JOURNAL OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE PEDAGOGY
Vol. 7, No. 2, July 2022, pp. 1-15

BLOOM TAXONOMY USED BY TEACHER IN LESSON PLAN

Roza Susanti[1], Dwi Settya Mahaputri[2*]

[1]STKIP Yayasan Abdi Pendidikan
Email: susantiroza.buja@gmail.com
[2*]STKIP Yayasan Abdi Pendidikan
Email: dwisetyyamahaputri@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Taxonomies used in education are referred to as following Bloom's Taxonomy. This study examines the use of Bloom's Taxonomy in the English teacher's lesson plans at the senior high school in East Payakumbuh. Descriptive research is what this study fell under. East Payakumbuh Senior High School served as the research setting. Th participants included English teachers from grades X and XI. As a source of information, the researcher studied official documents. Peer debriefing was employed by the researcher to verify the reliability of the data. The researcher followed the steps Gay suggested for data analysis. There were a few procedures involved in analyzing the descriptive data, including data data managing, reading or memoing, description, classifying, and writing report (2003:239). According to the findings, the English teacher used the cognitive domain the most in lesson plans, specifically C1 (Knowledge) 110 times; the affective domains were A2 (Responding) 6 times; and the psychomotor domains were P3 (Precision) 37 times.

Keywords : *Bloom Taxonomy, cognitive, affective, psychomotor*

INTRODUCTION

Education has been evolving quickly. One of the fundamental parts of the educational process is the curriculum. The curriculum is always evolving, particularly in Indonesia. Its growth is a result of the need for the community to improve the educational system. The curriculum is adaptable and should change as needed to meet the requirements of the community and the times. The 2013 curriculum is one of the subjects being developed. In this curriculum, students must be more engaged, imaginative, and creative as well as possess competence, attitude, and knowledge. The requirements of the 2013 curriculum enable teachers to make all the necessary preparations for the teaching and learning process. A teacher must outline what they will teach in a lesson plan in addition to properly preparing the material.

A lesson plan outlines the steps that the instructor will take to teach the pupils about a certain chapter and subject. In other words, the lesson plan became the teacher's point of reference while instructing. As a result, the teacher will concentrate on teaching the students the topic. According to the lesson plan for the 2013 curriculum, there are stages in teaching that start with pre-teaching and end with post-teaching activities.

The components of a lesson plan, such as the educational unit, class, semester, program study, subject, total number of meetings, Standard competency, indicator, learning objectives, time allocation, learning method, learning activity, learning resources, and assessment evaluation, are listed by Permendikbud (2013:6). Before beginning their lessons in the classroom, every English instructor should develop a lesson plan. It can aid teachers in organizing the classroom, including scheduling time for various activities.

A standard for the students' performance in subsequent sessions is provided in the lesson plan and is referred to as indications (*Indikator Pencapaian Kompetensi*). The *Kompetensi Dasar* is used to create the indication. Teachers should employ operational verbs (*Kata Kerja Operasional*) while creating quality indicators. Example: Students might specify their goals for the descriptive writing. Verbs that can reflect what students will do are known as operational verbs. The Bloom's Taxonomy serves as the foundation for the creation of operational verbs. In essence, Bloom's Taxonomy categorizes learning objectives into three categories (domains), namely cognitive, affective, and psychomotor. Cognitive refers to mental competence (knowledge), affective to growth in feel or emotional areas (attitude), and psychomotor to physical skills (skills).

English teachers in senior high school are already aware of the operational verbs used in syllabus or lesson plan (RPP) writing using Bloom's Taxonomy. Because most of them received training at events hosted by teacher working groups or subject matter teacher meetings, the competence of teachers to employ these operational verbs need not be questioned. The teacher was able to analyze the syllabus and lesson plan using operational verbs, but was unable to fully utilize the role of operational verb to enhance the caliber of students' thinking, according to the researcher who saw the lesson plans created by English teachers.

