

The Affective Domain in English language Primary Stage Reading Texts in Jordan: A Content Analysis

Razan Khaled Maqableh

Dina AbdI Hameed Al-Jamal

Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Faculty of Education, Yarmouk University, Jordan

Rkh3529@gmail.com

Deena.j@yu.edu.jo

Abstract

This study aimed at exploring the affective domain as embedded in EFL textbooks (1st grade through 3rd). To collect data, a content analysis sheet was tailed in light of (Bloom et al., 1956) affective domain categories, namely, receiving, responding, valuing, organizing, and internalization. The results showed that Action Pack textbooks are loaded with the affective domain criteria; as Action Pack 3 came on top with 649 occurrences, Action Pack 2 ranked second with 544 occurrences, and Action Pack 1 ranked third with 527 occurrences.

Keywords: Affective Domain, Content Analysis, Receiving, Responding, Valuing, Organizing, Internalization, and Jordanian EFL textbooks.

المجال الوجداني المتضمن في نصوص القراءة في كتب اللغة الانجليزية في الأردن: تحليل محتوى

دينا عبدالحميد الجمل

رزان خالد مقابلة

قسم المناهج وطرق التدريس - كلية التربية - جامعة اليرموك

Deena.j@yu.edu.jo

Rkh3529@gmail.com

الملخص

هدفت هذه الدراسة الى الكشف عن المجال العاطفي (الوجداني) المتضمن في كتب اللغة الانجليزية (في الصفوف الثلاثة الاولى). لجمع بيانات الدراسة، قامت الباحثة بتحليل محتوى الكتب في ضوء معايير (Bloom et al., 1956) وهي الاستقبال، الاستجابة، التقدير، التنظيم والاستيعاب. ولقد أظهرت النتائج درجات تضمين عالية للمجال العاطفي (الوجداني). حيث جاء كتاب Action Pack 3 في المرتبة الاولى، و Action Pack 2 في المرتبة الثانية، و Action Pack 1 في المرتبة الثالثة.

كلمات مفتاحية: المجال الوجداني، الكتب المدرسية للغة الإنجليزية لغة أجنبية، التنظيم، الاستقبال، الاستجابة، التقدير.

Introduction

The topic of behavioral outcomes is of great importance in education. Its importance is further emphasized in the field of foreign language learning. It has a crucial role in giving practical effect to learning subjects and consolidating their theoretical and practical values and implications to learners' behavior. The behavioral outcomes (i.e., cognitive, motor, affective) represent broad lines in light of which all the procedural steps are designed to achieve any given lesson's outcomes. The success of any educational work must have a precise outcome. Specifically, behavioral goals are the cornerstone of the educational process, from building school curricula to planning lessons and implementing them in the classroom. Such outcomes embody the student's required level to achieve as much balance as possible.

Bloom and a group of psychologists defined three domains or divisions of educational development in 1956: The Cognitive, the Affective, and the Psychomotor Domain. It is not a simple job to describe the term the Affective Domain (Hanna, 2007). It is how we communicate emotionally with thoughts, feelings, values, gratitude, enthusiasm, motivations, and behaviors.

The Affective Domain was introduced to the world through The Taxonomy of Educational Outcomes, known as Bloom's Taxonomy. It is a context for classifying declarations of what we hope or wish students to understand (Riazi, 2010). Instead of only recalling knowledge, it was created to improve higher forms of thought in education, such as reviewing and assessing ideas, methods, practices, and values. Even though named after Benjamin Bloom, the taxonomy was the work of the many people assigned to help maintain veterans' influx after World War II into the education system (Bloom & Krathwohl, 1958).

Although some scholars such as (Harriman, 2005; Neill, 2006; Weaver, 2004) relied exclusively on expectations, other scholars and educators, such as Hough (2011), Elias et al (2010), took a broader view to educate the entire child by concentrating not just on the learners' cognitive development, but also on the domains of the affective and psychomotor. The affective ability of emotionally dealing with things is recognized as a required aim for today's learners to move them into tomorrow's future. Multiculturalism is one of the most significant drivers of progress in economic development. It is a way of realizing an intellectual, mental, moral, and spiritual life that is more satisfactory. Therefore, people should cultivate their abilities and behaviors to deal with cultural diversity (Myunghee et al., 2010).

