

## ANALYSIS OF TASK COMPLEXITY LEVELS IN READING TASKS OF THE ENGLISH TEXTBOOK (*WORK IN PROGRESS*) BASED ON THE SOLO TAXONOMY

SITI AISYAH<sup>1</sup>, CHUSNUL CHOTIMAH<sup>2</sup>, ENCI ZARKASIH<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup>Universitas Islam As-Asyafi'iyah

<sup>1</sup>sitiaisyah51880@gmail.com, <sup>2</sup>chusnulchotimah.08@gmail.com, <sup>3</sup>encizarkasih1963@gmail.com

First Received: March 10, 2026

Final Proof Received: June 30, 2026

### Abstract

English textbooks play a central role in shaping students' cognitive development, particularly in reading activities that are expected to foster critical and meaningful learning in line with the Merdeka Curriculum. Although the textbook *Work in Progress* has been recognized as structurally well-designed and aligned with curriculum standards, limited studies have examined whether its reading tasks truly promote deep learning as conceptualized in the Structure of the Observed Learning Outcomes (SOLO) Taxonomy. Most previous analyses relied on Bloom's or Barrett's Taxonomy, which tend to classify questions into lower- and higher-order categories without considering the developmental progression of understanding. Therefore, this study aims to analyze the levels of task complexity in the reading activities of *Work in Progress* for Grade X using the SOLO Taxonomy framework. This research employed qualitative content analysis involving 72 reading tasks selected from six units of the textbook. Each task was coded and classified into five hierarchical SOLO levels: Prestructural, Unistructural, Multistructural, Relational, and Extended Abstract. The findings reveal that the majority of tasks are concentrated at the Unistructural (34.72%) and Multistructural (27.78%) levels, indicating a strong emphasis on information retrieval and identification of discrete ideas. Although Relational tasks (26.39%) are reasonably represented, tasks categorized as Extended Abstract (9.72%) remain limited. These results suggest that while the textbook supports structured comprehension and moderate integration of ideas, it does not consistently encourage abstract reasoning or evaluative thinking. In conclusion, the cognitive demands reflected in the reading tasks align partially with the deep learning orientation of the Merdeka Curriculum; therefore, teachers may need to supplement the textbook with additional tasks that require abstract reasoning to promote sustained critical engagement.

**Keywords:** SOLO Taxonomy, task complexity, reading tasks, Textbook analysis

## INTRODUCTION

English Language Teaching (ELT) textbooks play a crucial role in shaping language learning (Mubarok, Sofiana, and Mahendra 2024). They often become the main source of language input and classroom activities. As a result, teachers depend on textbook tasks to support students' cognitive growth and overall language learning. The English textbook *Work in Progress* for Grade X is among the most commonly used educational resources in high schools across Indonesia. Under the Merdeka Curriculum, senior high school students are expected to develop stronger communication and critical thinking skills, as stated in the English Learning Outcomes, which require learners to communicate effectively in various contexts and think creatively (Kemdikbud, 2022). Therefore, teaching materials should foster higher-order thinking and support deep learning.

Studies indicate that *Work in Progress* is well-structured and aligned with curriculum standards, but it remains unclear whether its tasks support deep learning. This issue is highlighted by Indonesia's declining PISA reading scores, which show students' difficulties

with complex texts. Therefore, this study examines the cognitive demands of the textbook's tasks using the SOLO Taxonomy to determine their potential to promote higher-order thinking and deep learning.

The Structure of Observed Learning Outcomes (SOLO) Taxonomy, developed by Biggs and Collis in 1982, is a key framework for analyzing cognitive complexity in learning tasks, especially reading activities. It explains stages of learning and helps teachers design progressive instruction. Recent research shows that SOLO reflects how learners move from basic understanding to deeper learning and supports evaluation of their reasoning quality (Ghunaimat and Alawneh 2024). The SOLO Taxonomy offers a systematic framework for examining the complexity of learning tasks and the quality of students' understanding (Aksoy 2021). It consists of five hierarchical levels: Prestructural, Unistructural, Multistructural, Relational, and Extended Abstract, which reflect increasing levels of quality in learners' reasoning.

