75 reading tasks analyzed from Scaffolding for Grade VIII, 72 tasks implemented the Lower-order thinking (LOT) skill while only 3 tasks implemented the Higher-order thinking (HOT) skill.

4.3 Interpretation of the Data

Based on the findings of the distribution of cognitive levels and thinking skill in the reading tasks of *Scaffolding for Grade VIII* textbook, it can be seen that the cognitive level of understand obtains the highest distribution with 32 out of 75 tasks, remember and apply obtain the second place with 20 out of 75 tasks each, cognitive level of analyze obtains only 3 out of 75 tasks while evaluate and create obtain null distribution.

The result of the data analysis also presumes that the author may have been more focus on the Lower-order thinking skill since the difference in the percentage between Lower-order thinking and Higher-order thinking is very far.

Additionally, it also can be seen that the range of distribution for the six cognitive levels are quite far from each other. The author seems to be emphasizing more on the cognitive level of understand since it obtain 32 out of 75 tasks. Especially since the cognitive level of evaluate and create have obtain null distribution.

Furthermore, from the tables of data analysis above, it can be interpreted that the reading task in *Scaffolding for Grade VIII* is lacking in the terms of cognitive levels variation.

4.4 Discussion

After the researcher categorize and analyze the reading task into six levels of cognitive, the researcher found that the cognitive levels are not

distributed equally. The findings of the analysis shows that the Lower-order thinking obtains way more distribution than the Higher-order thinking. Proven by the result of the data analysis that shows the distribution for Lower-order thinking is 72 out of 75 tasks distribution, leaving the Higher-order thinking with only 3 out of 75 tasks.

From 9 units in the textbook consists of 190 tasks, there are total 75 tasks under the practice of reading skill. However, only 3 tasks belongs to the Higher-order thinking. Thus, the researcher think that the distribution of the cognitive levels in the reading tasks of *Scaffolding for Grade VIII* textbook is not balance.

Moreover, the cognitive level that obtains the highest distribution among the six levels is understand with 32 out of 75 tasks while evaluate and create obtain null distribution. This might happens, since Mayer (2002) claims that the largest category of transfer-based educational objectives stressed in school and colleges is understand. Meaning that most of the goal of a subject matter in school is usually to understand the concept of ideas of that subject. Thus, the tasks and exercises provided in the textbook are following the goal of the subject, which is to understand the concept and ideas.

Additionally, the result of this study has similar result with Igbaria's study in 2013 that shows distribution of the Higher-order thinking is lower that the Lower-order thinking skill. Airasian & Russell (2008) argues that this might happen because the lower-order thinking questions are more frequently used in the lesson plan, the easiest to be answered by the students, and a lot

easier to be made by the teachers. The result of this study also appears in almost all the studies discussed in the literature review.

In contrast, the lower distribution of the Higher-order thinking skill in the reading tasks might occur because the tasks may look much more complex than the tasks belongs to the Lower-order thinking skill. Therefore, in reference to that statement, the author of the textbook may be concerned about the limitation of time in the classroom. The time in the classroom might be wasted since students might need more time in solving the tasks that are more complex and belongs to the Higher-order thinking skill. Teachers need to wait for a considerable amount of time for the students to solve a problem or finishing a task (Airasian & Russell, 2008).

It can be presumed that the author may have been focusing more on the Lower-order thinking skill. Proven by the distribution of Higher-order thinking only obtain 3 out of 75 tasks. The skill that is emphasized by the author of the textbook for the Higher-order thinking is analyze. It is proven by the highest distribution is obtained by the analyze skill while evaluate and create obtain null distribution. The ratio between the Lower-order thinking and Higher-order thinking is quite far.

It can also be considered important for the author of the textbook to also concern about evaluate and create which obtains null distribution. Create skill is essential for students since it trains them to give judgment upon something and also to produce an original product of their own thinking and ideas. It is also can be seen that the variation of Higher-order thinking tasks are not too

varied. On that ground, it can be presumed that the variation of the higher order thinking questions need to be enriched so that it can assist students in developing their higher order thinking skill properly. This is to be in line with Woodward and Elliot as cited in Reed and Bergemann (1998) who argues that, by emphasizing more on problem solving and Higher-order cognitive process, a textbook can be improved.