Feelings are considered in the modern educational code of practice. If the emotional components of each subject are neglected in teaching, the students will be stripped from expected and rightful meaning. In other words, if the focus is only on the cognitive domain, it is not easy to achieve its highest levels of learning (Combs, 1982). Emotional features are fundamental in the learning and teaching process, yet infrequently in the curricula (Sowell, 2005). As an essential feature of education, much research (such as The Importance of the Affective Domain in Further Education Classroom Culture (by Russell, 2007) promotes the affective domain, but few (such as The Dimensions of Measurement of the Affective Domain (by Geisert, 1972) have a way to quantify it.

In establishing the affective domain, students are not just learning. Instead, they are learning factors based on expectation, personal perceptions and prejudices, degree of self-esteem, and the need for social contact, organized by emotions and mindsets. On several levels, feelings operate. They continue after the particular incident. Every lesson or life experience's emotional effect can continue to reverberate. They are stored in memory and do not be forgotten (Rosenfield, 1988; Caine & Caine, 1991).

The affective factors are typically more important than the cognitive variables. Many educators and teachers, on the other hand, concentrate their aims and outcomes mainly on the cognitive realm of learning. In other words, although being regarded as the essential domain in learning, the affective domain has remained a neglected aspect of education (Noddings, 1996; Popham, 2011).

Numerous reading scholars have recognized the link between social and affective elements and students' reading ability (Alderson, 2000; Pretorius, 2000). Nevertheless, reading research studies, particularly those focusing on intervention programs, concentrate on cognitive remediation, with little attention or effort to increase social and affective reading abilities. Thus, it appears that research into social and affective components in reading is inadequate. On the other hand, students must have the will and desire to engage in the cognitive parts and the incentive to succeed (Grabe & Stoller, 2002). As a result, the affective factor must be investigated in order to improve students' reading skills.

Parra (2010) examined the explicit socio-affective language learning strategies at the Centro Colombo Americano in Bogota, Colombia. The study considered clarifying socio-affective language learning methods (SLLS) instruction in order to positively impact a group of novice EFL students' beliefs, attitudes, concerns, and motivations. With 17 students enrolled in a Basic English class, an action research study was conducted. They completed two open-ended questionnaires, one at the start and the other at the end of the study; they also completed a rating scale about emotional characteristics and engaged in a series of socio-affective activities that the researcher devised and implemented. The study's results implied that explicit strategy instruction in SLLS can help learners become more aware of the need to pay attention to their own emotions and social relationships as part of their learning process.

Agustin (2017) explored the importance of the materials in the student book entitled "Bahasa Inggris" for senior high school in grade XI and the key and the compulsory competencies in the Affective Domain 2013 curriculum, and the relevance in terms of the cognitive domain between the materials in the student book entitled "Bahasa Inggris" for grade XI senior high school and the core and required competencies in the 2013 curriculum. The research followed the descriptive design with a qualitative strategy. The investigator used the checklist instrument for the data collection. The topic of this thesis was the Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture's English Student Text, entitled 'Bahasa Inggris' for Grade XI Senior High School. The analysis indicated that the significance of materials in that textbook is categorized as "Good" and in terms of the cognitive domain in terms of Affective Area.

Statement of the Problem

The researcher has observed through her teaching experiences, that Jordanian young EFL learners sometimes fail to act out, with awareness, the ideas in written texts. Thereby, their ability to read and react by receiving, responding, valuing, or even organizing information that they already know may not reflect credible and confident learners. As a result, the researcher felt that such young learners are not involved in reading classes emotionally, as their ability to express interest and concern that promote behavior formation in reading classes tends to be incomplete.

Affective domain features exist in many instructional textbooks. Based on the researcher's teaching experience on teaching McGraw Hill series, the researcher observed that this series concentrated a lot on the affective domain features in reading sections. Nevertheless, much research on the Jordanian curriculum Action Pack series is still needed. So, the researcher

will content analyze reading texts in First through Third-grade Action Pack series textbooks to see the extent of including the features of the Affective Domain.

Question of the Study

This study aims at answering the following question: To what extent does the *Action Pack Series* (1-3) include the Affective Domain principles per textbook and altogether in the three textbooks?