In educational theory, deep learning is understood as the capacity of learners to develop meaningful understanding, connect different concepts, and use knowledge in new situations rather than simply memorizing facts (Biggs 1987). This approach differs from surface learning, which centers mainly on recalling separate pieces of information without deeper comprehension. Within reading instruction, deep learning becomes evident when students are asked to analyze ideas, evaluate arguments, synthesize information, applying what they have learned to different contexts. For this reason, the upper stages of the SOLO Taxonomy; Relational and Extended Abstract, serve as strong indicators of deeper cognitive involvement and meaningful understanding.

In line with this framework, deep learning in the Merdeka Curriculum refers to students' ability to build meaningful understanding, connect ideas, and apply knowledge beyond surface learning. In reading activities, deep learning is reflected in tasks that require students to explain relationships, evaluate ideas, and extend meaning. The Relational and Extended Abstract levels of the SOLO Taxonomy are therefore most relevant, as they represent integrated and abstract reasoning. Examining tasks at these levels helps indicate whether reading activities provide sufficient opportunities for deep cognitive engagement.

Previous studies examining English textbooks in Indonesian EFL contexts have primarily relied on Bloom's and Barrett's Taxonomies to classify cognitive levels (Grace and Riry, 2025; Gustiwan et al., 2021; Qisthi, 2025). While these studies provide insight into the distribution of higher- and lower-order questions, they do not capture the developmental structure of understanding as emphasized in the SOLO framework. Studies by Fitria (2022) and Pasaribu (2022) found that *Work in Progress* is well organized and meets quality criteria for English textbooks, but the study does not address the cognitive complexity of tasks or their role in supporting deep learning. Systematic review shows that the SOLO Taxonomy effectively distinguishes surface and deep learning and serves as a valid framework for examining cognitive complexity across disciplines (Adeniji et al., 2022; Ningsih et al., 2025). Although most reviewed studies are outside English language education, their findings support the use of SOLO as a valid framework for examining cognitive complexity in learning tasks.

Despite growing attention to textbook evaluation, most previous studies have relied on Bloom's and Barrett's Taxonomies to classify cognitive levels. While these frameworks identify lower- and higher-order questions, they do not examine the developmental structure

of understanding emphasized in the SOLO Taxonomy. Moreover, limited research has analyzed how the distribution of cognitive complexity in reading tasks aligns with the deep learning orientation of the Merdeka Curriculum. Therefore, a developmental analysis using the SOLO framework is necessary to better understand whether textbook tasks progressively support deeper levels of reasoning.

Therefore, this study aims to examine the levels of task complexity found in the reading activities of the English textbook *Work in Progress* using the SOLO Taxonomy as the analytical framework. Specifically, it explores the types of cognitive complexity reflected in the reading tasks, how these tasks are distributed across the five SOLO levels, and what this distribution reveals about the cognitive demands imposed by the textbook. In doing so, it addresses three main questions: what types of cognitive complexity are reflected in the reading tasks, how these tasks are distributed across the five levels of the SOLO Taxonomy, and what this distribution reveals about the cognitive demands imposed by the textbook.

#### **METHOD**

This research applies qualitative content analysis to examine the cognitive complexity of reading tasks in the English textbook *Work in Progress* for Grade X. The data consisted of 72 reading tasks selected from six units, including both text-based and multimodal activities. The analysis focused exclusively on task instructions and prompts, while other sections and student responses were excluded.

The primary data source is the textbook (Hermawan, Haryanti, & Suryaningsih, 2022), published by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology. The study was conducted from November to March, covering the stages of task identification, coding, classification, and interpretation.

The main research instrument in this study was document analysis, with the researcher serving as the primary instrument responsible for interpreting and categorizing the data.

Data collection involved: (1) identifying relevant reading sections, (2) selecting and documenting tasks from the chosen units, (3) compiling tasks into a structured table, and (4) organizing analysis tasks based on SOLO criteria.

Data analysis followed four stages: (1) Coding: reviewing each task to determine the required cognitive response and assigning SOLO levels (P, U, M, R, EA); (2) Classification: grouping tasks according to their cognitive complexity; (3) Interpretation: examining the distribution of tasks across SOLO levels to identify patterns of cognitive demand. To ensure reliability and consistency of the findings, the coding procedures followed a structured protocol based on well-defined SOLO criteria. Each reading activity was analyzed in detail and revisited several times to ensure stable and consistent categorization. The classification process relied on widely accepted theoretical principles of the SOLO Taxonomy, reducing the possibility of personal bias or subjective judgment.

