



COGNITIVE AND AFFECTIVE LEVELS OF THE QUESTIONS ASKED IN READING PART OF ENGLISH TEXTBOOK IN TURKEY

Zehra Sumeyye Ertemⁱ

Ministry of National Education,
06560, Ankara,
Turkey

orcid.org/0000-0002-7076-7712

Abstract:

The aim of this study is to determine which types of questions are most frequently included in the book titled Silver Lining, which is taught in English classes in 11th grades in Turkey, and at what level of understanding questions are asked. For this purpose, the analysis of the reading questions in the "Reading and Listening" section of the English textbook was carried out. Barrett's Taxonomy was used as a basis to determine the mental processes required by the questions. Since the questions in the book were examined in the study, the qualitative research method, one of the research methods, was adopted and document analysis was conducted. Within the scope of the research, ten units in the book titled Silver Lining were examined. There are two sections in each unit, section A and section B. There are six or seven question guidelines under the title "Reading and Writing" in each section. Within the scope of this study, a total of 263 reading comprehension questions, including 149 question instructions and 114 question items in the entire book, were examined. The eleventh grade English textbook mostly includes matching questions and multiple-choice questions. Open-ended questions, which have a very small share among the question types, were asked in a way that the answers could be easily found in the text. Additionally, it was observed that the questions were asked mostly at the level of simple understanding. In this sense, the text questions in the eleventh grade English textbook should be diversified by teachers, and in addition to simple questions, students should be asked more questions that will activate metacognition, thus enabling them to think critically.

Keywords: English textbook, reading comprehension, Barrett taxonomy, cognitive and affective level

ⁱ Correspondence: email zsgokler@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Reading is “an activity of making meaning from written symbols through the joint work of cognitive behaviors and psychomotor skills” according to Demirel (1999). Being able to make sense of the text read is the most distinctive feature of reading. Reading words without comprehension can be reduced to imitating the sounds of the language, it is nothing but verbal practice by repeating the text (Paris & Hamilton, 2009). Reading is a dynamic meaning-making process based on active and effective communication between the author and the reader (Akyol, 2010).

Reading skills are a separate unit within the curriculum that students must learn and teachers must teach (Pearson, 2009). Determining the subject of a text given a title, having general information about the text, obtaining detailed information about the text, finding the main idea of the text and supporting ideas, conveying information about the text, making a summary, guessing the meanings of unknown words in the text, developing a title for the text. can be counted among the reading skills (Akyol, 2010).

Comprehension skills have a very important function in developing reading skills and continuing educational activities (Kaldırım, 2020). In developing comprehension skills, questions are seen and used as evaluation tools as well as teaching tools (Akyol, Yıldırım, Ateş, & Çetinkaya, 2013).

In our country, Bloom's Revised Taxonomy is frequently used to evaluate the cognitive levels of curriculum, central exam questions, and exercises in books (Gökler, Aypay & Arı, 2012; Akyol, Yıldırım, Ateş, & Çetinkaya, 2013; Avşar & Mete, 2018; Büyükalın Filiz & Yıldırım, 2019; Demiroz & Ertem, 2022). Another technique that can be used to assess students' reading comprehension levels is Barrett's Taxonomy. Taxonomy helps teachers, especially in forming comprehension questions. As a matter of fact, if comprehension questions are prepared well, the questions help the reader to interact with the text and structure the meaning, and higher-level comprehension can be achieved (Akyol, Yıldırım, Ateş, & Çetinkaya, 2013). In this sense, Barrett's Taxonomy, which can be used to create and evaluate questions both cognitively and affectively, consists of five main sections and thirty-three sub-levels.

A. Literal Comprehension

The first level of taxonomy is literal comprehension. At this level of comprehension, the focus is on the information directly given in the text. These questions can be simple enough to ask you to remember an event, information, or fact in the text, or they can be complex enough to ask you to remember or notice more than one event, information or fact in the text (Yıldırım, 2012). At this level of understanding, questions such as "what is the main idea of the text you read", "where does the event take place", "what, where, when, how did it happen" can be asked. The important thing is that the answers to these questions are given directly in the text and the student is asked to notice or remember this information in the text (Kaldırım, 2020).

B. Reorganization

The second level of taxonomy is reorganization. At this level, the reader is expected to analyze and synthesize an event, information or fact in the text and reorganize it. At this level, the reader can take the author's statement as it is and reorganize it with his own words (Yıldırım, 2012; Kaldırım, 2020). Questions such as "What is the most appropriate title for the text", "How can you best summarize the text", "What can happen after this stage" can be asked at this level (Kaldırım, 2020).

