BLOOM Vs BARRET: COMPARING READING COMPREHENSION TYPES

By:

Nabela Ramadea
Universitas PGRI Semarang
ppg.nabelaramadea92@program.belajar.id

Ngasbun Egar
Universitas PGRI Semarang
ngasbunegar@upgris.ac.id

Fitri Yulianti
Universitas PGRI Semarang
fitriyulianti@upgris.ac.id

Abstract: This study was done to know the types of Bloom's Taxonomy and Barrett's Taxonomy used in reading comprehension questions of summative assessment made by an English teacher at SMAN 2 Semarang and the dominant type of each taxonomy used. This study was conducted using descriptive qualitative with content analysis research design because its research focused on analyzing reading comprehension inside a summative assessment made by an English teacher. This research focused on a passive observer who did not actively participate. The study aims to document findings. The data collected from the Bloom Taxonomy checklist revealed that the highest level of analysis (15) was predominant in all the reading comprehension questions. It was observed that the distribution of reading comprehension questions in the summative assessment was not spread evenly. The second dominant was the understanding level, with nine questions. Then, followed by applying the total question of 5. There are two remembering levels—the only questions related to evaluating. Even though the number of LOTS and HOTS questions are balanced, differences in results are shown by analysis using a checklist from Barrett's taxonomy. Low comprehension dominates with a percentage of 65,625%. Then, followed by medium comprehension with a portion of 31,25%. Unfortunately, high comprehension only has a portion of 3,125%. Hence, teachers should provide students with sufficient questions for evaluation grounded in HOTS to cultivate the essential critical thinking skills required for success in the twenty-first century.

Keywords: Reading Comprehension, Bloom's Taxonomy, Barrett's Taxonomy

INTRODUCTION

Commonly, being literate meant having the skill to read and write. According to UNESCO (2020), literacy encompasses a broader range of abilities, such as identifying, understanding, interpreting, creating, communicating, computing, and utilizing written and printed materials relevant to diverse situations. "Until now, reading literacy is a global issue that needs serious attention. Based on the findings from two separate studies, several countries have low reading literacy levels. The first study, the International Students Assessment, and Progress in International Reading Literacy Study, identified some of these countries had shown slight improvement over time (Wijayanti, 2020). Central Connecticut State University also ranked Indonesia as the sixtieth out of

sixty-one Southeast Asian Countries regarding reading interest (Muhassin et al., 2021). Therefore, it is necessary to give serious attention to reading comprehension to ensure a better quality of future human resources.

Moreover, advancing all fields, including education, science, and technology, defines the 21st century. Four abilities are necessary for education in the 21st century: collaboration, creativity, communication, critical thinking, and problem-solving. These competencies are regarded as Higher Order Thinking Competencies (HOTS). It involves higher-order thinking than just recalling information or giving someone a story exactly as it was told to you (Pratiwi et al., 2019) as cited in (Thomas & Thorne, 2009). According to (Qasrawi & Beniabdelrahman, 2020), education needs to go beyond

memorizing and recalling information since the amount of information and facts is rapidly increasing. Therefore, students unable to understand, analyze, apply, evaluate, and create may not be able to compete effectively in this world.

The term HOTS and LOTS are closely connected to Bloom's Taxonomy. Teachers often establish Bloom's revised Taxonomy as a learning goal for their students (Febrina et al., 2019). Therefore, including higher-order thinking skills (HOTS) in education is crucial for developing students' critical and creative thinking. Besides, another taxonomy from Barret's specific purpose is assessing questions that test reading comprehension (Reeves, 2012). In Barrett's taxonomy, inferential comprehension, evaluation, and appreciation in

Barrett's taxonomy are equivalent to Bloom's HOTS levels of analyzing, evaluating, and creating. While both taxonomies are similar in that they aim to help teachers develop effective learning objectives and questions for students, they differ in the number of levels and the specific focus of each level. To sum up, the frameworks provided by Bloom's taxonomy and Barrett's taxonomy are valuable for arranging learning objectives according to their levels of complexity and specificity.

As the subject of analysis, an English teacher's and English summative assessment for grade XII SMAN 2 Semarang is considered a rich source of material and content that may reflect the HOTS and LOTS. This assessment includes 40 questions, ten of which are in multiple-choice format, and the rest

are filled in. Thirty-two questions focus on reading comprehension. It is important to research to determine the difficulty level of the questions using either Bloom's taxonomy or Barrett's taxonomy.

