DOI: doi.org/10.21009/ISLLAE.02105

Received: 10 August 2019
Revised: 13 August 2019
Accepted: 10 December 2019
Published: 31 January 2020

Assessment and Evaluation Profiles of Literary Subjects at English Literature Study Program

Hasnini Hasra[1,a)], Nurul Rafikah Dewi[1,b)]
English Literature Study Program, Universitas Negeri Jakarta[1)]
hasnini_hasra@unj.ac.id[a)], fiikazhany@yahoo.com[b)]

Abstract

This research discusses assessment and evaluation profiles used in evaluating students' competencies in English Literature subjects at English Literature Study Program of State University of Jakarta. Assessment and evaluation process in literature classes were conducted by referring to revised Bloom taxonomy as one of pedagogical considerations besides CEFR and Indonesian KKNI, to measure the course learning outcomes achieved. This research aims at investigating types of assessment and evaluation used in assessing students competencies in literature classes and how those assessment types imply cognitive levels and high order thinking skills as reflected in the revised Bloom's taxonomy. This qualitative research uses content analysis method to analyze the data and interview as a supporting instrument to collect the data. The primary data are the question items of the tests, which are 153 test items and transcribed interview forms as secondary data. The data were then triangulated and analyzed by referring to cognitive levels of revised Bloom taxonomy. The results show that multiple choice test type was type of assessment mostly used. Inferential questions were dominantly used rather than referential questions in the tests. The results also reveal that 3.3 % of the tests items are at C1 cognitive level (remembering), 24.8 % were at C2 cognitive level (understanding), 9.8 % were at C3 level (applying), 51.6 % were at C4 level (analyzing), 10.5 % were at C5 level (evaluating) and 0 % was at C6 level (creating). It implies that assessment criteria for literature classes was mostly created by applying high order thinking skills (62.1 %) or critical thinking, included in C4 cognitive level and above in the taxonomy

Key Words: Assessment, Evaluation, Test, Revised Bloom Taxonomy, Critical Thinking

Absrtak

Penelitian ini membahas tentang profil penilaian dan evaluasi yang digunakan dalam mengevaluasi kompetensi mahasiswa pada mata kuliah Sastra Inggris di Program Studi Sastra Inggris Universitas Negeri Jakarta. Proses penilaian dan evaluasi di kelas

sastra dilakukan dengan mengacu pada taksonomi Bloom yang direvisi sebagai salah satu pertimbangan pedagogis selain CEFR dan KKNI Indonesia, untuk mengukur hasil belajar mata kuliah yang dicapai. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menyelidiki jenis penilaian dan evaluasi yang digunakan dalam menilai kompetensi siswa di kelas sastra dan bagaimana jenis penilaian tersebut menyiratkan tingkat kognitif dan keterampilan berpikir tingkat tinggi sebagaimana tercermin dalam taksonomi Bloom yang direvisi. Penelitian kualitatif ini menggunakan metode analisis isi untuk menganalisis data dan wawancara sebagai instrumen pendukung untuk mengumpulkan data. Data primer berupa butir-butir soal tes, yaitu 153 butir soal dan transkrip formulir wawancara sebagai data sekunder. Data tersebut kemudian ditriangulasi dan dianalisis dengan mengacu pada tingkat kognitif taksonomi Bloom yang direvisi. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa jenis tes pilihan ganda merupakan jenis penilaian yang paling banyak digunakan. Pertanyaan inferensial lebih dominan digunakan daripada pertanyaan referensial dalam tes. Hasil juga menunjukkan bahwa 3,3% item tes berada pada tingkat kognitif C1 (mengingat), 24,8% berada pada tingkat kognitif C2 (memahami), 9,8% berada pada tingkat C3 (menerapkan), 51,6% berada pada tingkat C4 (menganalisis). , 10,5% berada pada level C5 (mengevaluasi) dan 0% berada pada level C6 (mencipta). Hal ini menyiratkan bahwa kriteria penilaian untuk kelas sastra sebagian besar dibuat dengan menerapkan keterampilan berpikir tingkat tinggi (62,1%) atau berpikir kritis, termasuk dalam tingkat kognitif C4 ke atas dalam taksonomi.