Table 1. Example of SOLO Coding Analysis

Reading Tasks	SOLO Level	Justification
What do you notice first in the picture?	P	Surface observation without structured understanding
What does the picture tell you?	U	One direct interpretation
How does the picture relate to the written text?	R	Integration of two modes
What happens with the message of the text if the picture is deleted?	EA	Hypothetical abstract reasoning

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### Findings

#### Distribution of SOLO Levels in Reading Tasks

In responding to the first and second research questions, the reading tasks were analyzed by assigning codes and grouping them according to the five hierarchical levels of the SOLO Taxonomy. Each task was evaluated in terms of the cognitive response it demanded, with particular attention to the levels of integration, abstraction, and conceptual linkage involved.

The distribution of results derived from the analysis of 72 reading tasks across six units is presented as follows:

Table 2. Distribution of Reading Tasks Across SOLO Taxonomy Levels

SOLO Levels	Frequency	Percentage
Prestructural (P)	1	1.39%
Unistructural (U)	25	34.72%
Multistructural (M)	20	27.78%
Relational (R)	19	26.39%
Extended Abstract (EA)	7	9.72%
<b>Total</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Interpretation of Cognitive Demands

The findings reveal that the largest proportion of tasks (34.72%) is categorized at the Unistructural level, suggesting that many questions ask students to locate or identify a single piece of information. This can be seen in items such as “What is the main idea of the text?” and “How did he get known as a rocket man?”, which primarily emphasize information retrieval rather than the integration of ideas.

Tasks at the Multistructural level account for 27.78% and are commonly found in activities like matching headings with paragraphs or identifying reasons that support a claim. While these tasks require students to consider more than one piece of information, they do not demand that the ideas be combined into a unified understanding.

Relational tasks make up 26.39% of the distribution and are reflected in questions such as “How does the picture relate to the written text?” as well as comparison activities between the traditional and fractured versions of *Little Red Riding Hood*. These tasks encourage learners to link ideas and develop integrated meaning.

Extended Abstract tasks represent 9.72% of the total and include questions like “What would happen if the picture were deleted?” and “Which writer do you agree with? Explain your answer.” Such questions require hypothetical thinking and evaluative judgment that go beyond the information provided in the text, although their presence remains relatively limited.

Taken together, this pattern suggests that the textbook places greater emphasis on comprehension and basic information processing, whereas opportunities for sustained abstract reasoning and evaluation are less frequently provided.

### **The Overall Cognitive Demands Reflected in the Distribution**

Even though lower-order and higher-order tasks are present in the same proportion (36.11% each), the pattern of distribution indicates that higher-order tasks mostly occur at the Relational level rather than at the Extended Abstract level. This suggests that students are occasionally encouraged to make connections between ideas, but rarely asked to generalize, evaluate critically, or transfer knowledge beyond the text.

The high frequency of Unistructural tasks (34.72%) further shows that the textbook mainly focuses on recognizing explicit information and supporting literal comprehension. Although Multistructural and Relational tasks help develop a broader, more integrated understanding, opportunities for continuous abstract and transformative thinking remain limited.

In relation to deep learning and the Merdeka Curriculum, which emphasizes critical thinking, creativity, and meaningful knowledge transfer, the textbook demonstrates partial alignment. It supports structured comprehension and moderate integration of ideas, but it does not consistently scaffold learners toward higher-level evaluative and abstract reasoning. In general, the textbook's cognitive demands are moderate. The textbook facilitates structured understanding and some degree of idea integration; however, it does not consistently foster deep, evaluative, or abstract thinking.

### **Discussion**

The findings of this study can be interpreted through the framework of the SOLO Taxonomy, which conceptualizes learning as a progression from surface-level understanding to deep and abstract thinking. The dominance of Unistructural and Multistructural tasks indicates that the textbook primarily supports surface approaches to learning; students are asked to focus on one piece of information or several separate ideas without being encouraged to connect them into a bigger picture. This indicates that the textbook tends to emphasize comprehension and information processing rather than pushing students toward more complex thinking.

This pattern is also common in many EFL textbooks, where reading activities often focus on literal understanding and specific comprehension skills (Maryamah, Wati, and Suharto 2024; Zainil 2026; Ekalia, Jemadi, and Beda 2025). The inclusion of some Relational tasks shows that there are attempts to help students link ideas and develop a more connected understanding of the text. However, the relatively small number of Extended Abstract tasks suggests that students have limited chances to question the text, form broader interpretations, or apply what they learn beyond the reading itself. Because of this, learners may not often be

encouraged to move beyond the text or develop their own interpretations in a more independent way.