Significance of the Study

The study is significant as it may help EFL teachers by reminding them to vary their educational methods and learning styles to meet the students' Affective needs, which will help them perform better in the classroom. Moreover, it may help curriculum designers to plan and design appropriate activities and tasks that enhance students' Affective Domain.

Operational definition of Terms

1. **Content analysis:** is a method that aims at making inferences more accurate and outcome whether the text is audio, audiovisual, or written (Kaplan, 1943). In this study, the researcher will use Krathwohl's criteria in analyzing the reading textbooks texts in the 1st through 3rd grade *Action Pack series*. The researcher will develop a content analysis rubric based on the criteria mentioned above.
2. **The Affective Domain:** is how students learn to deal with things emotionally, such as attitudes, values, and feelings (Krathwohl et al., 1964). In this study, the researcher will adopt Krathwohl's classification of the Affective Domain. In this study, the researcher includes feelings, emotions, attitudes under it.
 - A. **Internalization:** is to act consistently in accordance with the values he or she has internalized. The focus is on patterns of adjustment. In this respect, the following question is raised: Does the learner act consistently with the new value? *It will be measured* by the characterization by value's verbs of: act, discriminate, display, influence, internalize, listen, modify, perform, and practice. . In this study, it contains verbs that give information about internalization.
 - B. **Organizing:** Is the learner able to integrate and conceptualized a new value giving it a priority? The focus is on the philosophy of life. The organization's verbs will be measured: alter, arrange, modify, combine, compare, defend, discriminate, and display. In this study, it contains verbs that give information about organizing.
 - C. **Receiving:** Is the learner conscious of the environment or reacting to it? The emphasis is on basic information and attention control. The receiving verbs of accept will measure it, ask, attend, choose, describe, develop, follow, give, hold, locate, name, point to, recognize, select, reply, and use. In this study, it contains verbs that give information about receiving.
 - D. **Responding:** The focus is on interest, seeking, and enjoyment. In this respect, the researcher raised this question: Can the learner show a new behavior due to an experience? *It will be measured* by responding verbs of an answer, assisting, completing, conforming, cooperating, discussing, helping, labeling, obeying, performing, practicing, presenting, reading, reciting, reporting, responding, selecting, telling, and writing. . In this study, it contains verbs that give information about responding.
 - E. **Valuing:** Will the learner display engagement and dedication? Attitudes and gratitude are the emphases. The valuing verbs will be measured: accept, complete, defend, describe, devote, differentiate, explain, follow, form, initiate, invite, join, justify,

propose, report, seek, select, share, study, and work. . In this study, it contains verbs that give information about valuing.

Limitations of the Study

The present study will be limited to analyzing the Affective Domain's factors of the Jordanian primary stage textbooks (*Action Pack 1-3*). This content analysis will be limited to the five categories that characterize the Affective Domain, according to Krathwohl (1964): receiving, responding, valuing, organizing, and internalization.

Methods and Procedures

This part addresses the methods and procedures which were followed by the researcher to investigate the Affective Domain in English language primary stage reading texts in Jordan by the means of content analysis. It describes the research design and samples, unit of analysis, criteria of analysis, categories, validity, reliability measures, and procedures of data analysis.

Research Tool

The present study applies a qualitative content analysis research tool.

Instruments of the Study

The instruments of this study include:

Content analysis checklist. The researcher conducts a content analysis study of 1st through 3rd-grade *Action Pack series* student's textbooks. The content analysis checklist was created in light of (Bloom et al., 1956) Affective Domain criteria as presented in five categories; namely, receiving, responding, valuing, organizing, and internalization.

Unit of Analysis

In the current study, the unit of analysis is the reading texts in the Student's Book in *Action Pack 1st through 3rd-grade* textbooks, including texts, dialogues, pictures, activities, and songs.

Content Analysis Criteria

The criterion of the content analysis is the inclusion of the given features of the Affective domain in all reading texts in *Action Pack 1st through 3rd grade* student's textbooks.

Categories of Analysis

The categories of analysis in the current study are based on (Bloom et al., 1956) Affective Domain criteria in the students' textbooks under study. These are: receiving, responding, valuing, organizing, and internalization.