Kata Kunci: Penilaian, Evaluasi, Tes, Revisi Taksonomi Meka, Berpikir Kritis

INTRODUCTION

Teaching and learning process in English classrooms requires different aspects in achieving the objectives framed in the curriculum. Teaching materials, classroom activities and assessments are some of the essential aspects to be prepared by teachers and instructors once the set of curriculum and syllabuses are designed. In designing the curriculum, assessment as a part of the curriculum represents the need to give attention to observing learning, testing the results of learning, and providing feedback to the learners about their progress. It provides information that can lead to changes at most of the other parts of the curriculum design process (Nation and McAlister, 2010, p.2). The students' need and competencies can be measured in different assessment and evaluation by referring to the particular objectives of each learning process. Bailey (1996) and McNamara (2004) in Poehner (2008, p.3) furtherly add that assessment is benignly described as an information-gathering activity explains that traditionally teachers assess in order to gain insights into learners' level of knowledge or ability, in which the result of assessment can be viewed as an integral component of a good teaching. In addition, assessment is seen as an activity that is distinct from, and perhaps even at odds with, the goals of teaching (Linn, 2000; Lynch, 2001; McNamara, 2001; Moss, 1996) as cited in Poehner (2008, p.4), eventhough some classroom based assessments prove that teachers often feel compelled to choose between their role as facilitator and monitor of language development and that of assessor and judge of language performance as achievement . This indicates that tests play an important role in teaching and learning process that teachers should improvise to gain the information needed concerning with the students' achievement.

In higher education, teaching and learning process are embedded in a critical thinking process as higher education curriculum also demands learning process based on problem solving activities. In English Literature Study program of Universitas Negeri Jakarta, the design was previously done by considering Revised Bloom Taxonomy with distinguished levels of achievement that students need to acquire, besides nowadays the curriculum and assessment arrangements are also referring to CEFR and KKNI. Taxonomy Bloom is a way to cover students' level of achievement in six levels of competences which included *knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis,* and *evaluation* which was firstly published by Benyamin S. Bloom in 1956 and then revised as Revised Bloom Taxonomy as in *Remembering, Understanding, Applying, Analyzing, Evaluating, and Creating (*Limbach and Waugh, 2010, p.4). Each cognitive domain is representing different level of students achievement at different learning stage, so teaching content subjects as English Literature subjects can be measured in a more specific way.

As there are different literature subjects taught in English Literature Study Program, like English Literature 1, English Literature 2 and History of English Literature, different ranges of cognitive models are also used to measure different students' competences as designed in the objectives of each syllabus.

This study was conducted to investigate three research questions; a) How are the cognitive levels of revised Bloom taxonomy reflected in the assessment and evaluation used in literary subjects of English Literature Study Program? b) Which aspects of cognitive levels are mostly used? c) What types of tests and assessment are mostly used in the literary subjects?

This paper aims to investigate how the assessment and evaluation in literary subjects are related to Revised Bloom taxonomy, which aspect of cognitive level are mostly reflected and what type of test are used in the assessments. This study was considered relevant to teaching and learning process in general and contributed significant scientific contribution especially in teaching and assessing content subjects as Literature subjects.

Test is a form of assessment, as cited in Hughes (2003, p. 5) that testing is not, of course, the only way in which information about people's language ability can be gathered. It is just one form of assessment, and other methods will often be more appropriate. Linn and Miller (2005) also state that a test is a particular type of assessment that typically consists of a set of questions administered during a fixed period of time under reasonably comparable conditions for all students. So, as testing is the part of assessment, the term *test* refers to a set of items (Heaton, 1975). The test includes the test item in form of questions. In teaching and learning process, tests are usually made to know students' ability in mastering the materials given by the teachers.Test should be used to measure same aspects of the same students, as Haynes and Zacarian (2010) say that many teachers believe that English language learners should not be treated any differently from their peers and should complete the same assignments and take the same tests. None of these responses effectively address the challenge of assigning homework to and assessing English language learners.