C. Inferential Comprehension

The third level of taxonomy is inferential comprehension. At this level, it is tried to reach the answer that is not directly given in the text, based on the information given in the text. At this level, students make inferences, guesses, and hypotheses using their previous experiences with the text. These inferences or predictions may come from different directions and combine, or they may be completely divergent (Yıldırım, 2012). At this level of understanding, the question "What is the main idea of the text" can be asked, which can also be asked at the level of reorganization. Unlike the other one, the answer to the question "what is the main idea of the text" at the inferential comprehension level is not directly given in the text. The reader reads the text, guesses what the main idea of the text is based on his previous experiences and knowledge, and makes inferences.

At this level, questions such as "what is the message intended to be given in the text", "what are the similarities and differences between the information in the text", "what can be said about the personality of the hero of the text" can be asked (Kaldırım, 2020).

D. Evaluation

The fourth level of the taxonomy is evaluation. At this level, the reader is expected to analyze and judge the text he reads according to predetermined standards. The standards or external criteria here may have been determined by subject experts or teachers or created based on written sources. In addition, the reader can make judgments using internal criteria based on his own knowledge and experience (Kaldırım, 2020). Essentially, evaluation is based on judgments and depends on attributes such as accuracy, acceptability, desirability, value, or probability of occurrence (<http://www.joebyrne.net/Curriculum/barrett.pdf>).

Questions that can be asked at this level of understanding can be listed as "how can the event in the text occur in real life", "how do you evaluate the events in the text according to the criteria of...", "what are your opinions about the accuracy or wrongness of the information given by the author" (Kaldırım, 2020).

E. Appreciation

The fifth level of the taxonomy is appreciation. This level includes all of the cognitive dimensions mentioned above and deals with the effect of the text on the reader (Yıldırım, 2012). Appreciation can be defined as "the reader's ability to express his/her feelings and

thoughts about the text using personal criteria and affective skills." At this level, questions such as "which character were you most impressed with", "how would you act if you were the main character in the text", "what kind of language did the author use" can be asked (Kaldırım, 2020). Table 1 shows the cognitive and affective dimensions of Barret's Taxonomy.

Table 1: Cognitive and Affective Dimensions of Barrett Taxonomy

1. Literal Comprehension (cognitive)	
Recognition	Recall
Recognition of Details	Recall of Details
Recognition of Main Ideas	Recall of Main Ideas
Recognition of a Sequence	Recall of a Sequence
Recognition of Comparison	Recall of Comparison
Recognition of Cause and Effect Relationships	Recall of Cause and Effect Relationships
Recognition of Character Traits	Recall of Character Traits
2. Reorganization (cognitive)	
Classifying	
Outlining	
Summarizing	
Synthesizing	
3. Inferential Comprehension (cognitive)	
Inferring Supporting Details	
Inferring Main Ideas	
Inferring Sequence	
Inferring Comparisons	
Inferring Cause and Effect Relationships	
Inferring Character Traits	
Predicting Outcomes	
Interpreting Figurative Language	
4. Evaluation (cognitive)	
Judgments of Reality or Fantasy	
Judgments of Fact or Opinion	
Judgments of Adequacy and Validity	
Judgments of Appropriateness	
Judgments of Worth, Desirability and Acceptability	
5. Appreciation (affective)	
Emotional Response to the Content	
Identification with Characters or Incidents	
Reactions to the Author's Use of Language	
Imagery	

Source: <http://www.joebyrne.net/Curriculum/barrett.pdf>

2. Purpose of the Research

The aim of this study is to determine which types of questions are most frequently included in the book titled *Silver Lining*, which is taught in English classes in 11th grades in Turkey, and at what cognitive and affective level of understanding questions are

asked. For this purpose, the analysis of the reading questions in the "Reading and Writing" section of the English textbook was carried out. Barrett's Taxonomy was used as a basis to determine the mental processes required by the questions. It was effective in making this choice that Barrett Taxonomy takes into account affective processes as well as cognitive processes, there is no study based on the classification based on Barrett Taxonomy regarding English language teaching, and the classification was developed to directly determine comprehension levels. For this purpose, the following questions were answered:

- 1) What types of questions are asked under the title of reading skills in the B1 Level Silver Lining book?
- 2) In which cognitive and affective levels are the reading comprehension questions under the heading of reading skills in the B1 Level Silver Lining book located, according to Barrett's Taxonomy?