Validity and Reliability of the Instruments

1. The validity of the content analysis checklist

The content analysis criterion was evaluated and validated by a jury of specialists in the current study to offer appropriate input. The jury experts were EFL University teachers and educational supervisors who reviewed and validated whether the material corresponded to the study topic. As a result, their suggestions and amendments aided in the development of the final form of the checklist in order to fulfill the study goal. The checklist was approved by the panel after certain changes were made.

2. The Reliability of the Content Analysis Checklist

The researcher examined the activities according to the categories of the analysis to determine the content analysis's reliability analysis following these procedures:

Intra-reliability: The researcher analyzed the three EFL textbooks according to the categories and units of the study. Three weeks later, she made another analysis using the same

unit and analytical categories. The percentage co-efficient of the two analyses was 80 which is considered an acceptable percentage.

Inter-reliability: another analyst was asked to analyze the three EFL textbooks using the same categories and units of analysis. The analyst had a PhD degree from the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at Yarmouk University. He took the course of content analysis and had some research papers on this topic. The percentage co-efficient of the two analyses was more than (80) which is considered very high.

Intra-class correlations, two-way random-effects model, and ICC with 95% confidence intervals (CI) were used to measure the inter-and intra-rater reliability. Table 1 shows inter-and intra-rater reliability for each book.

Table 1.

Summary Results of Content Analysis Reliability.

Book		Inter-rater Coefficients	Intra-rater Coefficients
<i>Action Pack 1</i>	Receiving	.90	.94
	Responding	.91	.95
	Valuing	.87	.99
	Organizing	.88	.97
	Internalization	.93	.97
<i>Action Pack 2</i>	Receiving	.87	.96
	Responding	.91	.98
	Valuing	.88	.96
	Organizing	.85	.98
	Internalization	.83	.97
<i>Action Pack 3</i>	Receiving	.80	.97
	Responding	.84	.98
	Valuing	.90	.95
	Organizing	.92	.96
	Internalization	.91	.99

Table 1 demonstrates the inter-rater reliability coefficient (agreement percentage) between the two estimators is higher than 80 on the five affective domains for Action Pack 1, Action Pack 2, and Action Pack 3, which indicate excellent coefficients of inter-rater agreement (Schlager et al., 2018). Also, the intra-rater reliability coefficient (agreement percentage) between the three estimations is higher than 80 on the five affective domains for Action Pack 1, Action Pack 2, and Action Pack 3, which indicate excellent coefficients of intra-rater agreement (Schlager et al., 2018).

Findings and Discussion of the Study

To answer the question of the study, the researcher analyzed the reading activities in the three Jordanian EFL textbooks that are taught in the public primary schools: *Action Pack 1*, *Action Pack 2*, and *Action Pack 3* in the light of (Bloom et al., 1956) Affective Domain criteria (receiving, responding, valuing, organizing, and internalization) following the categories that have been set. Tables from 2 to 8 illustrate the content analysis of *Action Pack 1*, *Action Pack 2*, and *Action Pack 3*.

Table 2.
The Affective Domain principles in the three textbooks

Affective domain	Frequencies	Percentages	Rank order
Action Pack 1	527	30.64	3
Action Pack 2	544	31.63	2
Action Pack 3	649	37.73	1
Total	1720		

Table 2 shows the Affective Domain in Action Pack 3 |are represented by a percentage of 37.73% in the first rank order, followed by Action Pack 2 31.63% in the second rank order, and Action Pack 1 in the third rank order 30.64%.

Table 3.
Frequencies and Percentages of Affective Domain Indices in Action Pack 1