Hughes (2003, p.11) distinguishes four kinds of test; proficiency, achievement, diagnostic and placement test, which contribute different functions and strategies. In

classroom teaching and learning process, teachers need to conduct achievement test as a feedback on the teaching process itself, and information for the students themselves to know their positions and ranks among the whole class participants. Creating tests in skill and content subjects are also different, as each subjects are designed with different competences and objectives to achieve. As content subjects, Literature subjects in general expose students to knowledge and application of the knowledge in speaking or writing skills, which sometimes needs critical thinking process.

The original Bloom's Taxonomy was firstly found by Benjamin. S Bloom in 1956 by dividing three teaching and learning process into three domains; cognitive, affective, and psychomotoric domain. Cognitive domain deals with intellectual or thinking ability. The second domain, affective domain, deals with value (Bloom et al, in Truschel, 2008). Furthermore, Lynch et al (2009, p.52) also state that the affective domain is a necessary complement to the cognitive domain. The last domain is psychomotoric domain that deals with pshycomotoric behaviour. Lynch, et.al (2009 : 48) add that the articulation of these domains is collectively referred to as Bloom's taxonomy although this label is often applied only to the cognitive domain as developed in the first report. This means that the term 'Bloom's Taxonomy' is often referred to the cognitive domain because this is the domain that was developed firstly in Bloom's Taxonomy. Bloom's Taxonomy gives a way to order students' thinking skills from the most basic to the most complex, as Forehand (2005 : 2) suggests that Bloom's Taxonomy is a multi-tiered model of classifying thinking according to six cognitive levels of complexity. Throughout the years, the levels have often been depicted as a stairway, leading many teachers to encourage their students to 'climb to a higher (level of) thought.' The cognitive domain which is in the original taxonomy is divided into six categories, as explained in McBeath (1992, p.166) as follows;

1. Knowledge = memorize and recall information
2. Comprehension = interpret information in one's own words
3. Application = apply knowledge to new situations
4. Analysis = breakdown knowledge into parts and show relationship among parts
5. Synthesis = bring together parts of knowledge to form a whole; build relationships for new situations
6. Evaluation = make judgments on basis of criteria

These domains had been revised in 1990's into two dimensions, *cognitive dimension* and *knowledge dimension*. Cognitive dimension includes *remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating,* and *creating*. Knowledge dimension includes *factual knowledge, conceptual procedural, procedural knowledge,* and *metacognitve knowledge*. The terminology used in the cognitive dimension of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy had been changed into verb from noun. The use of verb in the terminology seems more suitable because it shows the thinking process which is the active process rather than the use of noun. The structure of cognitive dimension of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy are stated in Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) as seen in the following tables.

Table 1. Level 1 of the Cognitive Dimension of Revised Bloom Taxonomy

Categories & Cognitive Processes	**Alternative Names**	**Definition**

Level 1 – C1		
Remember		**Retrieve knowledge from long-term memory**
Recognizing	Identifying	Locating knowledge in long-term memory that is consistent with presented material
Recalling	Retrieving	Retrieving relevant knowledge from long-term memory

The table above shows the basic level of students' cognitive competence as low level based on the remembering activities which enable them to retrieve knowledge from long term memory.

Table 2. Level 2 of the Cognitive Dimension of Revised Bloom Taxonomy

Categories & Cognitive Processes	**Alternative Names**	**Definition**
Level 2 – C2		
Understand		**Construct meaning from instructional messages, including oral, written, and graphic communication**
Interpreting	Clarifying Paraphrasing Representing Translating	Changing from one form of representation to another
Exemplifying	Illustrating Instantiating	Finding a specific example or illustration of a concept or principle
Classifying	Categorizing Subsuming	Determining that something belongs to a category
Summarizing	Abstracting Generalizing	Abstracting a general theme or major point(s)
Inferring	Concluding Extrapolating Interpolating Predicting	Drawing a logical conclusion from presented information
Comparing	Contrasting Mapping Matching	Detecting correspondences between two ideas, objects, and the like
Explaining	Constructing models	Constructing a cause and effect model of a system

The table of level 2 indicates students' cognitive level in showing their understanding by constructing the meaning from instructional messages, including oral, written, and graphic communication learning process.