3. Method

In this study, reading comprehension questions under the title of reading skill were classified according to Barrett's Taxonomy. For this purpose, reading comprehension questions in the "Reading and Listening" section of the book named Silver Lining were scanned. Silver Lining is B1 level according to the European languages common framework program. It is taught in 11th grades in secondary education institutions in Turkey. There are ten units in the book and it consists of 168 pages in total.

Since the questions in the book were examined in the study, the qualitative research method was adopted from the research methods, and document analysis was carried out. Qualitative research is a type of research in which qualitative data collection methods such as observation, interview, and document analysis are used, and a qualitative process is followed to reveal perceptions and events in a natural environment in a realistic and holistic way (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2008, p. 39). Document analysis, on the other hand, is the process of collecting existing records and documents related to the research and coding them according to a certain standard or system. It is also known as "documentary observation" or "documentary scanning" (Çepni, 2010).

Within the scope of the research, ten units in the book called Silver Lining were examined. There are two sections in each unit, section A and section B. There are six or seven question instructions under the heading "Reading and Writing" in each section. Although it varies according to the type of question, there are question items to be answered under each question directive. Within the scope of this study, a total of 263 reading comprehension questions, including 149 question instructions and 114 question items in the entire book, were examined. The following steps were taken for classification. First, the questions were coded. In the example Q1A.1, Q means question, 1A means first unit A section, and the number after the dot corresponds to the number given to the question in the book. After the coding process, the questions were placed in the Barrett Taxonomy levels. At this stage, definitions and classifications made in the literature

(Rahma, 2019; Kaldirim, 2020) were used. After the classification process, an expert's opinion was taken. After the expert opinion, the classification was finalized and frequency and percentage calculations were made. All questions are coded, their distribution into taxonomy levels, and percentage and frequency calculations are presented in the findings section. In addition, sample questions about each step are also included.

4. Findings

Within the scope of the purpose of the research, first of all, an answer was sought to the question of which question types were prepared for the reading comprehension questions in the Silver Lining book. Then, how the questions were distributed to the Barrett Taxonomy levels were presented with percentage and frequency calculations. Finally, the distribution of coded questions according to the subheadings of the taxonomy and sample questions are included.

4.1. Question Types in the B1 Level Silver Lining Book

When the reading comprehension questions were examined, it was seen that 38 questions out of 149 were asked in the form of matching. Matching questions, which appear in more than one exercise in almost every unit and constitute a quarter of the questions, are the most frequently asked question type. The least common question type is ranking questions. Wh questions have a share of 13%, yes-no questions have a share of 3%, true-wrong questions have a share of 5%, multiple-choice questions have a share of 25%, sentence completion questions have a share of 12%, and table completion questions have a share of approximately 7%.

Table 2: Percentage and Frequency Distribution of Reading Comprehension Questions

No	Question Type	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Wh- Question	20	13,4
2	Yes/no question	5	3,3
3	True/False Question	8	5,3
4	Multiple Choice Question	13	8,7
5	Matching	38	25,5
6	Ranking questions	3	2
7	Sentence completion	18	12
8	Filling the chart	10	6,7
9	Other	34	22,8
Total		149	100

4.2. Cognitive and Affective Levels of Reading Comprehension Questions in the B1 Level Silver Lining Book

When the distribution of reading comprehension questions in Barrett's taxonomy is examined, it is seen that more than half of the questions are collected at the literal comprehension level and one-third are at the inferential level. Reorganization was the

level where the least problems were settled. About 5% of the questions are placed on the appreciation, which is the affective level. The distribution of the questions is shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Cognitive and Affective Levels of Reading Comprehension Questions

Barrett's Taxonomy Levels	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Literal Comprehension	142	53,9
Reorganization	5	1,9
Inferential	89	33,8
Evaluation	14	5,3
Appreciation	13	4,9
Total	263	100

Question distributions specific to units are seen in Table 4. Approximately 80% of the 8th unit questions consist of literal comprehension questions. This is the highest rate seen among these units. Other units where Literal Comprehension questions are included more than 50% are units 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, and 10. In the remaining three units, less than 50% of literal comprehension questions were asked. Half or more of the questions in the 2nd and 7th units of these units consist of questions at the inferential level. Questions at the Reorganization level were not found in either unit. The units that include questions at all five levels are units 3, 4, and 9. In Units 5, 6, and 10, questions at the affective level were not included. While there are questions at least in Unit 6 at the level of literal comprehension, it is seen that the percentage of questions at the inferential level is 62% in the same unit. According to Table 4, it can be said that there is not a balanced distribution between the cognitive difficulty levels of the questions, simple questions are generally preferred, and there are no questions at the affective level in some units.