From a deep learning perspective, meaningful learning happens when students actively connect ideas, reflect on what they read, and apply their knowledge in new contexts. The distribution of tasks found in this study suggests that these kinds of opportunities are not consistently built into the textbook. Since lower level tasks appear much more frequently than higher level ones, students may be more likely to rely on surface learning strategies. Over time, this imbalance could limit the development of stronger analytical and critical thinking skills.

When these findings are viewed in relation to the Merdeka Curriculum, the textbook appears to show only partial alignment with the goals of the curriculum. While it supports basic comprehension and some level of idea integration, it does not consistently encourage students to think critically, creatively, or extend their understanding beyond the text. This suggests that there is still a gap between what the curriculum aims to promote and the level of thinking that the textbook actually encourages in practice.

#### **Pedagogical Implication**

Several pedagogical implications can be drawn from these findings. Teachers may need to enrich the textbook by providing additional tasks that foster evaluative thinking and conceptual generalization. For example, Relational-level activities can be extended into analytical writing or argumentative discussion to strengthen cognitive integration. In addition, Multistructural tasks could be modified so that students are required to synthesize information rather than simply list ideas, which would encourage deeper processing. Incorporating more systematically designed Extended Abstract questions would further support sustained critical engagement and help classroom practices better reflect deep learning principles.

#### **CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**

This research employed the SOLO Taxonomy to analyze the cognitive complexity of reading tasks in the English textbook *Work in Progress* for Grade X. The results reveal that most reading tasks fall within the Unistructural and Multistructural levels, which mainly focus on retrieving information and identifying several ideas without requiring students to integrate them. While a reasonable number of Relational tasks are present and provide opportunities for linking and synthesizing ideas, tasks at the Extended Abstract level appear far less frequently. This pattern indicates that the textbook offers structured comprehension activities and some degree of conceptual integration, yet it does not consistently encourage abstract reasoning, evaluative thinking, or the transfer of knowledge to new contexts.

From a conceptual standpoint, the cognitive demands represented in the textbook show partial alignment with the deep learning orientation promoted by the Merdeka Curriculum. The inclusion of Relational-level tasks suggests that learners are, at times, guided to construct integrated understanding. Nevertheless, the limited presence of Extended Abstract tasks implies that chances for sustained critical thinking and transformative learning remain insufficient. In general, the textbook facilitates basic and intermediate levels of cognitive engagement, but its alignment with the curriculum's emphasis on deep, evaluative, and creative thinking can be considered moderate.

This study has several limitations. First, the analysis was limited to six selected units and focused solely on reading tasks, which may not fully represent the overall cognitive profile of

the textbook. Second, the study relied exclusively on document analysis without examining classroom implementation or student responses. Therefore, the findings reflect potential cognitive demands rather than actual learning outcomes.

Regarding future research, researchers are encouraged to broaden the scope of analysis by including other language skills, such as listening, speaking, and writing, to gain a more comprehensive picture of the textbook's cognitive profile. Future studies may also conduct comparisons across different textbooks, grade levels, or curricula to identify patterns of cognitive progression and consistency. In addition, combining SOLO-based analysis with classroom observations or data on student performance could help clarify how task complexity is reflected in actual learning processes and outcomes. Such research would contribute to a deeper understanding of the connections between textbook design, instructional practices, and the development of higher-order thinking skills.