Table 3. Level 3 of the Cognitive Dimension of Revised Bloom Taxonomy

Categories & Cognitive Processes	**Alternative Names**	**Definition**

Level 3 – C3		
Apply		**Applying a procedure to a familiar task**
Executing	Carrying out	Applying a procedure to a familiar Task
Implementing	Using	Applying a procedure to an unfamiliar task

Table 3 shows the 3rd level of cognitive competence dealing with students' ability to apply the knowledge especially dealing with procedures of a particular task.

Table 4. Level 4 of the Cognitive Dimension of Revised Bloom Taxonomy

Categories & Cognitive Processes	Alternative Names	Definition
Level 4- C4		
Analyze		**Break material into its constituent parts and determine how the parts relate to one another and to an overall structure or purpose**
Differentiating	Discriminating Distinguishing Focusing Selecting	Distinguishing relevant from irrelevant parts or important from unimportant parts of presented material
Organizing	Finding coherence Integrating Outlining Parsing Structuring	Determining how elements fit or function within a structure
Attributing	Deconstructing	Determine a point of view, bias, values, or intent underlying presented material

Table 4 shows students'critical thinking in analytical level which requires their competence in breaking material into its constituent parts and determining how the parts relate to one another and to an overall structure or purpose. This is considered as higher level thinking skills and suggested to be applied in higher level of language learning activities.

Table 5. Level 5 of the Cognitive Dimension of Revised Bloom Taxonomy

Categories & Cognitive Processes	Alternative Names	Definition
Level 5 – C5		
Evaluate		**Make judgments based on criteria and standards**
Checking	Coordinating Detecting Monitoring	Detecting inconsistencies or fallacies within a process or product; determining whether a process or product has

	Testing	internal consistency; detecting the effectiveness of a procedure as it is being implemented
Critiquing	Judging	Detecting inconsistencies between a product and external criteria; determining whether a product has external consistency; detecting the appropriateness of a procedure for a given problem

Table 5 is the higher level in critical thinking skill where students are required to be able to evaluate in learning activities by making judgments based on criteria and standards of a particular context.

Table 6. Level 6 of the Cognitive Dimension of Revised Bloom Taxonomy

Categories & Cognitive Processes	**Alternative Names**	**Definition**
Level 6 – C6		
Create		**Put elements together to form a coherent or functional whole; reorganize elements into a new pattern or structure**
Generating	Hypothesizing	Coming up with alternative hypotheses based on criteria
Planning	Designing	Devising a procedure for accomplishing some task
Producing	Constructing	Inventing a product

Table 6 is the highest cognitive level requiring students to be able to create or produce a similar task based on the modeled activities or to reorganize elements into a new pattern or structure. Students apply this highest critical thinking skills by creating a new text or new design derived from the particular task provided.

In addition, the structures of knowledge dimension of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy is shown in Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) as seen in table 7.

Table 7. The structures of knowledge dimension of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy

Knowledge Dimension	**Definition**
A. Factual Knowledge a. Knowledge of terminology b. Knowledge of specific details and elements	The basic elements that students must know to be acquainted with a discipline or solve problems in it
B. Conceptual Knowledge a. Knowledge of classifications and categories b. Knowledge of principles and generalizations	The interrelationships among the basic elements within a larger structure that enable them to function together.

c. Knowledge of theories, models, and structures	
C. Procedural Knowledge a. Knowledge of subject-specific skills and algorithms b. Knowledge of subject-specific techniques and methods c. Knowledge of criteria for determining when to use appropriate procedures	How to do something; methods of inquiry, and criteria for using skills, algorithms, techniques, and methods.
D. Metacognitive Knowledge a. Strategic knowledge b. Knowledge about cognitive tasks, including appropriate contextual and conditional knowledge c. Self-knowledge	Knowledge of cognition in general as well as awareness and knowledge of one's own cognition.