Table 4: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Cognitive and Affective Levels of Reading Comprehension Questions by Units

Theme No	Barrett's Taxonomy Levels										Total	
	Literal Comprehension		Reorganisation		Inferential		Evaluation		Appreciation			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	11	61,1	1	5,5	3	16,6	-	-	3	16,6	18	100
2	18	42,8	-	-	21	50	-	-	3	7,1	42	100
3	18	52,9	1	2,9	11	32,3	3	8,8	1	2,9	34	100
4	21	48,8	1	2,3	16	37,2	3	6,9	2	4,6	43	100
5	16	69,5	1	4,3	4	17,3	2	8,6	-	-	23	100
6	7	29,1	-	-	15	62,5	2	8,3	-	-	24	100
7	12	60	-	-	7	35	-	-	1	5	20	100
8	18	78,2	-	-	3	13	1	4,3	1	4,3	23	100
9	11	57,8	1	5,2	4	21	1	5,2	2	10,5	19	100
10	10	58,8	-	-	5	29,4	2	11,7	-	-	17	100
Total	142	53,9	5	1,9	89	33,8	14	5,3	13	4,9	263	100

4.2.1 Literal Comprehension

Simple level literal comprehension questions are examined under six subheadings. These are recognition or recall details, main idea, sequence, comparison, cause and effect and character traits. According to Table 5, the reading comprehension questions in the Silver Lining book are not seen only in the recognition main idea, recall sequence, and recall cause and effect subheadings. Among others, recognition details and recognition character traits questions are largely seen. Examples of classification are presented below.

Table 5: Distribution of Literal Comprehension Questions

Literal Comprehension		
Recognition	Details	Q1B1.1a, Q1B1.1b, Q1B1.1c, Q1B1.1d, Q1B.4., Q2A.1, Q2A.5.1, Q2A.5.4, Q2A.5.5, Q4A2.1, Q4A2.2, Q4A4.2, Q4A4.4, Q4A4.6, Q4B.1.1, Q4B.1.2 Q4B.1.3, Q4B.1.4, Q4B.4.2, Q4B.4.3, Q4B.4.4, Q4B.4.5, Q4B.4.6, Q5A.3, Q5B.1 Q5B.4.1, Q5B.4.3, Q6B.2, Q6B5.2, Q6B5.3, Q6B.5.4, Q6B5.5, Q7A.1.a, Q7A.1b Q7A.1.1, Q7A.1.2., Q7A.1.3, Q7A.1.4, Q7A.1.5., Q7A.1.6, Q7A.6, Q7B.1, Q7B.2, Q7B.4, Q8A.1a, Q8A.1b, Q8A.4.2, Q8A.4.3, Q8A.4.4, Q8A.4.5, Q8A.4.6 Q8A.7, Q8A.8, Q8B.1, Q8B4.1, Q8B4.2, Q8B4.3, Q8B4.4, Q8B4.5, Q8B.5, Q9A.4, Q9B.1, Q9B.2, Q10A.6, Q10B.3.1, Q10B.3.3, Q10B.3.4, Q10B.3.5
	Main Idea	
	Sequence	Q5B.4.4, Q8B.3
	Comparison	Q1A.1, Q1A. 5a., Q1B5., Q1B6., Q4A.4.1, Q4A4.3, Q5B.5, Q5B.6a, Q6A.6 Q9A.6, Q9A.8a., Q10A.1a, Q10A.4a, Q10A.4b, Q10B.2
	Cause and Effect	Q4A4.5.1., Q4A4.5.2., Q4A4.5.3., Q4A4.5.4., Q4A4.5.5., Q5A.6, Q5B.2, Q5B.4.2., Q6B.5.1, Q9A.5.1
	Character Traits	Q2A.3., Q2B.1a., Q2B.3, Q2B.3.1, Q2B.3.2, Q2B.3.3, Q2B.3.4, Q2B.3.5 Q2B.3.6, Q2B.4.4, Q2B.4.5, Q2B.4.6, Q2B.4.7, Q3A5.1, Q3A5.2, Q3A5.3 Q3A6.1, Q3A6.2., Q3A6.3., Q3B.3, Q3B.4.1, Q3B.4.2, Q3B.4.3, Q3B.4.4 Q3B.4.5, Q3B.4.6, Q3B.4.7, Q3B.4.8, Q3B.6a, Q5A.4a.2, Q5A.4a.3., Q5A.4a 4. Q5A.4a.5., Q5A.4b, Q9A.5.2, Q9A.5.3, Q9A.5.4, Q9A.5.5, Q9A.7
Recall	Details	Q1B2., Q2B5., Q5A.7, Q8A.6
	Main Idea	Q3A4a, Q3Ab
	Sequence	
	Comparison	Q1A.6., Q10B.1b
	Cause and Effect	

Examples:

Details

Q2A.5.5: *"Where was he invited to give workshops?"*

Q4B.1.1: *"Read the news on the magazine cover and fill in the blanks."*

"There were people on board."