Bloom's Taxonomy, according to Salkind (2008:110), is a system for classifying educational goals that can be used in the design of test items and the formulation of instructional objectives. It implies that the classification of item testing while developing instructional objectives is done using the Bloom's Taxonomy approach. In addition, Bloom's Taxonomy is a schema that systematically categorized educational objectives, according to

Arends (2003:61). This means that Bloom's Taxonomy is a framework that may be utilized as a planning tool as well as in other educational contexts to organize information and explain relationships between concepts or objects. According to Suyono & Hariyanto, the Bloom's Taxonomy is then constructed as a quantifiable, observeable learning behavior framework to aid in planning and evaluating learning outcomes (2012:166). Bloom's Taxonomy is a system for evaluating the outcomes of learning, to put it another way.

Moroever, Arends (2003:61) and Suyono & Haryanto (2012:167) classify Bloom's Taxonomy into 3 large domains, namely Cognitive Domains, Affective Domains, and Psychomotor Domains. For Cognitive and Affective domains, Arend (2003:61) and Suyono & Haryanto(2012:167) have the same perception, but they have different opinions in the Psychomotor Domains.

1. Cognitive Domains

The cognitive domain is divided into six categories according to the Bloom classification system. Every level describes the particular cognitive, or thinking, process that students must apply, ranging from the simple to the complex. The cognitive domain's six levels and the corresponding cognitive process that is anticipated of the learner are mentioned and defined below.

(a) Knowledge

The students have the ability to recall, define, identify, or recognize specific material that was delivered during education. The data could take the shape of a fact, a rule, a graphic, a sound, etc. Example of operational verbs: *menyebutkan, mengutip, menjelaskan , menggambar , mengidentifikasi, menulis , etc* .

(b) Comprehension

By translating material into another form or by identifying it in another form, pupils can show that they comprehend it. This can be done in a variety of ways, including by providing a definition in one's own words, summarizing, providing an original example, identifying an example, and more. Example of operational verbs : *memperkirakan , membandingkan , menghitung , mendiskusikan , mencontohkan , menyimpulkan , merangkum, etc.*

(c) Application

The students' can apply the information in performing concrete actions. Theses action may involve figuring, writing, reading, handling equipment, and so forth. Example of operational verbs : *menugaskan , mengurutkan , menentukan , menyesuaikan , menilai , mengoperasikan , mengemukakan , etc.*

(d) Analysis

The students are able to identify the structure and organization of a body of information, dissect it into its component elements, and explain the connections between these parts. Example of operational verbs: *menganalisis, memecahkan, mendiagnosis, mengkorelasikan ,menyimpulkan , menelaah , etc* .

(e) Synthesis

The students' can bring to bear information from various sources to create a product uniquely his or her own. The product can take a variety of forms – written, oral, pictorial, and so on. Example of operational verbs : *mengatur , mengumpulkan , mengkode , menyeleksi , merinci , mengedit , memilih , etc* .

(f) Evaluation

The students' can apply a standard in making a judgment on the worth of something – a concerto , an essay , an action , an architectural design , and so forth. Example of operational verbs: *membandingkan, menyimpulkan , menilai , mengarahkan , mengkritik , menafsirkan , etc.*

2. Affective Domain

The majority of the time spent in schools is on cognitively demanding activities. But it's important to remember that there are other educational objectives that fall under the affective domain (for example, emotional responses to tasks). The five categories of affect are outlined by Bloom's taxonomy. For each category, the degree of commitment or emotional intensity required of students is stated. The five categories of affective domains and the degree of student reaction are listed below.

(a) Receiving: The student is aware of or attending to something in the environment. Example of operational verbs: *memilih, mempertanyakan, mengikuti, memberi , menganut , mematuhi , etc* .