As cognitive dimension of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy has six cognitive levels, *Remembering, Understanding, Applying, Analyzing, Evaluating,* and *Creating*, the cognitive levels of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy relates with students' thinking skills which distinguishes low order and high order thinking skills. The highest three levels are included in high-order-thinking (Limbach and Waugh. 2010; Ramirez and Ganaden; 2008) and students with competences in the upper three levels are practicing higher level thinking. This also means that the low order thinking occupies the three lowest levels of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy (*Remembering, Understanding,* and *Applying*).

Those highest three levels promote the students to improve their high order thinking skills. Stowell (2010) explains that Bloom's taxonomy has become a valuable tool for teachers to understand how their practices influence their students' cognitive development, and help to judge which activities are ultimately more challenging and valuable to promote high-level thinking skills or critical thinking skills. High level thinking or high order thinking is useful for the students to develop because this thinking skill can help them to think more deeply from what they get, not only absorbing information. Students are to participate in higher level thinking, they must pose arguments, state opinions, look for evidence, critique the evidence, and think with fair-mindedness. In this thinking, the students are also promoted into level where they can sharpen their thinking critically. The use of Bloom's Taxonomy can be a very powerful tool in assisting a student to learn at a higher and more critical level (in Limbach and Waugh, 2010; Truschel, 2008).

Teaching literary subjects are mostly imposing students to reading activities which enable them to deep understanding of the literary text and its social and cultural aspects. Literary texts are written in different language styles for certain intensions with values in them to uncover. In teaching and learning process, teachers will deal with many aspects of cognitive domain to explore and to invite students' elaborative skill and comprehension. Chambers and Gregory (2006, p. 136) claim that teaching literature challenges teacher to develop their own strategies to encourage students' critical autonomy and critical thinking. Garrison (1991, p. 291) as cited in Chambers and Gregory (2006, p.125) also suggests that in this discipline, concepts are fluid, made and remade in relationship to other concepts and intimately bound up with

beliefs and values within social discourse. Critical thinking involves problematising, *not* taking things at face value, and also creativity – sensing difficulties and gaps, 'something askew' in understanding, imagining alternative possibilities and making guesses. It follows, then, that the *way* students learn to study literature is fundamentally important. Thus, this has profound implications for the teacher's pedagogic as well as assessment practice. So, assessment criteria by considering students' range of higher thinking skills are suggested as there is no correct or incorrect concept used in teaching literary subjects but proposing alternative possibilities and making guesses are more acceptable which enable students to elaborate creative and critical skills.

Some previous related studies had been conducted dealing with testing in language teaching. Taylor (2004) in TESOL Quarterly discusses the exploration of the potential of CBT for formative as well as summative assessment, to achieve a more integrated approach for Engish teaching and testing. This study used tests of language skills subjects as the main source of the data. Another study about using Revised Bloom taxonomy was conducted by Zorluoglu (2006) which discusses evaluation of learning outcomes in high school chemistry curriculum and resulted that majority of the learning outcomes are focused on understanding level cognitive domain as cited from Necatibey Faculty of Education Electronic Journal of Science & Mathematics Education, June 2016, Vol. 10 Issue 1, p.260-279. Related study was also conducted by Dagostino, Bauer, and Qing Zhao and Hashim (2014) about assessing reading comprehension by referring to Bloom taxonomy which shows that classification by cognitive level allows one to measure specific cognitive abilities as defined by Bloom's Revised Taxonomy. This study also shows it is significant because Bloom's Revised Taxonomy gives teachers objectives for classifying the learning, teaching and assessing of the cognitive dimension of thought that is central to instruction in most subject areas, and in relationship to teachers' work in reading comprehension as an aspect of assessment of literacy in a way that differs from most current measures of reading comprehension.