Unit	Affective Domain%					Frequencies
	Receiving	Responding	Valuing	Organizing	Internalization	
1. Hello	47.37	36.84	5.26	5.26	5.26	19
2. What's this?	48.00	40.00	8.00	4.00	0	25
3. Look! It's a robot	50.00	41.67	0	0	8.33	24
4. One, Two, Three	42.11	31.58	15.79	10.53	0	19
5. Review	37.93	41.38	13.73	3.45	3.45	29
6. How old are You?	28.13	40.63	9.38	15.63	6.25	32
7. My Family	41.94	41.94	9.68	3.23	3.23	31
8. Fadia is in the bed room	38.10	38.10	9.52	14.29	0	21
9. My toys	37.50	25.00	4.17	12.50	20.83	24
10. Review	47.37	26.32	5.26	15.79	5.26	19
11. Where's my bag?	43.47	43.47	4.35	4.35	4.35	23
12. It's raining	71.43	21.43	0	0	7.14	14
13. I like this jacket	46.15	23.08	0	30.77	0	13
14. It's a blue bus	39.13	39.13	0	21.74	0	23
15. Review	41.67	25.00	25.00	8.33	0	12
16. I can swim	50.00	43.75	6.25	0	0	16
17. I like chicken	40.00	36.00	4.00	20.00	0	25
18. Can I have some bread, please?	25.49	58.82	3.92	11.76	0	51
19. Let's draw a man	50.00	41.67	0	8.33	0	24
20. Review	28.92	43.37	2.41	24.10	1.20	83
Whole Book	39.28	39.85	5.69	12.52	3.04	527

In Action Pack 1, the responding domain 39.85% had the greatest representation, while the internalization domain 3.04% had the least.

Table 4.
Frequencies and Percentages of Affective Domains Indices in Action Pack 2

Unit	Affective Domain%					Frequencies
	Receiving	Responding	Valuing	Organizing	Internalization	
1. Good morning, children	48.98	42.86	2.04	2.04	4.08	49
2. Where do you live?	45.24	42.86	0	11.90	0	42
3. What day is it today?	38.24	35.29	2.94	20.59	2.94	34
4. Review	39.13	34.78	8.70	17.39	0	23
5. What can you see?	44.44	38.89	5.56	8.33	2.78	36
6. Can turtles swim?	36.36	39.39	6.06	15.16	3.03	33
7. I 've got a headache	40.63	28.13	9.38	15.63	6.25	32
8. Review	29.63	44.44	7.41	14.81	3.70	27
9. How many are there?	37.65	35.29	3.53	18.82	4.71	85
10. What time is it?	44.00	24.00	20.00	8.00	4.00	25
11. What does he look like?	41.38	20.69	3.45	13.79	20.69	29
12. Review	40.00	32.50	2.50	25.00	0	40
13. This is a present for you	45.00	40.00	15.00	0	0	20
14. I like playing tennis	26.87	34.78	17.39	17.39	4.35	23
15. How do you spell it?	39.13	34.78	13.04	4.35	8.70	23
16. Review	39.13	2.17	13.04	17.39	8.70	23
Whole Book (Frequency)	218	191	38	73	24	544

In *Action Pack 2*, the receiving domain 38.84% had the greatest representation, while the internalization domain 4.96% had the least.

Table 5.
Frequencies and Percentages of Affective Domains Indices in Action Pack 3

Unit	Affective Domain%					Frequencies
	Receiving	Responding	Valuing	Organizing	Internalization	
1. We're ready for school	37.93	31.03	3.45	27.59	0	58
2. What do you do after school?	51.28	33.33	2.56	12.83	0	39
3. What does your uncle do?	51.43	31.43	2.86	11.42	2.86	35
4. Review	35.48	38.71	0	16.13	9.68	31
5. What's the weather like?	40	37.14	11.43	11.43	0	35
6. Let's go to a restaurant?	39.34	32.79	3.28	22.95	1.64	61
7. What are you doing?	36.36	34.09	4.55	18.18	6.82	44
8. Review	46.43	35.71	10.71	7.11	0	28
9. There is a big museum?	50.00	27.50	2.50	17.50	2.50	40
10. You must sit down	68.18	13.64	13.64	4.54	0	22
11. Is the cat jumping?	41.51	43.40	3.77	9.43	1.89	53
12. Review	46.67	20.00	10.00	13.33	10.00	30
13. Happy mother's day	48.28	24.14	6.90	20.68	0	29
14. Where is the bookshop?	46.00	24.00	6.00	22.00	2.00	50
15. Eat a lot of fruit	58.97	25.64	7.69	2.56	5.14	39
16. Review	50.91	36.36	3.64	5.45	3.64	55
Whole Book	45.76 (297)	31.43 (204)	5.24 (34)	14.80 (96)	2.77 (18)	649

In *Action Pack 3*, the receiving domain 45.76 had the greatest representation, while the internalization domain 2.77% had the least.