(b) Responding: The students' display some new behavior as a result of experience and responds to the experience. Example of operational verbs: *menjawab, membantu, mengajukan, menampilkan, etc.*

(c) Valuing: The student displays defenited involvement or commitment toward some experience. Example of operational verbs: *mengasumsikan, meyakini , melengkapi , mengimani , etc* .

(d) Organization: The student has integrated a new value into his or her general set of values and can give it its proper in a priority system. Example of operational verbs: *mengubah, menata, mengklarifikasikan, memadukan , membentuk , etc* .

(e) Characterization by value: The student acts consistently according to the value and is firmly committed to the experience. Example of operational verbs: *mengubah perilaku, berakhlak mulia, mempengaruhi , mendengarkan , etc* .

3. Psycomotor Domain

According to Arend (2003:61), the psychomotor domain of Bloom's Taxonomy classifies objectives pertaining to physical movement and coordination. The six groups of goals for the psychomotor domain are listed below. The categories range from simple reflex actions that let people know their thoughts and feelings, so pay attention to that.

(a) Reflex Movement: Student actions can occur involuntary in response to some stimulus.

(b) Basic fundamental movement: students' has innate movement patterns formed from a combination of reflex movement.

(c) Perceptual abilities: Students can translate stimuli received through the sense into appropiate desired movements.

(d) Skilled movements: Students has developed more complex movements requiring a certain degree of efficiency.

(e) Non discursives communications: Student has the ability to communicate through body movement.

Previous studies have been done by some researchers related to Bloom taxonomy. A study entitled "An Analysis of Tenth Grade English Language Textbooks Question in Jordan Based on the Revision Edition of Bloom's Taxonomy" was conducted by Abdelrahman in 2004. According to the research, the majority of the questions fell into the first two levels: remembering and understanding (55.11 %), applies (16.18 %), and fewer for the other levels (28.71 %), which showed a prevalence of low level questions (51.9 percent). The researcher therefore suggested that the textbook's questions be improved to better reflect the six levels of the new Bloom's Taxonomy, and that teachers and curriculum designers be trained to use and write questions in accordance with the new version.

The second study, Rahman & Manaf (2017), investigated A Critical Analysis of Bloom's Taxonomy in Teaching Creative and Critical Thinking Skills in Malaysia through English Literature. Based on their research, they have come to the conclusion that literature is

an important subject for students to study, particularly when it comes to fostering critical and creative thinking.

Third, Wang & Farmer (2008) wrote it under the heading "Adult Teaching Methods in China and Bloom's Taxonomy." They came to the conclusion that Chinese instructors of adult learners were accustomed to imparting lower-level thinking abilities connected to the information, comprehension, and application domains of Bloom's Taxonomy. Moreover, Veeravagu et al. (2010) published a paper with the title "Using Bloom's Taxonomy to Gauge Students' Reading Comprehension Performances." They get to the conclusion that there is a correlation between the level of cognitive process required and the pupils' capacity to provide an accurate response.

In addition, a descriptive content analysis of the extent of Bloom's Taxonomy in the Reading Comprehension Question of the Course Book Q: Skills for Success 4 Reading and Writing is the title of the final paper by Ulum (2016). The study's conclusions indicated that this evaluated course book lacked the higher levels of cognitive abilities required by Bloom's Taxonomy. Therefore, some assumptions have been made using the findings in order to recommend how the course books that are now being created should refer to Bloom's Taxonomy in their reading portions. This research did different research based on the findings of the previous researcher, it was aimed to know the Bloom Taxonomy used by teachers in lesson plan in teaching English.

METHOD

This research is descriptive research. Descriptive research is a subset of survey research, according to Gay et al (2012: 183). This research involves obtaining data to test hypotheses or to react to questions about the general public's perception of a certain issue or topic. This investigation looked at the ways in which the East Payakumbuh Senior High School English teacher employed Bloom's Taxonomy in their lesson plans.