These previous studies are related with language skill test items and are not dealing with some content subject tests as literary subjects because literary subjects require high order thinking skills in practice. Regarding with this phenomena, this research dealing with literary assessment was then conducted by referring to Revised Bloom taxonomy which focused on the assessment aspects used in literary subjects at English Literature Study Program of Universitas Negeri Jakarta.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study gathered data from the test items in midterms and final terms used in three literature subjects; English Literature 1, English Literature 2 and History of English Literature. Content analysis as research design was used to analyze the data in this qualitative research. The data of 153 test items were classified as primary data, which then in the analysis were triangulated with the secondary data, resulted from interview with the lectures to gain data about the typical test types they used in assessing the students' literary comprehension.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

From 153 items analyzed, it is revealed that the most dominantly reflected cognitive level in the test items is C4 cognitive level (analyze). This reveals that the

test items were constructed in the range of critical thinking skill lying on the highest cognitive level of Bloom taxonomy, although none of the test item indicate the C6 cognitive level (create). The result of the analysis is shown in table 8.

Table 8. The Cognitive Domains in Literature Test Items

Subjects	Cognitive Domain						Percentage
	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	%
English Literature 1	1	10	4	20	5	0	40
English Literature 2	1	8	5.8	20	5.5	0	40.8
History of English Lit.		1.3		6.8	0	11.6 0	0 19.7
Total	**3.3**	**24.8**	**9.8**	**51.6**	**10.5**	**0**	**100**

The result of the interview shows that using supply test which ranges on referential questions was the only type of assessment used in evaluating the students comprehension. Among all test items (153 items), there are seventy-nine test items that comprise C4 level (51,6%), sixteen test items comprise C5 level (10,5%), and there is no test item that comprises C6 level (0%). Therefore, the test items in Literature subjects comprise the highest three levels of cognitive dimension of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy because there are ninety-five test items or 62,1% from all of the test items that comprise C4 and C5 level which are included in the highest three levels of cognitive domain of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy. This also means that the tests in Literature subjects develop students' critical thinking which is categorized as high order thinking skills. It can be seen that the mostly used test items are at C4 (analyzing) and C5 (evaluating) cognitive levels. The least used items are 3.3 % at C1 (remembering) and 9.8 % at C3 (applying) level, with no items indicating C6 level (creating).

Some of the test items were asked in multiple choices and essay forms. The test items are usually given after students finish reading the poems or short stories provided by lecturer and they can answer the questions after reading the texts. In English Literature 1 midterm for example, the poem provided was *Daffodils* by William Worsworth. As the test items were in multiple choices in part I, the instruction was asking students to choose the correct answers after reading the text, as in the following items; The figure of speech that you find in lines 1-2 is a ….

A. simile B. metaphor
C. symbol D. personification

The items required students to apply the concept of the figurative language and relate it with the context of use in the poem. This cognitive level represents C3 level because they need to recall types of figurative language and apply the concept in certain words and phrases in parts of the poem as Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) explain that applying occurs when the students apply a procedure to an unfamiliar task (implementing). The procedure here means their acquired knowledge about figure of speech and an unfamiliar task means the lines that are involved in the poem.

The following test item also asked students to apply their analytical skill in answering the question, as follows;

What does the phrase "a host of daffodils" (line 4) do to what the poet means by "a crowd" in line 3 ?

A. It shows a contrast to it B. It gives a detailed explanation to it
C. It gives an example of it D. It says nothing about it

Besides, some other items were requiring students' ability to understand the text in answering the question, or C2 cognitive level, as follows;
The word "they" in "The waves beside them danced, but they…" (line 13) refers to

A. the waves B. their heads
C. the golden daffodils D. the stars

The following item also reveals C2 cognitive level;
In the poem you see the words : vales, hills, lake, trees, stars, waves. Each of these words is used to appeal to the reader's sense of ….

A. smell C. feeling
B. sight D. taste

In part II of the test, the question was provided in an essay form, in which students were asked to paraphrase the poem by using their own words. The poem provided was *Along the Field As We Came* by , A.E Housman. The question was as follows;

Read the poem carefully and paraphrase it!
(The poem, entitled, *Along The Field As We Came By*)
The above question is in C2 cognitive level because it asked students understanding about the whole text firstly before stating their own comprehension in a different way.

Some questions in the test items of English Literature 2 subjects were proposed in C4 cognitive level, which requires students ability to analyze the text provided. The following item is an example, as taken from a poem entitled *Frustration* by Charlotte Lamb;
This poem attempts to show ….

