Examining Instructors' Awareness on the Implementation of Bloom's Revised Taxonomy in Teaching Turkish as a Foreign/ Second Language[1]

Eser KOCAMAN GÜRATA[2]
Mine AKDEMİR[3]
Mustafa DURMUŞ[4]

Abstract

Questions and activities in language teaching should be designed to contribute to higher-order thinking processes with this objective in mind. Instructors are expected to be aware of various factors, such as how the questions and activities are prepared, whether the outcomes meet higher-order cognitive skills, and which learning objectives are selected. In this context, this study aims to evaluate questions and activities prepared according to Bloom's Revised Taxonomy in teaching Turkish as a foreign/ second language regarding instructor awareness. The study group consisted of 86 instructors aged between 23 and 60 working at Turkish Language Teaching Centers (TÖMER). In this study, a descriptive survey model was employed, incorporating both quantitative and qualitative features. Quantitative data were obtained through a questionnaire and qualitative data were gathered through semi-structured interviews. Content analysis was used to analyze the qualitative data. The quantitative data were analyzed using the SPSS program, and the results were presented in tables with percentages and frequencies. As a result, the study identified based on which cognitive level instructors prioritized to match verbs, questions, and activities related to cognitive levels, which level they focused on, and which level they disregarded. This study is significant in providing perspectives for instructors, curriculum developers, exam developers, test designers, experts in assessment and evaluation, and prospective instructors interested in the field.

Keywords: *Turkish as a foreign/ second language, Bloom's taxonomy, instructor awareness, higher-order thinking skills, assessing cognitive skills.*

---

[1] This study was presented as a paper at the International Symposium on Measurement, Selection and Placement

[2] Dr., Öğr. Gör., Hacettepe Üniversitesi, eserkocaman@gmail.com, ORCID:0000-0002-0774-3208
[3] Öğr. Gör., Hacettepe Üniversitesi, mineakdemir@hacettepe.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-5047-3020
[4] Prof. Dr., Hacettepe Üniversitesi, mustafadurmus@hacettepe.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-5337-3113

Kaynak gösterme: Kocaman Gürata, E., Akdemir, M. ve Durmuş, M. (2025). Examining instructors' awareness on the implementation of bloom's revised taxonomy in teaching Turkish as a foreign/ second language. *Aydın TÖMER Dil Dergisi, 10*(2), 253-293 Doi:10.17932/IAU.TOMER.2016.019/tomer_v010i2003
Geliş tarihi: 08. 02. 2025 – Kabul tarihi: 10.06.2025

Yenilenmiş Bloom Taksonomisi'nin Yabancı/İkinci Dil Olarak Türkçe Öğretiminde Uygulanmasına Yönelik Öğretici Farkındalığının İncelenmesi

Öz

Yabancı/ikinci dil öğretiminde temel amaç, öğrenenlerin yalnızca belirli bilgiyi veya kullanacakları ifadeleri ezberlemeleri yerine, öğrendiklerini sorgulayan, eleştirel düşünen ve yaratıcı biçimde değerlendiren bireyler olarak yetişmelerini sağlamaktır. Bu doğrultuda, dil öğretiminde kullanılan soru ve etkinliklerin, üst düzey bilişsel süreçleri (değerlendirme ve yaratma gibi) destekleyecek şekilde tasarlanması gerekmektedir. Bu bağlamda, öğreticilerin, hazırlanan soru ve etkinliklerin nasıl ve hangi yöntemlerle oluşturulduğu, bunların üst düzey bilişsel becerileri ne ölçüde karşıladığı ve hangi öğrenme hedeflerine hizmet ettiği gibi çeşitli faktörlerin farkında olmaları beklenmektedir. Bu çalışma, yabancılara Türkçe öğretiminde Bloom'un Yenilenmiş Taksonomisi doğrultusunda hazırlanan soru ve etkinliklerin, öğreticilerin farkındalığı açısından değerlendirilmesini amaçlamaktadır. Araştırma grubunu, Türkçe Öğretim Merkezlerinde (TÖMER) görev yapan ve yaşları 23 ile 60 arasında değişen 86 öğretici oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmada nitel ve nicel verilerin bir araya getirildiği betimsel nitelikli tarama modeli kullanılmıştır. Çalışma verileri, anket formu ve yarı yapılandırılmış görüşme formu aracılığıyla toplanmıştır. Nitel verilerin analizinde içerik analizi yöntemi kullanılmış olup, kapalı uçlu anket sorularından elde edilen nicel veriler ise SPSS programı ile analiz edilerek yüzde ve frekans tabloları halinde sunulmuştur. Araştırma sonucunda, öğreticilerin bilişsel düzeylere ilişkin fiil, soru ve etkinlikleri hangi bilişsel seviyeye göre önceliklendirdiği, hangi düzeye daha fazla odaklandığı ve hangi düzeyi göz ardı ettiği tespit edilmiştir. Bu çalışma, öğreticilere, müfredat geliştiricilere, sınav hazırlayıcılarına, ölçme ve değerlendirme uzmanlarına ve bu alana ilgi duyan öğretici adaylarına farklı bakış açıları sunması bakımından önem taşımaktadır.