East Payakumbuh Senior High School serves as the research setting. MAN 3 Payakumbuh, SMAN 1 Payakumbuh, and SMKN 3 Payakumbuh are all available to be the place of study. The location exactly is in Kecamatan Payakumbuh Timur, Kota Payakumbuh. Because they are easily accessible, the researcher selected those schools as the study's location. The participant of this research is 5 of the English teachers of Senior High School in East Payakumbuh.

There are many different ways to gather qualitative data, according to Gay et al (2011:381). These methods include observation, interviews, questionnaires, phone calls,

personal and official document , photograph , recording , drawing , journal emails , messages and responses , and informal conversation. The researcher uses official documents that were obtained from the English teacher's lesson plan for the senior high school in East Payakumbuh as a source of data.

The researcher used documents to collect the data for this research. The school principal was consulted for approval by the researcher. The researcher then went to see the English teacher and requested a copy of their lesson plan. When performing qualitative research, there are a few techniques that can help ensure that the results are credible and understandable, according to Gay et al (2000:392). Peer debriefing is one of them. According to Gay et al. (2011:393), peer debriefing can be used to assess your insight through conversation with other professionals. Here, the researcher peer-debriefs one of the school's principals to check the statistics while they are being checked.

According to Gay and Airasian (2000:239) data analysis took place simultaneously with data collected, the first step in data analysis is managing the data so they can be studied. In analysis the data, the researcher used the step that is stated by Gay and Airasian (2000:239). There are some steps to analyze the qualitative data namely:

1. Data Managing

Gay and Airasian (2000:241) explain that there are two main purposes for data managing. The first is to organize the data and check it for completeness. The second is to start the researcher analyze and check for completeness of the data by using data managing. Before analyzing the data the researcher data managed to check all of the data for completeness.

2. Reading or Memoing

According to Gay and Airasian (2000:241) the first step in analysis is reading memoing: reading the fielt notes, transcript, memos, and observe comment to get a sense of your data. The researcher read the lesson plan of English teacher to get a sense of data.

3. Description

Description is often held in less esteem than analytical or theoriticall aspect of research, but in qualitative research description is an integral and important aspect. The researcher will describe the data about each of lesson plan.

4. Classifying

Classifying small pieces of data into more general categories is the qualitative research way to make sense and found the connection among the data. The researcher analyze the data by used classify and found connection of the result of the research.

The classification of Bloom's Taxonomy by grouping them as follow:

Table 1. Classifying of Bloom Taxonomy

Classifying	Total
Cognitive domains	- Knowlegde - Comprehension - Application - Analysis - Synthesis - Evaluation
Affective domains	- Receiving - Responding - Valuing - Organization - Characteristic by value
Psychomotor domains	- Imitation - Manipulation - Precisition - Articulation - Naturalisation

5. Writing Report

According to Gay and Airasian (2000:253) writing a report to describe the researcher and finding is the final process in qualitative researcher. So, the researcher write a report based on what findings that the researcher found.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

This research examined the English teacher's use of Bloom's Taxonomy in the senior high school lesson plans in East Payakumbuh. The researcher used official English instructor materials to gather data for this research. Five English teachers with 24 lesson plans from Senior High Schools in East Payakumbuh, SMA N 1 Payakumbuh, MAN 3 Payakumbuh, and SMK N 3 Payakumbuh participated in this research. Lesson plans were provided to the researcher by the teachers. The operative verbs used by the teacher in the lesson plan were

examined in this research in connection to Bloom's Taxonomy. The researcher then divided the categories into Bloom's Taxonomy's three cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains. The findings can be seen from the following table:

Table 2. Bloom's Taxonomy used by teachers

Bloom's Taxonomy	Sub Indicators	Operational Verbs	Frequency	Total
Cognitive Domains	C1	Mengidentifikasi Menyebutkan Memaparkan Menunjukkan Mendeskripsikan Menyatakan Membaca	34 4 1 11 2 1 3	110
	C2	Memahami Mengkomunikasikan Membedakan Mengelompokkan Menjelaskan Mempresentasikan Meriview	21 3 4 1 3 1 1	
	C3	Menyusun Menemukan Menentukan Memerankan menggunakan	6 1 2 2 7	
	C4	menganalisis	1	
	C5	-	0	
	C6	menyimpulkan	1	
Affective Domains	A1	-	0	6
	A2	Merespon Menampilkan	3 1	
	A3	Melengkapi	1	
	A4	-	0	
	A5	Berperilaku santun	1	
Psychomotor Domains	P1	-	0	37
	P2	Membuat	15	
	P3	Mendemostrasikan Menyunting menghasilkan	15 3 2	
	P4	Membuat Menempelkan	1 1	
	P5	-	0	
Total			153	

The English teacher used Bloom's Taxonomy 110 times in the Cognitive Domains, six times in the Affective Domains, and 37 times in the Psychomotor Domains, as seen in the above table. Therefore, it may be claimed that teachers use each of the three domains of Bloom's Taxonomy.

This part went into great detail about the analysis's findings. In the senior high school lesson plan at East Payakumbuh, the English instructor uses Bloom's Taxonomy. The research discovered that English teachers, particularly those in Indikator Pencapaian Kompetensi (IPK), utilised Bloom's Taxonomy in lesson plans. There are three types of domains: cognitive, affective, and psychomotor.

1. Cognitive Domains

According to official document data, the teacher employed the Cognitive Domains in their lesson plans 110 times on average. Table 3 provides specifics of each Cognitive Domain. The outcome is displayed in the following table:

Table 3: Cognitive domains

Bloom's Taxonomy	Sub Indicators	Operational Verbs	Frequency	Total
Cognitive domains	C1	Mengidentifikasi Menyebutkan Memaparkan Menunjukkan Mendeskripsikan Menyatakan membaca	34 4 1 11 2 1 3	56
	C2	Memahami Mengkomunikasikan Membedakan Mengelompokkan Menjelaskan Mempresentasikan Meriview	21 3 4 1 3 1 1	34
	C3	Menyusun Menemukan Menentukan Memerankan menggunakan	6 1 2 2 7	18
	C4	Menganalisis	1	1
	C5	-	0	0
	C6	Menyimpulkan	1	1
Total				110

From the table above, the Cognitive Domains used by English teacher most used C1 (*mengidentifikasi , menyebutkan , memaparkan , menunjukkan , mendeskripsikan , menyatakan , membaca)* 56 times in their lesson plan , C2 *(memahami , mengkomunikasikan , membedakan , mengelompokkan , menjelaskan , mempresentsikan , meriview)* 34 times , C3 *(meyusun , menemukan , menentukan , memerankan , menggunakan)* 18 times , C4 *(menganalisis)* and C6 *(menyimpulkan)* only once , and for C5 is not found . It can be seen from the operational verbs (KKO) used by English teachers in making lesson plan.

Example:

C1	***Mengidentifikasi*** *dan menyebutkan bagian-bagian dari undangan dengan ucapan dan tekanan kata yang benar*
C2	***Mengkomunikasikan*** *secara lisan dan tertulis tentang teks prosedure berupa manual dan tips dengan menggunakan struktur teks dan unsur bahasa yang tepat sesuai dengan konteks penggunaannya .*
C3	***Menyusun*** *teks lisan dan tertulis mengenai teks menggunakan struktur teks dan unsur bahasa yang tepat sesuai dengan konteks penggunaannya .*
C4	***Menganalisis*** *unsur-unsur eksposisi surat pribadi.*
C6	***Menyimpulkan*** *isi dalam teks tulis deskriptif.*

2. Affective Domains

In the lesson plan of the teachers, it was found that the teachers used affective domains 6 times .Detail of each aspect of Affective Domains presented in table 4. The result can be seen in the table bellow:

Table 4. Affective Domains

Bloom's Taxonomy	Sub Indicators	Operational Verbs	Frequency	Total
Affective Domains	A1	-	0	0
	A2	Merespon Menampilkan	3 1	4
	A3	Melengkapi	1	1
	A4	-	0	0
	A5	Berperilaku santun	1	1
Total			6	

From the table above , it can be seen the Affective Domains used by teacher most used A2 *(merespon , menmpilkan)* 4 times in their lesson plan , A3 *(melengkapi)* and A5 *(berperilaku santun)* only once , but A1 and A4 is not found.