Sequence

Q5B.4.4: *"While the drivers were on the road in San Francisco,"*

Q8B.3: *“Read the page on the sports magazine “X-treme” and number the scrambled paragraphs in the right order.”*

Comparison

Q4A.4.1: *“Read the webpage and the statements below. Write true (T) or false (F). Correct the false ones.”*

“The types of the three museums are completely different from each other.”

Q4A4.3: *“All the museums have things to show from different countries”*

Cause and Effect

Q5A.6: *“Work in pairs. Match the situations with the results. Then, ask and answer questions using them as in the example.”*

Q5B.4.2: *“Nevil Maskelyne set up a plan to”*

Character Traits

Q2A.3: *“Read the text and underline the sentences which mention John’s past abilities.”*

Q9A.5.3: *“What kind of a person is Charlize Theron in her real life?”*

Main Idea

Q3A4a: *“Underline the thesis statement.”*

Q3Ab: *“Read the essay and insert the topic sentences into the paragraphs. One is extra.”*

4.2.2 Reorganization

The level where questions are least settled is reorganization. Only 5 questions in the entire book were asked at this level. It is examined under four subheadings. These are *“Classifying”, “Outlining”, “Summarizing”* and *“Synthesizing”*. In all of the reorganization questions, students were asked to summarize the text, and in one question, they were asked to make a classification. *“Outlining”* and *“Synthesizing”* questions are not included throughout the book. Examples are presented below.

Table 6: Reorganization Question Distribution

Reorganisation	
Classifying	Q1A. 4.
Outlining	
Summarising	Q3B.6b, Q4B.6, Q5B.6b, Q9B4
Synthesising	

Examples:

Classifying

Q1A. 4: *“Read the text again and match the questions with the paragraphs. One is extra.”*

Summarising

Q3B.6b: *“Work in pairs and summarize the stories using the information in the chart in exercise 6a. Then tell one of the stories in your own words.”*

Q4B.6: *“Work in pairs and retell the life story of Christa McAuliffe in your own words using the information below.”*

4.2.3 Inferential

Inferential is examined under eight subheadings. These are *“Supporting Details”, “Main Ideas”, “Sequence”, “Comparison”, “Cause and Effect”, “Character Trait”, “Outcomes”* and *“Figurative Language”*. It is seen in Table 7 that only the inferential outcomes questions are not included in the book among these sub-headings. Almost all of the inferential questions are gathered under the sub-title of *“Inferential Character Traits”* or *“Inferential Figurative Language”*. In only two questions, students were asked to make inferences about the main idea of the text. Examples of sub-headings are presented below.

Table 7: Inferential Question Distribution

Inferential	
Supporting Details	Q2A.5.2, Q2A.5.3, Q10B.3.2
Main Ideas	Q1A. 3, Q10B.4
Sequence	Q7A.4
Comparison	Q4B.5, Q2A.6.1, Q2A.6.2, Q2A.6.3, Q2A.6.4., Q2A.6.5, Q2A.6.6
Cause and Effect	Q5A.4a.1, Q8A.4.1, Q10A.1b
Character Traits	Q2A.4.1, Q2A.4.2, Q2A.4.3, Q2A.4.4, Q2A.4.5, Q2A.4.6, Q2B.4.1, Q2B.4.2, Q2B.4.3 Q2B.4.8, Q2B.4.9, Q3A6.4, Q4A5.1, Q4A5.2, Q4A5.3, Q4A5.4, Q4A5.5, Q4A5.6, Q4B.4.1, Q6A.4.1, Q6A.4.2, Q6A.4.3, Q6A.4.4, Q6A.4.5., Q6A5.1 Q6A5.2, Q6A5.3., Q6A5.4, Q6B.3
Outcomes	
Figurative Language	Q1A. 5b., Q1B.3., Q2A.6., Q2B.2, Q3A.2, Q3A3., Q3A7.1, Q3A7.2, Q3A7.3, Q3A7.4, Q3A7.5, Q3A7.6., Q3B.2, Q3B.5, Q4A6.1, Q4A6.2, Q4A6.3, Q4A6.4., Q4A6.5, Q4A6.6, Q4A6.7, Q4A6.8, Q5A.2, Q5A.5, Q5B.5, Q6A.1, Q6A.3, Q6B.1, Q6B.4, Q6B.6, Q7A.2, Q7A.5, Q7A.7a, Q7A.7b, Q7B.3, Q7B.5, Q8A.5, Q8B.2, Q9A.1, Q9A.2, Q9A.3, Q9B.6, Q10A.2, Q10A.3