Table 6.
The Affective Domain Principles altogether in Action Pack 1

Affective domain	Frequencies	Percentages	Rank order
Receiving	205	38.90	2
Responding	210	39.85	1
Valuing	30	5.69	4
Organizing	66	12.52	3
Internalization	16	3.04	5
Total	527		

Table 6 shows that the responding domain came in the first rank with a percentage of 39.85, the receiving domain came in the second rank with a percentage of 38.90, the organizing domains came in the third rank with a percentage of 12.52, the valuing domain came in the fourth rank with a percentage of 5.69, and the internalization domains came in the fifth rank with a percentage of 3.04.

Table 7.
The Affective Domain Principles altogether in Action Pack 2

Affective domain	Frequencies	Percentages	Rank order
Receiving	218	40.07	1
Responding	191	35.11	2
Valuing	36	6.62	4
Organizing	75	13.79	3
Internalization	24	4.41	5
Total	544		

Table 7 shows that the receiving domain came in the first rank with a percentage of 38.84, the responding domain came in the second rank with a percentage of 33.26, the organizing domain came in the third rank with a percentage of 15.50, the valuing domain came in the fourth rank with a percentage of 7.44, and the internalization domains came in the fifth rank with a percentage of 4.96.

Table 8.
The Affective Domain Principles altogether in Action Pack 3

Affective domain	Frequencies	Percentages	Rank order
Receiving	297	45.76	1
Responding	204	31.43	2
Valuing	34	5.24	4
Organizing	96	14.80	3
Internalization	18	2.77	5
Total	649		

Table 8 shows that the receiving domain came in the first rank with a percentage of 45.76, the responding domain came in the second rank with a percentage of 31.43, the organizing domain came in the third rank with a percentage of 14.80, the valuing domain came in the fourth rank with a percentage of 5.24, and the internalization domains came in the fifth rank with a percentage of 2.77.

It is clear from the results of the three textbooks that the Affective Domain (receiving) has got the first rank among the five Affective Domains. Thus, it can be inferred that the authors

of the three textbooks introduce activities that focus on receiving as one of the Affective Domains.

Different reasons led to this results that authors of the textbooks aim to present the learning material that makes pupils more conscious of the surrounded environment. They are focused on introducing the content of textbooks with more emphasis on the basic information that pupils need in this stage (i.e., primary stage). Another possible reason for this result is that the presented learning activities to pupils who are in grades 1-3 are focused on attention control. Thus, many activities in the analyzed textbooks asked pupils to point to what they hear and select the correct answer. Another activity is asked by pupils to follow the simple instructions and reply to them. These activities improve pupils' attention and later control it.

For the internalization criterion, it has got the last rank among the five Affective Domains. One possible reason, for this reason, is that the internalization criterion focused on using the values that the learner internalized. It also alters behavior and revises conclusions in light of new information. Internalization is concerned with a student's ability to impact his or her general awareness to internalize the effect and guide and regulate his or her conduct. This area allows students to demonstrate their understanding of the values they are given. It emphasizes morals and asks students to manage and govern their behavior. The internalization criterion is the highest level in Krathwohl's Taxonomy of the Affective Domain. In fact, due to the previous illustration and due to the age of the pupils at this level, it is difficult for the pupils in grades 1-3 to grasp and acquire these two characteristics, hence little attention is placed on them in this textbook.

The findings of this study indicated that the arrangement of the Affective Domain criteria, that appear in the textbooks understudy, indicates a pre-planned, rather than random, inclination to include the Affective Domain in a way that suits the learners' age. Moreover, it is obvious from the results that the textbook *Action Pack 3* ranked first, *Action Pack 2* ranked second, and *Action Pack 1* ranked third with 527 occurrences. This means that the author pays attention to the student's development and learning abilities where the student is moving through a certain period in the growing-up process.

Recommendations for further research

Based on the findings that the current study revealed, the researcher recommends the following

- Researchers are invited to conduct studies to explore the Affective Domain's role in improving learners' ability in other skills (e.g., speaking, listening).
- The Ministry of Education is advised to hold training programs and workshops to emphasize teachers' awareness of the Affective Domain criteria in teaching language skills. Prior to the design of textbooks and when they are used, the Ministry of Education should conduct a needs analysis, as well as evaluation and revision of editions. Moreover, teachers' input is critical because they are the ones who have the information on hand and must put it into practice to teach within the Affective Domain standards.
- Teachers can use content analysis studies relating to the Affective Domain criteria to improve their teaching of those principles concerning their students' needs. As a result, their communicative competence will improve, and teachers will be less reliant on traditional instructional methods.