Some research studies investigate Bloom's taxonomy and Barrett's taxonomy. One study under Higher-Order Thinking Skill (HOTs) Questions in the English National Examination in Indonesia was conducted (Putra & Abdullah, 2019). This study aimed to identify the use of HOTS-based questions and what particular skills appear under the HOTS category in the English National Examination. They employed quantitative research through content analysis based on the HOTS aspect in the Revised Bloom's Taxonomy. The finding revealed insufficient HOTS questions in the English National Examination. Only 137 goods (25.23%) are classified as LOTS, while only 53 (25.23%) are classified as HOTS. The second observation is that the sole HOTS level featured in the English National Examination 2013-2018 is Analyze. It is slightly different from this research. This research used Bloom's Taxonomy and Barrett's Taxonomy as a guideline to determine to what extent the teacher of SMAN 2 Semarang made the reading comprehension level. This research used descriptive qualitative.

Another previous study was presented by (Wahyuni, 2021) under the title "The Levels of Questions Used in The English Textbook Entitled "Stop Bullying Now" For the XI Grade of Senior High School." This previous study focuses on analyzing the level of questions

utilized in a class XI SMA English textbook entitled "Stop Bullying Now," published by the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia in 2017. The study utilized Barrett's taxonomy to assess reading comprehension. The results indicated that higher-level comprehension questions were more prevalent than lower-level ones, but the distribution of question levels was not well across all the texts analyzed. In contrast, this current research aimed to make a comparison using Bloom's taxonomy as well.

Furthermore, a study conducted by (Akhir & Marwiah, 2021) under the title "Barrett Taxonomy Reorganization to Improve Students' Intensive Reading Ability" aimed to investigate the effect of the Barrett taxonomy Reorganization Method on the intensive reading ability of class VIII students of SMP Negeri 2 Duampanua, Pinrang Regency, during the 2019/2020 academic year. This research used a quasi-experimental design with a True Experimental Design. The result demonstrated that the Barrett Taxonomy Reorganization method improved students' understanding and enhanced their reading ability. However, no specific information is available about a research study that directly compares these two taxonomies.

According to the problem's scope, the study aimed to analyze level reading comprehension questions on summative assessment using Bloom's taxonomy and Barrett's taxonomy. The study tries explicitly to address the following problem formulation. 1) What are the types of Bloom's taxonomy used in reading comprehension questions of

summative assessments made by English teachers at SMAN 2 Semarang? 2) What are the types of Barrett's taxonomy used in reading comprehension questions of summative assessments made by English teachers at SMAN 2 Semarang? 3) What is the dominant Bloom's taxonomy used in reading comprehension questions of summative assessment by an English teacher at SMAN 2 Semarang? 4) What is the dominant Barrett's taxonomy used in reading comprehension questions of summative assessment by an English teacher at SMAN 2 Semarang?

This study investigates to what extent the types of Bloom's Taxonomy and Barrett's Taxonomy used in reading comprehension questions of summative sssessments made by English teachers at SMAN 2

Semarang and the dominant type of each taxonomy used.

METHODOLOGY

The present study is descriptive qualitative with content analysis to answer the research objectives. As stated by (Ary et al., 2010), qualitative research places the researcher as the primary instrument and requires them to understand the research methodology. The data were obtained through purposive sampling from the teacher-made summative assessments. Because this research merely documented, the subject of this study was a nonparticipant observer. In qualitative research, document analysis is used to complement the checklist approach. This analysis focuses on all reading comprehension questions in the summative assessment given by the

teacher. This researcher analyzed the data by checklist form with gave code based on categorizing six levels of Bloom's taxonomy and five levels of Barrett's taxonomy to check the distribution of every reading question based on those levels. So, by checklist, the researcher found the data. In addition, four types of material are present on the questions; offering help, caption, application letter, and news item. The distribution of material can be categorized as shown in Table 1.