Examples:

Supporting Details

Q2A.5.2: *“What was his teacher’s prediction about John’s passion?”*

Q2A.5.3: *“What was the turning point of his life?”*

Main Ideas

Q1A.3: *“Read the text about one of the entrepreneurs of the 21st century and choose its main idea.”*

Q10B.4: *“Read again to choose the main idea of the summary.”*

Sequence

Q7A.4: *“Read the text again and put the events in the chronological order.”*

Comparison

Q4B.5: *“Match the highlighted sentences in the text with their similar ones given”*

Cause and Effect

Q8A.4.1: *“Since Wimbledon Tennis Tournament is a popular event,”*

Q10A.1b: *“Work in pairs. Discuss the possible reasons for the social norms above.”*

Character Traits

Q3A6.4: *“What are the common personality traits of these three people?”*

Q4A5.1: *“Read the webpage again. Decide the owner of the statements. Write Bao, Hilary or Horge.”*

1. *“I think making wax figures requires blood, sweat and tears.”*

Figurative Language

Q5A.5: *“Complete the sentences using the highlighted words in the e-mails. Make necessary changes”*

Q7A.7a: *“Match the English proverbs with their explanations.”*

4.2.4. Evaluation

Evaluation can be examined under five subheadings. These are *“Judgements of Reality or Fantasy”*, *“Judgements of Fact or Opinion”*, *“Judgements of Adequacy and Validity”*, *“Judgements of Appropriateness”*, *“Judgements of Worth, Desirability and Acceptability”*. The questions are mostly in the sub-title of judgements of appropriateness. There are no *“Judgments of Reality or Fantasy”* and *“Judgements of Adequacy and Validity”* type questions. Sample questions are presented below.

Table 8: Evaluation Question Distribution

Evaluation	
Judgements of Reality or Fantasy	
Judgements of Fact or Opinion	Q3B.a, Q10A.5
Judgements of Adequacy and Validity	
Judgements of Appropriateness	Q3A8., Q3B.7, Q4A.3, Q4A.7a, Q4B.3, Q5B.3, Q6A.2, Q8A.3, Q9B.5
Judgements of Worth, Desirability and Acceptability	Q5A.1, Q6A.1.b, Q10B.1a

Examples:

Judgements of Fact or Opinion

Q3B1a: *“Think about the teenage problems below and tick the boxes. Teenagers suffer from.”*

Q10B.1a: *“Read the quotes from The Little Prince and tick the ones you agree.”*

Judgements of Appropriateness

Q3A8: *“Read the facts about Olympics, the Oscars and FIFA World Cup. Place the following facts in the missing parts.”*

Q9B.5: *“Read the text again. Complete the blanks in the article with the following sentences. There is one extra.”*

Judgements of Worth, Desirability and Acceptability

Q5A.1: *“Look at the school behaviour problems below. Discuss how they affect the students’ school performance.”*

Q6A.1.b: *“Work in pairs. Discuss the statements in the bubbles. Which one is the most essential when you love someone / something? Explain why.”*

4.2.5. Appreciation

There are thirteen questions in the appreciation level, also known as the affective level. Appreciation level can be examined under four subheadings. These are *“Emotional Response to the Content”*, *“Identification with Characters or Incidents”*, *“Reactions to the Author’s Use of Language”* and *“Imagery”*. The questions are mostly collected under the subheading *“Identification with Characters or Incidents”*. This is followed by *“Emotional Response to the Content”*. Sample questions are presented below.