Anahtar kelimeler: *Yabancı/ikinci dil olarak Türkçe, Bloom taksonomisi, öğretici farkındalığı, üst düzey düşünme becerileri, bilişsel becerileri ölçme ve değerlendirme.*

Introduction

Higher-order thinking skills constitute a complex cognitive process that includes elaboration, inference, analysis, and association, which are fundamental mental activities (Utami et al., 2019: 66). These skills also encompass the ability to transfer knowledge, engage in critical thinking, and solve problems. Implementing higher-order thinking skills aims to enhance students' critical thinking abilities. Many countries around the world put significant emphasis on the application of teaching practices based on higher-order thinking skills. To create a better generation with reasoning and critical thinking competencies, it is essential to seek the best strategies to develop these advanced skills (Utami et al., 2019: 65).

Brookhard (2010), defines higher-order thinking in three ways: transferring, critical thinking, and problem-solving. From the perspective of transferring, it is asserted that learning becomes meaningful only when transfer occurs. During the transfer process, learners not only recall information but also interpret and apply what they have learned. According to those who define higher-order thinking in terms of critical thinking, learners engage in logical reasoning, questioning, investigating, observing, identifying, comparing, and connecting, which ultimately leads to decision-making. Those who define it in terms of problem-solving state that learners employ one or more higher-order thinking processes to achieve their goals (Brookhard, 2010: 3-4).

In higher-order processes, the final two levels are particularly notable for the development of higher-order cognitive skills. Accordingly, making judgments based on criteria and standards refers to evaluating, while reorganizing elements into new and coherent structures corresponds to the level of creating. Within this framework, higher-order learning in teaching Turkish as a foreign language involves achieving a good understanding and effective use of the target language as well as interpreting and analyzing complex texts encountered in the target language. Incorporating higher-order questions aimed at creating and evaluating Turkish teaching textbooks and in-class materials, particularly from the B1 level onward, would yield positive outcomes (Arslan & Batur, 2022: 342-343). In this context, when the literature was examined, it was noteworthy that there were no academic studies on the competencies, awareness and opinions of the instructors regarding the teaching of high-level cognitive skills according to levels. Accordingly, this study focuses on determining the level of

awareness among instructors in the field of teaching Turkish as a foreign/ second language concerning teaching higher-order cognitive skills.