Table 1
The Distribution of Reading Comprehension Questions in Summative Assessment Teacher Made

No	Title	Questions format	Number of items
1	Offering help	Multiple choice	1-5
2	Caption	Open-ended	6-10
3	Application letter	Open-ended	11- 18
4	News item	Open-ended	21- 34
TOTAL			32

To obtain the results, the researcher used the seven-step content analysis process outlined by (Cohen et al., 2017), which included determining the research questions, b) determining the population, c) determining the sample, d) creating categories for analysis, e) conducting analyzing, f) summarizing, and g) making speculative inferences.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. Analyzing Reading Comprehension Level Based on Bloom's Taxonomy

Utilizing the revised Bloom's taxonomy framework, the present research has identified 32 reading comprehension questions from 40 questions included in the summative assessment English teachers made for 12th-grade students in SMAN 2 Semarang distributed by English teacher, to students in 2022.

Meanwhile, it did not have a Creating (C6) level of reading comprehension questions. Examples of the findings for each level are presented in the table below.

Table 2
Reading Comprehension Questions for Remembering (C1) Presented in The Summative Assessment Teacher Made for Class XII

No	Questions	Number
1	From the above caption, we can get some information, except ___	7
2	What kind of meeting is being held?	8

Remembering level involves recalling information from memory. Verbs associated with this level include list, memorize, name, recognize, recall, repeat, and reproduce. Table 2 above manifests the level of Remembering (C1). There are only two questions related to this level. Both questions came from caption material. The caption on questions number 7 and 8 reads as follows: *Foreign Minister Retno LP*

Marsudirini (left) talks with ASEAN Secretary-General Lim Jock Hoi before a meeting with southeast Asian foreign ministers at the ASEAN Secretariat building in Jakarta on Oct. 27, 2022. (AFP/Galih Pradipta/Pool). The questions are presented in multiple choice. Then, the students choose the correct answer based on the information in the caption. Next, the questions included in the second level will be explained in the column below.

Table 3
Reading Comprehension Questions for Understanding (C2) Presented in The Summative Assessment Teacher Made for Class XII

No	Questions	Number
1	What mistake did the master of the ceremony make in announcing the winners?	10
2	What is the purpose of the text?	25
3	How long did the natural disaster in Sidoarjo and Jember regencies in East Java?	26
4	Find the words in the text that have similar meanings to the following ones!	29-34

The understanding level involves comprehending the meaning

of information. Verbs associated with this level include explaining, interpreting, summarizing, and translating. Table 3 above manifests the level of Understanding (C2). There are nine questions related to the Understanding level. Question number 10 is the only one presented in multiple-choice at this level. The teacher presents questions with caption material which raises the case of Badminton Denmark apologizing after erroneously stating that the Indonesian Badminton pairs Fajar Alfian and Muhammad Rian Ardiano, as well as Marcus Gideon and Kevin Sukamuljo, were representing Malaysia. Moreover, Question number 25-34 is a question that appears based on the text entitled "Hundreds of homes damaged after a thunderstorm in East Java." For questions 29-34, students are

presented with a word in a column. Then, students are asked to find the word stated in the paragraph (Employees, establish, inaccessible, injured persons, increased, unlucky) with similar meaning. Furthermore, the questions included in the third level of Bloom's Taxonomy will be explained in the column below.

Table 4
Reading Comprehension Questions for Applying (C3) Presented in The Summative Assessment Teacher Made for Class XII

No	Questions	Number
1	Waiter: Good morning, Sir. ___ Customer: Sure. What would you recommend for the breakfast menu?	1
2	Sara: __ I think I can reach it with the auxiliary chair Rachel: Yes, please. It's very kind of you. Thank you, Sara.	2
3	Anna: Sure, Peter. What would you like for dinner? Peter: ___ Anna: That sounds good. Let's have pasta. Which type of sauce should I make?	3
4	Mark: Susan, ___ Susan: I'd be glad to help out. What seems to be the problem?	4
5	Employee: ___ Boss: Oh, that's a little difficult.	5

Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) defined C3 Apply as executing or implementing a procedure. Applying involves using learned

material in new and concrete situations, typically through products such as models, presentations, interviews, simulations, and other activities. Applying requires the student to demonstrate their ability to apply their knowledge in practical scenarios. Table 4 above provides examples of applying questions presented as multiple choice. Those questions present several dialogues with themes *offering help*. Besides, several questions are included in the next level of Bloom Taxonomy Analyzing (C4).