Tablo 9: Appreciation Question Distribution

Appreciation	
Emotional Response to the Content	Q4A.1, Q4A7b, Q7A.b, Q8B.5, Q9A.8.b
Identification with Characters or Incidents	Q1A. 2a, Q1A. 2b, Q2A.2., Q2A.7, Q2B.1b, Q3B1b, Q9B.3
Reactions to the Author’s Use of Language	Q3A.1
Imagery	

Examples:

Emotional Response to the Content

Q4A7b: *“Read about the famous artworks. Which one is your favourite? Explain why”*

Q7A.b: *“Have you ever been to one of the historical sites above? - If yes, what affected you the most? - If not, which one would you like to see?”*

Identification with Characters or Incidents

Q2A.7: *“Read the text. Which of the entrepreneurs inspires you? Give your reasons.”*

Q1A.2a: *“Look at the common characteristics of successful entrepreneurs. Number them from the most important to the least according to you.”*

5. Conclusion and Discussion

Reading is one of the four basic skills that need to be developed in foreign language teaching. One of the most used methods to determine to what extent students can understand what they read is to ask questions about the text read (Polat and Dedeoğlu, 2020). Variables such as the purpose, content, level, and type of questions for reading comprehension have a very important place in structuring meaning (Fordham, 2006). The eleventh grade English textbook mostly includes matching questions and multiple-choice questions. Open-ended questions, which have a very small share among the question types, were asked in a way that the answers could be easily found in the text. According to Pearson and Johnson (1978), questions can be examined in three main categories: "the answer is in the text", "the answer is implied in the text" and "the answer is not in the text". There is no need to use metacognitive processes to answer questions whose answers are in the text, and the answer can be reached with less mental effort, such as remembering. This situation limits students and does not help them think critically (Akyol, 1997). According to Hervey (2006), questions should be thought-provoking on issues such as the author's purpose, language and style preference, what kind of thoughts and values he expresses, how the text is presented, and students' reactions to the text. Considering that teachers mostly teach based on guidebooks during the teaching process (Ateş, 2011), the necessity of diversifying reading comprehension questions by teachers and improving teachers' questioning skills comes to the fore.

The variety and type of questions asked, as well as their level, are extremely important. As a matter of fact, high-level questions activate metacognition and students can think independently and critically (Akyol, 1997). Like many other studies (Özdemir, Özdemir and Çetinkaya, 2007; Durukan, 2009; Sunggingwati, 2001; Gökler, Aypay and Arı, 2012; Abu Humos, 2012; Akyol et al., 2013; Polat and Dedeoğlu, 2020), it was seen that the questions in this study, the questions were asked at the level of literal comprehension. However, the importance of more complex questions in running metacognitive mental processes cannot be denied. In such questions, students will try to find the truth by going to more than one source to reach the answer, and in-depth understanding and critical thinking will occur (Akyol, 1997; Cerdan, Vidal-Abarca, Martinez, Gilabert, & Gil, 2009). In this sense, the text questions in the eleventh grade English textbook should be diversified by teachers, and in addition to simple questions, students should be asked more questions that will activate metacognition, thus enabling them to think critically.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

About the Author(s)

Zehra Sumeyye Ertem (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7076-7712>) works as a teacher at a high school in Ankara, Turkey. Her career as a teacher began in 2008. She had doctoral degree in curriculum and instruction from Eskisehir Osmangazi University in 2016. She has research interest in curriculum and instruction, meta evaluation, curriculum evaluation and English language teaching.

References

- Abu Humos, O. (2012). An evaluative analysis of comprehension questions' level of difficulty: A case of 12th grade Palestinian English student's textbook. *AnNajah Uni. J. Res. (Humanities)*, 26 (3), 767-788.
- Akyol, H. (1997). Okuma metinlerindeki soruların sınıflandırılması. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 21(105), 10- 17.
- Akyol, H. (2010). *Türkçe ilk okuma yazma öğretimi*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Akyol, H., Yıldırım, K., Ateş, S., & Çetinkaya, Ç. (2013). Anlamaya yönelik ne tür sorular soruyoruz? *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9(1), 41-56.
- Ateş, S. (2011). *İlköğretim beşinci sınıf Türkçe dersi öğrenme-öğretme sürecinin anlama öğretimi açısından değerlendirilmesi*. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara
- Avşar, G. & Mete, F. (2018). Türkçe öğretim programlarında kullanılan fiillerin yenilenmiş bloom taksonomisine göre sınıflandırılması, *Karaelmas Journal of Educational Sciences*, 6, 75- 87.
- Baştuğ, M., Hiğde, A., Çam, E., Örs, E., & Efe, P. (2021). *Okuduğunu anlama becerilerini geliştirme stratejiler teknikler uygulamalar*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Büyükalın Filiz, S. & Yıldırım N. (2019). Ortaokul Türkçe dersi öğretim programı kazanımlarının revize edilmiş Bloom taksonomisine göre analizi. *Elementary Education Online*, 18(4), 1550-1573.
- Cerdán, R., Vidal-Abarca, E., Martínez, T., Gilabert, R., & Gil, L. (2009). Impact of question-answering tasks on search processes and reading comprehension. *Learning and Instruction*. 19, 13-27.
- Çepni, S. (2010). *Araştırma ve proje çalışmalarına giriş*. Trabzon: Celepler Matbaacılık.
- Demirel, Ö. (1999). *İlköğretim okullarında yabancı dil öğretimi*. Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- Demiröz, B. & Ertem, I. S. (2022). İlkokul fen bilimleri ders kitabındaki ünite değerlendirme sorularının yenilenmiş Bloom taksonomisinin bilişsel süreç boyutu, soru türleri ve konu alanlarına göre incelenmesi. *Maarif Mektepleri Uluslararası Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*. 6(2), 32-55.
- Durukan, E. (2009). 7. Sınıf Türkçe ders kitaplarındaki metinleri anlamaya yönelik sorular üzerine taksonomik bir inceleme. *Milli Eğitim*, 181, 84-93.
- Fordham, N. W. (2006). Crafting questions that address comprehension strategies in content reading. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 49, 390-396.