#### **REFERENCES:**

- Adeniji, Saidat Morenike, Penelope Baker, and Martin Schmude. 2022. "Structure of the Observed Learning Outcomes ( SOLO ) Model: A Mixed-Method Systematic Review of Research in Mathematics Education." 18(6).
- Aksoy, Sevil Hasirci. 2021. "JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTIC STUDIES A Critical Perspective in Terms of SOLO Taxonomy for Reading Outcomes in Mother-Tongue Teaching Curriculums ( 1981 , 2006 and 2019 ) in Turkey." 17(1):327–45. doi: 10.52462/jlls.20.
- Biggs, John. 1987. *Student Approaches to LEARNING and STUDYING*. Vol. 32.
- Biggs, John B., and Kevin F. Collis. 1982. "Evaluating the Quality of Learning: The SOLO Taxonomy."
- Ekalia, Yulian Juita, Fransiskus Jemadi, and Raimundus Beda. 2025. "THE COGNITIVE LEVELS IN READING COMPREHENSION QUESTIONS: A BLOOM'S TAXONOMY STUDY OF THE GRADE 8 ENGLISH FOR NUSANTARA TEXTBOOK IN THE INDONESIAN EFL CONTEXT." 5(2):166–80.
- Fitria, Tira Nur. 2022. "Quality of English Textbook Work in Progress for SMA/SMK/MA Class X in Edition 2022: A Content Analysis."
- Ghunaimat, Mohammad A., and Esraa Ahmed Alawneh. 2024. "The Effectiveness of Using the SOLO Taxonomy in Acquiring Students the Concepts of Coordinate Geometry." 5(3):523–36.
- Grace, Jholie, and Imanuella Riry. 2025. "Analyzing Reading Comprehension Questions in English Textbooks Using Barrett ' s Taxonomy." 2(2):144–54. doi: 10.30598/matail.v5i2.18343.
- Gustiwan, Farhan, Movi Riana Rahmawanti, Yani Awaliyah Indah, English Education Program, Universitas Ibn Khaldun, and Taxonomy Bloom. 2021. CONTENT ANALYSIS OF MANDATORY ENGLISH TEXTBOOK BASED ON BLOOM'S TAXONOMY OF COGNITIVE DOMAIN AND ITS IMPLICATION FOR MATERIAL DEVELOPMENT." *Bogor English Student and Teacher (BEST)* 139–47.
- Maryamah, Siti Ega, Setyo Wati, and Pipit Prihartanti Suharto. 2024. "Analyzing Higher Order Thinking Skills in Reading Exercises of Indonesian EFL Textbook." *SALEE: Study of Applied Linguistics and English Education* 5(2):560–70. doi:

- 10.35961/salee.v5i2.927.
- Mubarok, Husni, Nina Sofiana, and Danang Mahendra. 2024. "An Evaluation of English Language Textbook for Senior High School Students in Indonesia." 2024:45–55. doi: 10.18502/kss.v9i6.15253.
- Ningsih, Seri, Riyo Riyadi, and Vitria Puri Rahayu. 2025. "Students ' Thinking Skills in Solving HOTS Standardized Problems Based on the SOLO Taxonomy of Economics Subjects at Senior High School." 6(1):22–30.
- Pasaribu, Arsen Nahum. 2022. "The Efl Students' Perceptions of the Quality of the English Language Textbook." *English Review: Journal of English Education* 10(2):409–20. doi: 10.25134/erjee.v10i2.6242.
- Qisthi, Atina Firdausa. 2025. "Investigating Cognitive Levels on Reading Comprehension Questions in EFL Textbook for Merdeka Curriculum." 4778:5063–76. doi: 10.24256/ideas.
- Zainil, Yetti. 2026. "ANALYZING HIGHER AND LOWER ORDER THINKING SKILLS IN THE ' ENGLISH FOR NUSANTARA ' GRADE VIII TEXTBOOK." 14(1):366–76.

## APPENDIX

### Appendix 1.

Chapter	Reading Task	Code	Justification
Unit 1: Great Athletes	1. What is the main idea of the text?	U	Identifies one central concept
	2. What makes Cristiano Ronaldo different from other players in scoring a goal?	M	Requires identifying multiple supporting details
	3. How did he get known as a rocket man?	U	Single cause identification
	4. How does the text organized its idea about Ronaldo?	R	Requires understanding text structure
	5. "Ronaldo's G-force is ive times higher than that of a cheetah." What can you infer from the sentence above?	R	Requires connecting clues (inferential reasoning)
	6. What is the function of the picture in relation to the verbal text?	R	Requires linking visual and verbal meaning
	Matching "Speed, Success, Jumps, Goal Skills, Training" with paragraphs	M	Multiple details but no integration
	1. What do you notice first from the picture?	P	Surface observation without structured understanding
	2. What does the picture tell you?	U	One direct interpretation
	3. How does the picture relate to the written text?	R	Integration of two modes
	4. What happens with the message of		