Example:

A2	***Menampilkan*** *undangan dengan menempelkan di dinding kelas dan bertanya jawab dengan pembaca (siswa lain , guru) yang datan membacanya.*
A3	***Melengkapi*** *teks tentang suatu produk yang kata kerjanya banyak dihilangkan dengan kata kerja yang bermakna tepat dalam bentuk pasif dengan grammar dan ejaan yang benar.*
A5	***Berperilaku santun*** *, peduli dan jujur dalam memberikan ucapan selamat dan memuji .*

3. Psychomotor Domains

Based of official document data, in fact the teacher most used psychomotor Domains, it found 37 times in their lesson plan. Detail of each aspect of Psychomotor Domains presented in table 5. The result can be seen in the table bellow:

Table 5. Psychomotor Domains

Bloom's Taxonomy	Sub Indicators	Operational Verbs	Frequency	Total
Psychomoto Domains	P1	-	0	0
	P2	Membuat	15	15
	P3	Mendemonstrasikan Menyunting Menghasilkan	15 3 2	20
	P4	Merekontruksi Menempelkan	11	2
	P5	-	0	0
Total			37	

From the table above , for the category of Psychomotor Domains the teacher most used P3 (*mendemonstrasikan , menyunting , menghasilkan*) 20 times in their lesson plan , P2 (membuat) 15 times , P4 *(menempelkan , menkrontruksi)* 2 times but P1 and P5 is not found .

Example:

P2	***Membuat*** *teks lisan dan tulis tentang ungkapan memberi selamat dan memuji.*
P3	***Mendemonstrasikan*** *cara memberi dan meminta informasi terkait jati diri.*
P4	***Menempelkan*** *karya siswa mengenai teks recount di dinding kelas dan bertanya jawab dengan pembaca (siswa lain atau guru) yang datang membacanya.*

Discussion

In the English teacher's lesson plans for the Senior High School in East Payakumbuh, Bloom's Taxonomy was used. The three key areas that the English teacher used were. In their lesson plan, the teacher used all three of Bloom's Taxonomy domains. First, the research discovered that the teacher utilized the cognitive domain most frequently in lesson plans,

specifically C1 (Knowledge), which was used 56 times, C2 34 times, C3 18 times, C4 and C6 only once, but C5 is not there. Because C1 is presumably the lowest level of thinking process, the researcher assumed that English teachers employ it the majority of the time. According to Wang and Farmer (2008:2), cognitive domains have six levels, with the bottom three levels being regarded lower levels that encourage lesser thinking skill, name knowledge, comprehension, and application. This is consistent with Bloom's 1956 theory.

The researcher discovered, in terms of affective domains, that teachers mostly employed A2 (Responding) four times, A3 (Valuing) and A5 (Characterization by Value) just once, and A1 and A4 were not included in their lesson plan. In other words, since A2, A3, and A5 have been figured, the teacher has already utilized the aspect for affective domains. The emotional domains targets in this instance must reach an A4 (Materi Pedoman Implementasi Kurikulum 2013, 2014) at the level of Senior High School. One of the teacher, though, had previously applied as of A5.