A. sadness C. anger
B. humor D. love

Students needed to analyze the tone of the poem by referring to the words used in answering the above question. Theed right emotional situation needed to be selected is available behind the poem. Therefore, the students need to find the intended situation which is not stated explicitly in the text. This also means they need to read between the lines to find the emotional situation shown in the poem. King et al (2009 : 64) state that multiple choice can assess students' high order thinking. Analytical skill occurs when the students determine a point of view, bias, values, or intent underlying presented material (attributing).
The following items was also asking students analytical skill in answering the questions;

Choose which of the following is the most appropriate tone of the poem

A. personal and puzzled B. personal and admiring
C. objective and convincing D. objective and patriotic

Besides poems, English Literature 2 subject were also providing proses in the test items, like *A Clean, Well-lighted Place* by Ernest Hemingway, *The Open Window* by Saki and *Moving Day* by Jonathan Stone. All the test items were mostly requiring students analytical thinking skills as reflected in C4 cognitive domains. The test items are as follows (from *A Clean, Well-lighted Place)*:

Whom do the following sentences apply to and how do they bear upon the theme of the story?
It is the lights of course, but it is necessary that the place be clean and pleasant. You do not want music. ...Nor can you stand before a bar with dignity. ... What did he fear? It was not fear or dread. It was a nothing that he knew too well…

Another test item from a prose entitled *Open Window* also reflects C4 level as follows;
Where (at what point) in the story did the climax occur?

A test item from a prose *A Moving Day* reflects analytical thinking skill at C4 level as follows;
The title of this story is "*A Moving Day*". One meaning of 'moving' is 'going to another place', and another is 'affecting the emotions'. How do you relate these two meanings to what the story is about?

To answer the previous questions, the students need to determine in what way the title as an element within the text can lead the students to create certain depiction of the content of the text when reading the whole text. This process needs analytical thinking skill to enable them answer the questions.

Some evaluative cognitive level (C5) also occurred in the test items, which required students' appreciation and judgement about a particular text, as stated in the following test items taken from *The Quiet Man* by Maurice Walsh*;*
Point out examples of description as dramatic background, whether it harmonizes or contrasts with the action.

The previous items were demanding students to judge the comparison between the background and the actions of the characters. This means that they need to seek for reasons and arguments for answer that might be given. This evaluative skill also occur in the following test item;

Do you get entertained by the story? That is, do you get emotional and intellectual pleasure out of this story? Give an elaborate answer!
The above test items asked students to elaborate their judgement and evaluation on the story they had read by proposing some supporting proofs and details in their answers.

The test items in History of English Literature subject also ranged from low order to high order thinking skills, which mostly reflected C4 analytical skill. The test items were designed by referring to students knowledge and their application and evaluative skills of the knowledge. The examples of the items are as follows;
Answer TWO of following questions.

What is Geoffrey Chaucer's contribution to English Literature? Discuss!

Students were to analyze Chaucers' works and the implied message in them then related them to the historical context of which those works dealt with. This requires students' ability to support their analysis by referring to examples and knowledge they had acquired and comprised C4 cognitive domain. this activity reflects the fourth level of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy, as Hughes (2007) explains that distinguishing relevant from irrelevant parts or important from unimportant parts of presented material (differentiating) is in fourth level of Revised Bloom's Taxonomy.

In *Meditation 17*, John Donne wrote *'No man is an island entire of itself..."*, which has become a much quoted line. Can you accept this statement? Defend your answer.

The previous test item asked students to evaluate the statement and provide some supporting arguments to strengthen the answer. This ability is dealing with C5 cognitive domain in which they need to defend their reasons and as Overbaugh and Schultz (2008) explain that evaluating level is reached when the students can justify a stand or decision.

CONCLUSIONS

From the analysis done to all test items of the three literary subjects, it can be concluded that the items are enabling students to develop their cognitive levels from the lower level to the higher level. The result of the analysis reveals that analytical thinking skill in C4 cognitive domain are mostly used in the test items which indicates that most of the test items are provoking students high order thinking skills or critical thinking, which lies on the C4, C5 and C6 level of cognitive domains. It is recommended that Revised Bloom taxonomy is used in assessing students' competences as it enables teachers to vary the test items and widen the tested criteria based on the objectives designed in the syllabuses. This research was focused in assessing test items in literary subjects and some other relevant research dealing with asssesing different group of subjects by using Revised Bloom taxonomy are still possible to conduct.