Table 5
Reading Comprehension Questions for Analyzing (C4) Presented in The Summative Assessment Teacher Made for Class XII

No	Questions	Number
1	The caption means ___	6
2	What words will describe the feeling of the two Indonesian badminton pairs?	9
3	Name parts of the application letter!	11-16
4	How did John Donaldson know that LTC Company opened the recruitment of the programmer position?	17
5	Fill in the blank table based on the above information!	21-24
6	What was necessary to help the victims?	27
7	Mention the source of the above information!	28

Table 5 above presents an example of analyzing (C4). The first level of HOTS has given analysis. This question focuses on students' ability to break down sections or content into their parts for better organization. Analyzing has the highest frequency with 15 questions. For questions number 11-16, students have presented *an application letter*. Then students must complete blanks in the form of a generic application letter structure. Moreover, in questions 21-24, students are asked to analyze *the news* and fill in the blanks in the form of types of damaged buildings and facilities based on a list of villages, districts, and

regencies. Henceforth, Evaluation will be the highest level of this assessment.

Table 3
Reading Comprehension Questions for Evaluating (C5) Presented in The Summative Assessment Teacher Made for Class XII

No	Questions	Number
1	Why was John Donaldson determined to apply for the offered position?	18

C5 Evaluate might be defined as developing judgments based on criteria and standards through checking and critiquing. A few formats that can be created to present the actions of this level are critiques, recommendations, and reports. (Anderson et al., 2001). Before creating, revised Bloom's taxonomy recommends evaluating the current. The table above shows question examples of evaluating levels. This level has the lowest frequency with 1 question. From the explanation above, it can be concluded that the total

percentage of LOTS and HOTS based on Bloom's Taxonomy is as follows:

Table 4
The Total Percentage of LOTS and HOTS Based on Bloom's Taxonomy

Level	Bloom Taxonomy	Frequency	Total	Percentage
LOTS	Remembering	2	16	50%
	Understanding	9		
	Applying	5		
HOTS	Analyzing	15	16	50%
	Evaluating	1		
	Creating	0		
TOTAL		32	32	100%

2. Analyzing Reading Comprehension Level Based on Barrett's Taxonomy

Table 8
Example of Literal Comprehension Question (recognition and recall)

No	Questions	Features of descriptor	Number of questions
1	What kind of meeting is being held?	Recognition of details	8
2	What mistake did the master of the ceremony make in announcing the winners?	Recall the main idea	10
3	Why was John Donaldson determined to apply for the offered position?	Recall of cause and effect	18
4	What is the purpose of the text?	Recall of cause and effect	25

The table above shows that there were four questions related to

literal comprehension. Literal comprehension concentrates on the ideas and information that are explicitly stated. Recognizing or remembering a single fact or experience might be easy in literal comprehension. This question is incredibly simple to construct because it is too quick and easy to find answers to. Two of the questions are multiple-choice with caption material, and the rest are filled in with application letters and news item material. The questions ask the student to determine details, main idea, cause, and effect. Meanwhile, no question asks students to determine the sequence and comparison. The table below shows the next level of Barret's taxonomy.

Table 5
Example of Reorganization
Comprehension Question

No	Questions	Features of descriptor	Number of questions
1	Waiter: Good morning, Sir. …. Customer: Sure. What would you recommend for the breakfast menu?	Reorganization of classifying	1
2	Sara: ___ I think I can reach it with the auxiliary chair. Rachel: Yes, please. It's very kind of you. Thank you, Sara.	Reorganization of classifying	2
3	Anna: Sure, Peter. What would you like for dinner? Peter: ___ Anna: That sounds good. Let's have pasta. Which type of sauce should I make?	Reorganization of classifying	3
4	Mark: Susan, ___ Susan: I'd be glad to help out. What seems to be the problem?	Reorganization of classifying	4
5	Employee: ___ Boss: Oh, that's a little difficult.	Reorganization of classifying	5
6	From the above caption, we can get some information, EXCEPT ___	Reorganization of classifying	7
7	Name parts of the application letter	Reorganization of outlining	11-16
8	Fill in the blank table based on the above information!	Reorganization of classifying	21-24
9	How long did the natural disaster in Sidoarjo and Jember regencies in East Java?	Reorganization of Synthesising	26

Reorganization questions demand students to classify, synthesize, describe, and summarize. It is not difficult to construct the

reorganization-level question. However, students must be careful in reading and understand what is read because the ten questions related to a reorganization are not presented in multiple-choice form. In addition, students also need to understand the form of the question. Based on the table above, ten questions related to the reorganization of classifying were presented. There are six questions related to the Reorganisation of outlining and only one related to the Reorganisation of Synthesising. So, the total number of questions at this level of comprehension was 16. Then, the table below will present questions that are included in the inferential comprehension question.