The teacher employed P3 (precision) 20 times, P2 (manipulating) 15 times, and P4 (articulation) 2 times in the psychomotor domain, but P1 (imitation) and P5 (naturalisasi) were not seen. The researcher made the assumption that the psychomotor domains in Bloom's Taxonomy are not typically used in lesson plans since they are better suited for organizing and assessing physical learning. According to Suyono and Haryanto (2012:171), psychomotor domains in Bloom's Taxonomy are not often included in lesson plans since they are more suited for organizing and assessing physical learning and art because they place a greater emphasis on physical activity.

In conclusion, English teachers at Senior High School in East Payakumbuh employed Bloom's Taxonomy 56 times in the Cognitive Domain (Knowledge), 4 times in the Affective Domain (Responding), and 20 times in the Psychomotor Domain (Precision). Since cognitive skills are prioritized at the senior high school level, they gain the highest usage rank (Materi Pedoman Implementasi Kurikulum 2013, 2014)

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Based on the explanation of discussion above, a conclusion was drawn that English teachers used Bloom's Taxonomy (Cognitive, Affective, and Psychomotor domains) in their lesson plan based on the explanation in the research findings. The cognitive domains C1 (Knowledge), C2 (Comprehension), C3 (Application), C4 (Analysis), and C6 (Evaluation) are present in the lesson plans of English teachers, but C5 (Synthesis) is not found.

In the lesson plan utilized by the English instructor for the affective domains were A2 (Report), A3 (Valuing), and A5 (Characteristic by Values), but A1 (Receiving) and A4 (Organization) are not included The researcher discovered P2 (Manipulasi), P3 (Precision), and P4 (Articulation) in the Psychomotor domains but not P1 (Imitation) or P5 (Naturalisasi), which English teachers employ in their lesson plans.

Due to the concentrate on this domain in the senior high school teaching process, the cognitive domains become dominant (Materi Pedoman Implementasi Kurikulum 2013, 2014). Based on the result, the researcher advised taking into account the following: The researcher advises the teachers to use this as a guide while preparing their lesson plan. The researcher expects that this research will be helpful to future researchers who are interested in performing additional research on the topic.

REFERENCES

Abdelrahman, M. S. H. B. (2014). An analysis of the tenth grade English language textbooks questions in Jordan based on the revised edition of Bloom's taxonomy. *Journal of Education and Practice, 5*(18), 139-151.

Arends, R. I. (2003). *Learning to Teach* (5th Ed). New York: McGraw Hill.

Brown, H. D. (1994). *Teaching by Principles An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. London: TinaCarver.

Celce-Murcia, M., & McIntosh, L. (1991). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*. Los Angeles: HarperCollins Publisher.

Gay, L.R, Geoffrey E.M and Peter Airisian. (2011). *Educational Research : Competences for Analysis Application*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Gay, L.R and Airasian. (2000). *Educational Research*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Badan Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan .2014. Materi Pelatihan Implementasi Kurikulum 2013 Tahun 2014. Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia No 41 Tahun 2007 tentang Standar Proses.

Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan No 22 Tahun 2016 tentang Standar Proses Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah.

Print, M. (1987). *Curriculum Development and Design*. Australia: Allen & Unwin Pty Ltd.

Rahman, S. A., & Manaf, N. F. A. (2017). A Critical Analysis of Bloom's Taxonomy in Teaching Creative and Critical Thinking Skills in Malaysia through English Literature. *English Language Teaching*, *10*(9), 245-256.

Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C., Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (Eds.). (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge university press.

Richard, C. J. & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Dictionary of Language Teaching & applied Linguistics.* Malaysia: Library of Congress.

Salkind, N. J. (2008). *Encyclopedia of Educational Psychology*. London: United Kingdom.

Suyono & Haryanto. (2012). *Belajar dan Pembelajaran Teori dan Konsep.* Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya Offet.

Tessa, W. (2001). Planning Lesson and Courses. Singapore: University press.

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. *The Qualitative Report*, *21*(9), 1674.

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.

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.

Wang, V., & Farmer, L. (2008). Adult Teaching Methods in China and Bloom's Taxonomy. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, *2*(2), n2.