REFERENCES

Anderson, Lorin W. & Krathwohl, David R. 2001. A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching and Assessing: a Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy. New York: Longman Publishing.

Chambers, Ellie and Marshall Gregory. 2006. Teaching and Learning English Literature. London: SAGE Publication.

Dagostino, Lorraine, James Carifio, Bauer, Jennifer D. C., Qing Zhao, Hashim, Nor. 2014. Assessment of a Reading Comprehension Instrument as It Relates to Cognitive Abilities as Defined by Bloom's Revised Taxonomy . Current Issues in Education. 1/21/2014, Vol. 17 Issue 1, p.1-15.

Duron, Robert, Barbara Limbach, and Wendy Waugh. 2006. Critical Thinking Framework for Any Discipline. International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education 2006, Volume 17 (2), p. 16 0-166.

Forehand, Mary. 2005. Bloom's Taxonomy: Original and Revised. Available at http://english.hyde.wikispaces.net/file, accessed on November 22th, 2010.

Haynes, Judy and Debbie Zacarians. 2010. Teaching English Language Learners Across the Content Areas. Virginia: ASCD

Heaton, J.B. 1975. Writing English Language Test; A Practical Guide for Teachers of English as a Second or Foreign Language. London: Longman

Hughes, Arthur. 2003. Testing For Language Teachers. Second Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

King, FJ, Ludwika Goodson, and Faranak Rohani. 2009. Higher Order Thinking Skills. Center for Advancement of Learning and Assessment. Retrieved from http://www.cala.fsu.edu/files, July 22nd, 2011

Limbach, Barbara and Wendy Waugh. 2010. Developing Higher Level Thinking. Journal of Instructional Pedagogies. Available at http://www.aabri.com on November 10th, 2010.

Linn, Robert. L. and M. David Miller. 2005. Measurement and Assessment in Teaching. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.

Lynch, Daniel R, Jeffrey S. Russell, Jeffrey C. Evans, and Kevin G. Sutterer. 2009. Beyond the Cognitive: The Affective Domain, Values, and the Achievement of the Vision. Journal of Professional Issues In Engineering Education and Practice at http://www.engr.wisc.edu/cee/faculty, January 28th, 2011.

McBeath, Ron J. 1992. Instructing and Evaluating in Higher Education, A Guidebook for Planning Learning Outcomes. New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications, Inc.

Nation, I.S.P and John Macalister. 2010. Language Curriculum Design. New York: Routledge.

Poehner, Mathew. A. 2008. Dynamic Assessment. USA: Springer Science.

Ramirez, Rachel Patricia B and Mildred S. Ganaden. 2008. Creative Activities and Students' Higher Order Thinking Skills. Education Quarterly. Vol 66 (1), p. 22-33.

Stowell, Richard. 2010. Using to Bloom's Taxonomy to Create Objectives, A Blueprint for Teachers to Develop High-level Thinking in Learners at http://www.suite101.com/content/blooms-taxonomy, accessed on January 2nd, 2010.

Overbaugh, Richard C and Lynn Schultz. 2008. Bloom's Revised Taxonomy at http://nbccffcoach.wikispaces.com/file, November 22th, 2010

Taylor, Lynda. B. 2004. Current Issues in English Language Testing Research. TESOL

Quarterly. Spring 2004, Vol. 38 Issue 1, p.141-146.

Truschel, Jack. 2008. What tutors can do to enhance critical thinking skills through the use of Bloom's Taxonomy at http://www.myatp.org/Synergy, November 22th, 2010.

Zorluoglu, S. Levent. 2016. Analysis and Evaluation of Learning Outcomes in High School Chemistry Curriculum According to Revised Bloom Taxonomy .

Necatibey Faculty of Education Electronic Journal of Science &

Mathematics Education. June 2016, Vol. 10 Issue 1, p.260-279.