- Gökler, Z. S., Aypay, A., & Arı, A. (2012). İlköğretim İngilizce dersi hedefleri kazanımları SBS soruları ve yazılı sınav sorularının yeni Bloom taksonomisine göre değerlendirilmesi. *Eğitimde Politika Analizi Dergisi*, 1(2), 115-133.
- Hervey, S. (2006). Who asks the questions? *Teaching PreK-8*, 37, 68-69.
- Kaldırım, A. (2020). *Barrett taksonomisine dayalı öğretim programının 7. sınıf öğrencilerinin okuduğunu anlama becerilerine etkisi*. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Koyuncu, İ. (2022). *Türkçenin yabancı dil olarak öğretimi programı anlama kazanımlarının Barrett taksonomisine göre incelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Kırıkkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Türkçe Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı.
- Özdemir, M., Özdemir, O., & Çetinkaya, Ç. (2007). *İlköğretim 1-5 sınıflar Türkçe çalışma kitaplarındaki soruların analizi*. Bu çalışma İlköğretim Kongresi'nde sunulmuştur, Ankara.
- Paris, S. G., & Hamilton, E. E. (2009). The development of children's reading comprehension. In S. E. Israel & G. G. Duffy (Eds.), *Handbook of research on reading comprehension* (pp. 32-53). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pearson, P. D. (2009). The roots of reading comprehension. In S. E. Israel, & G. G. Duffy (Eds.), *Handbook of research on reading comprehension* (pp. 3-31). New York: Routledge.
- Pearson, P. D. and Johnson, D. D. (1978) *Teaching Reading Comprehension*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- Polat, İ. ve Dedeoğlu, H. (2020). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin hazırladığı metin altı sorularının incelenmesi. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, 8(4), 1468-1482.
- Rahma, D. N. (2019). *An analysis of reading comprehension questions made by English teacher at sman 2 sidoarjo based on Barrett's taxonomy*. Unpublished thesis. State Islamic University of Sunan Ampel Surabaya.
- Sunggingwati, D. (2001). *Reading questions of junior high school English textbooks*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Malang: Graduate Program of the Malang University.
- Şimşek, N. (2012). *Türkiye ve ABD'de ana dili öğretimi (6. sınıf ana dili ders kitaplarındaki metinlerin karşılaştırılması)*. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- The Barrett Taxonomy of Cognitive and Affective Dimensions of Reading Comprehension, <http://www.joebyrne.net/Curriculum/barrett.pdf>
- Türkben, T. (2018). Beşinci sınıf Türkçe ders kitabı metinlerinin metinsellik ölçütleri açısından incelenmesi. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, 961-986
- Ülper, H., Çetinkaya, G., & Bayat, N. (2017). Okuduğunu anlama testinin geliştirilmesi. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18(1), 175-187.
- Yıldırım, K. (2012). Öğretmenlerin öğrencilerin okuduğunu anlama becerilerini değerlendirmede kullanabilecekleri bir sistem: Barrett taksonomisi. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 45-58.

Yıldırım, A., & Simsek, H. (2008). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Arastirma Yontemleri*. Seckin Yayinlari.

Creative Commons licensing terms

Author(s) will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Education Studies shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflicts of interest, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated into the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).