Table 6
Example of Inferential Comprehension Question

No	Questions	Features of descriptor	Number of questions
1	The caption means ___	Inferential or figurative language	6
2	How did John Donaldson know that LTC Company opened recruitment for the programmer position?	Inferential cause and effect	17
3	What was necessary to help the victim?	Inferential cause and effect	27
4	Find words in the text that have similar meanings to the following ones!	Inferential or figurative language	28-34

Generally, understanding inferential comprehension can be improved by reading and the teacher's questions that require thinking and imagination beyond what is written on the page. According to the above table, two questions related to Inferential of figurative. Besides, there were 2 Inferential cause and effect questions. However, there was no question about supporting details, main ideas, sequence, comparison, character traits, and outcomes.

Evaluation involves making judgments and focuses on accuracy, acceptability, desirability, worth, or probability of something occurring. There are five types of judgments in

evaluation; reality or fantasy, fact or opinion, adequacy and validity, appropriateness, worth, desirability, and acceptability. Nonetheless, there was no single questions related to evaluation comprehension. Moreover, the table below will review the questions of appreciation comprehension.

Table 11
Example of Appreciation Comprehension Question

No	Questions	Features of descriptor	Number of questions
1	What words will describe the feeling of the two Indonesian badminton pairs?	Appreciation of identification with characters or incident	9

The level of appreciation implies higher thinking. However, few questions of appreciation are encountered. Based on the table above, there was only one reading comprehension question related to the appreciation of identification with characters or incidents. Based on the previous explanation, the overall

percentage of low, medium, and high levels based on Barrett's Taxonomy is as follows:

Table 7
The Total Percentage of Low, Medium, and High Levels Based on Barrett's Taxonomy

Level	Barret's Taxonomy	Frequency	Total	Percentage
Low	Literal Comprehension	4	21	66%
	Reorganization	17		
Medium	Inferential	10	10	31.25%
High	Evaluation	0	1	3.13%
	Appreciation	1		
TOTAL		32		100%

Concerning the previously described study reading comprehension questions, the researcher delivers the results of reading comprehension questions in the teacher's summative assessment. The data from the Bloom Taxonomy checklist revealed that all reading comprehension questions dominated the analyzing level (15). The reading comprehension question in the summative assessment is not distributed evenly. The second dominant was the understanding

level, with nine questions. Then, followed by applying the total question of 5. There are two remembering levels. The only questions related to evaluating. Even though the number of LOTS and HOTS questions are balanced.

Differences in results are shown by analysis using a checklist from Barrett's taxonomy. Low comprehension dominates with a percentage of 65,625%. Then, followed by medium comprehension with a portion of 31,25%. Unfortunately, high comprehension only has a portion of 3,125%.

These findings are considered a bit better than the findings from the study conducted by (Putra & Abdullah, 2019). This research analysis used Bloom's taxonomy. They have discovered that the English National Examination lacks an

adequate number of higher-order thinking Skills (HOTS) questions. Out of the 157 items assessed, only 53 (25.23%) are categorized as HOTS questions, while the remaining items fall into the Lower Order Thinking Skills (LOTS) category. Another significant finding is that the HOTS questions included in the English National Examination between 2013 and 2018 are limited to the Analyze level.

Contrary to the findings by (Wahyuni, 2021). This study utilized Barret's taxonomy to analyze reading comprehension. She found that higher-level comprehension skills were more prominent than lower-level comprehension skills; however, the distribution of these levels was not consistent across all texts.

Based on the prior research findings, we held the belief that our

findings indicated a positive advancement in the implementation of higher-order thinking Skills (HOTS) within reading comprehension questions, particularly in the realm of reading assessment. However, teachers are suggested to take more thoughtful consideration in implementing HOTS questions when preparing assessments so that students will be more critical. This suggestion is corroborated by (Yildrim & Soylemez, 2018). He said that engaging in reading activities that involve critical reading questions demonstrates a statistically notable impact on student's critical thinking abilities and reading skills.