References

- Agustin, M. (2017). *Affective, Cognitive, and Psychometric Domain in Student Book "Bahasa Inggris" for Grade XI Senior High School*. Thesis, Department of Language Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, State Islamic Institute of Palangka Raya. Advisors: (I) Sabarun, M.Pd., (II) Aris Sugianto, M.Pd.
- Alderson, J. (2000). *Assessing reading*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Bloom, B., & Krathwohl, D. (1958). *Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objective*. Retrieved 1 November 2021, from <https://www.uky.edu/~rsand1/china2018/texts/Bloom%20et%20al%20-Taxonomy%20of%20Educational%20Objectives.pdf>
- Bloom, B., Engelhart, M., Furst, E., Hill, W. & Krathwohl, D. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. Handbook 1: Cognitive domain*. New York: David McKay.
- Caine, R., & Caine, G. (1991). *Making connections: Teaching and the Human Brain*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Combs, A. (1982). Affective education or none at all. *Educational leadership*, 39(7), 495-497. Retrieved 18 March 2021 from, https://files.ascd.org/staticfiles/ascd/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_198204_combs.pdf
- Elias, M., DeFini, J. & Bergmann, J. (2010). Coordinating Social-Emotional and Character Development (SECD) Initiatives Improve School Climate and Student Learning. *Middle School Journal*, 42(1), 30-37.
- Geisert, P. (1972). *The Dimensions of Measurement of the Affective Domain*. Unpublished Thesis. University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming.
- Grabe, W. & Stoller, F. (2002) *Teaching and researching reading*. London: Pearson, Education.
- Hanna, W. (2007). The New Bloom's Taxonomy: Implications for Music Education. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 108(4), 7-16. Retrieved 22 June 2021, from https://www.academia.edu/875401/The_new_Blooms_taxonomy_Implications_for_music_education.
- Harriman, N. (2005). Perceptions of Students and Educators on the Impact of No Child Left Behind: Some Will and Some Won't. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 24(1), 64-69. Retrieved 10 October 2021, from <https://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy>.
- Hough, D. (2011). Characteristics of Effective Professional Development: An Examination of the Developmental Designs Character Education Classroom Management Approach in Middle Grades Schools. *Middle Grades Research Journal*, 6(3), 129-143. Retrieved 1 January 2021, from <https://www.thefreelibrary.com/Characteristics+of+effective+professional+development%3A+an+examination...-a0284015988>
- Myunghee, K., Heok, H., Il-Hyun, J., Jongho, S., & Jeonghee, S. (2010). Developing an Educational Performance Indicator for New Millennium Learners. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 43(2), 157-170. Retrieved 7 February 2021, from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ907024.pdf>
- Neill, M. (2006). Preparing Teachers to Beat the Agonies of NCLB. *Education Digest*, 71(8), 8-12. Retrieved 12 May 2020, from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ741052>
- Noddings, N. (1996). Stories And Affect in Teacher Education. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 26(3), 435-647.

- Parra, Y. (2010). Explicit Teaching of Socio-Affective Language Learning Strategies to Beginner EFL Students. *Íkala, revista de lenguaje y cultura*, 15(24), 145-169.
- Popham, W. (2011). *Classroom assessment: What teachers need to know*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Pretorius, E. (2000). *Inference Generation in the Reading of Expository Texts by University Students* (Doctoral Dissertation, University of South Africa).
- Riazi, A. (2010). *Evaluation of learning objectives in Iranian high-school and pre-university English textbooks using Bloom's taxonomy*. ESL-EJ.
- Rosenfield, I. (1988). *The Invention of Memory*. New York: Basic Books.
- Russell, M. (2007). The Importance of the Affective Domain in Further Education Classroom Culture. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 9(2), 249-270.
- Sowell, E. (2005). *Curriculum: An integrative introduction*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Weaver, P. (2004). The Culture of Teaching and Mentoring for Compliance. *Childhood Education: Annual Theme*, 80 (5), 258-260.