	the text if the picture is deleted?	EA	Hypothetical abstract reasoning
Unit 2: Sport Events	<p>Read and Rearrange: Andi is writing about his experience of watching a football match. In pairs, rearrange the paragraphs into a meaningful text. Discuss your results with the class.</p> <p>The task requires students to reorganize a recount text describing a football match experience</p>	R	Requires understanding coherence and structure
Unit 3: Sports and Health	<p>Disajikan infografis siswa diminta untuk menentukan true or false</p> <p>Infografis A: The following activities can maintain your mental health (True False)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Engross yourself shortly with what is around you.</li> <li>2. Remind yourself that some things can go wrong.</li> <li>3. Mind your bodily well-being.</li> </ol> <p>Infografis B; The following activities can help you lose weight</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Miss your morning meals.</li> <li>2. Avoid drinking water when you get up from your sleep.</li> <li>3. Have a big portion for your lunch.</li> </ol>	U	Students identify whether a single statement matches textual information.
	<p>Complete the following sentences with ONE word from the infographics.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In order to lose weight, you need to avoid a sedentary lifestyle and begin to ..... around.</li> <li>2. Make sure you have enough gap between your dinner and your .....</li> <li>3. Talking about your problem may help you with mental health only if you ..... the person you talk to.</li> </ol>	U	Retrieval of one lexical item from the infographic.

	<p>4. You need to convince ..... that despite all the problems, by the end of the day everything is going to be fine.</p> <p>5. You need to consume ..... the first thing in the morning.</p>		
<p>Unit 4: Healthy Foods</p>	<p>Look at the following statements (Questions 15) and the list of tips. Match each statement with the correct tips, AF based on the reading text.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It takes time for the brain to get the information that you have eaten enough. (.....)</li> <li>2. You need to focus and find a proper place to eat. (.....)</li> <li>3. Cook your own meal for healthier and cheaper options. (.....)</li> <li>4. Food is best when they are not over-processed. (.....)</li> <li>5. More variation means more nutrients in your food. (.....)</li> </ol> <p>Tips of Healthy Eating</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Eat real food, not processed food.</li> <li>B. Eat a variety of different foods.</li> <li>C. Cook more than eating out</li> <li>D. Stop eating before you are full.</li> <li>E. Eat at the dining table, not in your car or at your desk.</li> <li>F. Drink water and forget everything else.</li> </ol>	<p>M</p>	<p>Multiple pieces of information matched independently.</p>
	<p>Answer the questions based on the information you get from the text.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Who will find the information in the text useful?</li> <li>2. In what kind of reading section will you likely find this type of text?</li> <li>3. In Rule number 5, “Eat at the Dining Table, Not in Your Car or at</li> </ol>	<p>R  R</p>	<p>Requires contextual application and reasoning.  Requires recognizing genre characteristics.</p>

	<p>Your Desk,” the word ‘this’ in the sentence ‘Following this rule also reduces the chances of eating when you are bored,’ refers to ....</p> <p>4. “Stop Eating Before You Are Full,” the word ‘satiated’ in the sentence ‘...stop eating before you feel completely satiated,’ can be best replaced by what word?</p>	<p>U</p> <p>U</p>	<p>Identifying referent in sentence.</p> <p>Vocabulary recall within context.</p>
<p>Unit 5; Graffiti</p>	<p>Read the statements and decide if they are found/discussed in either Expository Text 1 or Expository Text 2. Tick the appropriate box. Tick both, if the statement is found/discussed in both Expository Text 1 or Expository Text 2. Tick neither, if the statement is not found/discussed in both.</p> <p>Read the two texts again carefully this time, pay attention to the details, then select the best answer.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Graffiti is a type of art.</li> <li>2. Graffiti is always vandalism.</li> <li>3. Graffiti is a celebrate by those who are juvenile</li> <li>4. Graffiti connects the public and the artist</li> <li>5. Graffiti turns a simple building into a masterpiece</li> <li>6. Graffiti has the power to affect people positively</li> <li>7. Graffiti is committed without permission on another person’s property</li> <li>8. No two pieces of graffiti are the same</li> <li>9. Physical disorder and vandalism have a contagious effect</li> <li>10. Everyone is meant to be appreciated</li> </ol>	<p>M</p>	<p>Requires checking and comparing content in both texts.</p>