CONCLUSION

The primary objective of the present study was to investigate the various levels of reading questions

within a summative assessment, employing both Bloom's Taxonomy and Barrett's Taxonomy as the frameworks for analysis. The result of this study, identified using Bloom's Taxonomy, showed that the distribution of LOTS and HOTS of reading comprehension questions has a balanced portion. Even though the dominant question is analyzing. Moreover, none of the reading questions was at the creating (C6) level.

Then, the result of this study, identified using Barrett's Taxonomy, showed that the reading comprehension inside the summative assessment focused on low comprehension level rather than High level. This different result is because each taxonomy has its criteria and level. Barrett's taxonomy is more suitable for teacher guidance in

143

compiling reading comprehension questions. Whereas in Bloom's taxonomy, its use is wider. These two taxonomies are great to combine. This study can assist the writers in creating more diversified reading comprehension questions for every grade that will be distributed to the students would be preferable if the questions were scattered evenly across all levels. Therefore, teachers must give students enough HOTS-based material to develop the critical thinking abilities they need to succeed in the twenty-first century.

REFERENCES

Akhir, M., & Marwiah, M. (2021). Barrett Taxonomy Reorganization To Improve Students' Intensive Reading Ability. *Journal of Educational Science and Technology (EST)*. https://doi.org/10.26858/est.v0i0.16417

Anderson, L. W., Krathwohl Peter W Airasian, D. R., Cruikshank, K. A., Mayer, R. E., Pintrich, P. R., Raths, J., & Wittrock, M. C. (2001). *Taxonomy for Assessing a Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. https://www.uky.edu/~rsand1/china2018/texts/Anderson-Krathwohl - A taxonomy for learning teaching and assessing.pdf

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Soronsen, C., & Asghar, R. (2010). Introduction to Research in Education. In C. Shortt (Ed.), *Nucl. Phys.* (8th edition, Vol. 13, Issue 1). Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2017). Research Methods in Education. In *Research Methods in Education* (6th edition). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315456539

Febrina, Bustami, U., & Asnawi, M. (2019). Analysis of Reading Comprehension Questions By Using Revised Bloom's Taxonomy on Higher Order. *English Education Journal*, *10*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v9i1.1904

Muhassin, M., Annisa, J., & Hidayati, D. A. (2021). The Impact of Fix-Up Strategy on Indonesian EFL Learners' Reading Comprehension. *International Journal of Instruction*, *14*(2), 253–270. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.14215a

Pratiwi, N. P. W., Dewi, N. L. P. E. S., & Paramartha, A. A. G. Y. (2019). The Reflection of HOTS in EFL Teachers' Summative Assessment. *Journal of Education Research and Evaluation*, *3*(3), 127.

https://doi.org/10.23887/jere.v3i3.21853

Putra, T. K., & Abdullah, D. F. (2019). Higher-Order Thinking Skill (HOTs) Questions in English National Examination in Indonesia. *Jurnal Bahasa Lingua Scientia*. https://doi.org/10.21274/ls.2019.11.1.145-160

Qasrawi, R., & Beniabdelrahman, A. (2020). The Higher and Lower-order Thinking Skills in Unlock English Textbooks. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET*, *7*(3), 744–758.

Reeves, C. (2012). *Developing a Framework for Assessing and Comparing the Cognitive Challenge of Home Language Examinations*. *July*.

Wahyuni, K. B. (2021). The Levels Of Questions Used in The English Textbook Entitled "Stop Bullying Now" For The XI Grade of Senior High School. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Undiksha*, *9*(2), 191. https://doi.org/10.23887/jpbi.v9i2.34393

Wijayanti, S. (2020). *Indonesian Students' Reading Literacy*. *390*(Icracos 2019), 61–65. https://doi.org/10.2991/icracos-19.2020.13

Yildrim, S., & Soylemez, Y. (2018). The Effect of Performing Reading Activities with Critical Reading Questions on Critical Thinking and Reading Skills. *Asian Journal of Education and Training*, *4*(4), 326–335. https://doi.org/10.20448/journal.522.2018.44.326.335