	11. The one who created graffiti is usually involves in other crimes as well																	
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 30%;">Structure</th> <th style="width: 30%;">Expository Text 1</th> <th style="width: 30%;">Expository Text 2</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>What is the author claiming?</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>What reasons does the author use to support the claim?</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>What evidence does the author include?</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>What does the author say as the closing?</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Structure	Expository Text 1	Expository Text 2	What is the author claiming?			What reasons does the author use to support the claim?			What evidence does the author include?			What does the author say as the closing?			U  M  M  U	Identifies one central claim.  Lists several supporting points.  Identifies multiple evidences.  Identifies one concluding idea.
Structure	Expository Text 1	Expository Text 2																
What is the author claiming?																		
What reasons does the author use to support the claim?																		
What evidence does the author include?																		
What does the author say as the closing?																		
	<p>Now, read the following posts written by Hanif and Sofia.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Why do you think they write the posts?</li> <li>2. Which writer do you agree with? Explain your answer. Refer to what is written on the posts.</li> <li>3. How would you feel if somebody painted graffiti on your property?</li> <li>4. Who owns the graffiti? If somebody paints on your property, can you legally claim the artwork as your own?</li> <li>5. In your opinion, what would the world be like without graffiti?</li> </ol>	R  EA  EA  EA  EA	Requires interpretation of purpose.  Requires evaluation + justification.  Personal evaluation beyond text.  Abstract reasoning + legal conceptualization.  Hypothetical generalization.															

Unit 6: Fractured Stories	<p>Read and Answer (Part 1) Little Red Riding Hood (Traditional Version)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Why did Little Red Riding Hood walk through the forest?</li> <li>2. What rule did Little Red Riding Hood break when she talked to the wolf?</li> <li>3. Why did the wolf ask Little Red Riding Hood where her grandmother lived?</li> <li>4. What might happen if the woodsman were not there?</li> </ol> <p>Read and Answer (Part 2) Little Red Riding Hood (A Fractured Fairy Tale)</p> <p>Answer the following questions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Who told the story?</li> <li>2. What made the girl scream an ear piercing scream?</li> <li>3. How could the world find out Grandma's place?</li> <li>4. What made the girl realize that it was not her grandma who take the goodies?</li> <li>5. What is meant by "cat got your tongue? In "Cat got your tongue?" The dwarf said, and pulled out a cat."</li> <li>6. What would happen if the grandma did not jump into the wolf's mouth?</li> </ol>	<p>U</p> <p>U</p> <p>U</p> <p>EA</p> <p>U</p> <p>U</p> <p>U</p> <p>U</p> <p>R</p> <p>EA</p>	<p>Requires recalling one explicit reason.</p> <p>Identifies one specific rule from the text.</p> <p>Requires one stated motivation.</p> <p>Requires predicting an alternative outcome.</p> <p>Identifies the narrator.</p> <p>Requires recalling one cause.</p> <p>Identifies one explanation.</p> <p>Requires recalling one clue.</p> <p>Requires interpreting figurative meaning.</p> <p>Requires hypothetical reasoning.</p>
	<p>Let's Compare Fill in the table below to compare the traditional story in Task A and fractured story in Task 3 point B.</p> <p>Did both stories ...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Have all the same characters?</li> </ol>	<p>R</p> <p>R</p>	<p>Requires comparing two texts.</p> <p>Requires cross-text comparison.</p>

	2. Have the same setting?	R	Compares narrative structure.
	3. Have the same beginning?	R	Requires structural comparison.
	4. Have the same middle?	R	Compares story resolution.
	5. End the same way?	R	Requires identifying and
	6. Have the same main characters?	R	comparing roles.
	7. Have the same problems?		Compares central conflicts.

### **Appendix 2. SOLO Taxonomy Measurement Indicators for Question Analysis**

<b>SOLO Level</b>	<b>Cognitive Demand of the Question</b>	<b>Question Indicators</b>
Prestructural	Requires recognition of isolated or surface-level information	The question asks for basic identification of a simple fact without requiring conceptual understanding
Unistructural	Focuses on one relevant aspect of the material	The question requires the identification of one specific idea, detail, or concept from the text
Multistructural	Involves several relevant aspects considered independently	The question requires listing or explaining multiple pieces of information without relating them
Relational	Requires integration of ideas into a coherent understanding	The question asks students to analyze relationships, compare ideas, or explain connections between parts of the text
Extended Abstract	Requires generalization, evaluation, or application beyond the given material	The question asks students to evaluate, justify opinions, draw conclusions, or apply concepts to new contexts