Bloom's Revised Taxonomy

In the original version of Bloom's taxonomy, the category of knowledge incorporates both noun and verb characteristics. As a noun, it is explained in the subcategories of the knowledge dimension; as a verb, it is still considered a part of the knowledge dimension as it requires the learner to recall or recognize information (Krathwohl, 2002: 213). In the Revised Taxonomy, the noun and verb aspects are separated into the dimensions of knowledge and cognitive processes. In other words, the previously one-dimensional taxonomy was revised to consist of two dimensions: "Knowledge" and "Cognitive Process" (Airasian & Miranda, 2002: 249). While the knowledge category in the original taxonomy encompassed both noun and verb characteristics, knowledge has been separated into its "noun form" and "verb form" in the Revised Taxonomy (Krathwohl, 2002: 213). Three important aspects were taken into consideration during these changes: (1) The approaches were reviewed and expanded without departing from the framework of the original taxonomy; (2) it was designed in a way that everyone could understand and use; (3) examples of real-world application were used to explain the Revised Taxonomy (Sönmez, 2019: 107). The taxonomy, structured within a hierarchical framework, requires mastering the preceding step before progressing to the next (Krathwohl, 2002: 218). In other words, to understand a concept, one must first recall it. To apply a concept, one must first understand it. To evaluate, one must analyze the information or concept. To arrive at accurate conclusions and produce new knowledge, a comprehensive evaluation is essential. From this perspective, the taxonomy provides a structure focused on the learner's development (Airasian & Miranda, 2002: 253), contributing to developing responsibility and fostering critical thinking skills (Athanassiou, McNett & Harvey, 2003: 538). Thus, this structure offers opportunities that support learners' higher-order cognitive development. Instructors should incorporate this taxonomy into classroom practices to ensure the continuity of learners' development and deliver quality instruction. In a study conducted by Athanassiou, McNett and Harvey (2003: 549), the taxonomy was implemented in the classroom, yielding positive results. Learners described the taxonomy as a framework that functioned as a structural skeleton for their ideas, using the metaphor, "The classification gave us a closet where all the hooks for our ideas are." Moreover, Athanassiou, McNett,

and Harvey (2003), noted that student visits during office hours decreased significantly due to using the taxonomy in the classroom.

In foreign and second language classrooms, Bloom's revised taxonomy is often used to design assessments and tasks. While Bloom's framework has been widely adopted, several researchers and educators have raised concerns about its effectiveness and relevance in language education contexts. One primary criticism is the rigid hierarchical structure of Bloom's Taxonomy, which posits a progression from lower-order to higher-order thinking skills. Critics argue that this linear model does not accurately reflect the cognitive processes involved in language learning, where skills often develop simultaneously rather than sequentially. Bandura's (2001, 2006) Social Cognitive Theory emphasizes the importance of agency, motivation, and self-regulation in learning. This perspective contrasts with Bloom's cognitive focus, which does not adequately account for the learner's role as an active agent in shaping their learning process. In communicative language teaching, learners co-construct meaning in interaction, a process not easily mapped onto Bloom's categories. Despite critiques of Bloom's Revised Taxonomy, it remains a prevalent framework in foreign and second language education, often adapted to suit contemporary pedagogical needs. Recent studies (Ulum, 2022; Altun, 2023) underscore its continued relevance, particularly when applied flexibly to address the multifaceted nature of language learning. All in all, it is highlighted that in foreign/second language teaching, learner outcomes, where students actively use higher-order thinking processes such as evaluation, creation, and critical and creative thinking, will positively affect instruction as opposed to students who simply memorize information. Therefore, it is crucial for instructors to take higher-order cognitive processes into account. In this regard, it is essential first to determine the level of awareness instructors have regarding higher-order cognitive skills.

Using Bloom's Revised Taxonomy in Teaching Turkish as a Foreign/Second Language

To ensure the continuity of learners' development and provide quality instruction, it is necessary to incorporate Bloom's Taxonomy in the classroom. Using Bloom's Revised Taxonomy in Turkish as a foreign/second language classroom will significantly contribute to the teaching process. The literature review shows that studies on this subject have been conducted in recent years. In these studies, textbooks used in teaching Turkish as

a foreign/second language, end-of-course exams, Turkish Proficiency Exams, skill areas, curricula, learning outcomes, texts and text-based questions have been analyzed according to Bloom's Taxonomy (Sertdemir, 2021; Emre, 2020; Demir, 2019; Özyalçın, 2019; Güney, 2019; Ulutaş & Kara; İltar & Karataş, 2002). The common results of these studies indicate that more emphasis is placed on lower cognitive levels (Remembering-Understanding-Applying), while insufficient attention is given to higher-order cognitive skills (Analyzing-Evaluating-Creating). Bloom's Revised Taxonomy in teaching Turkish as a foreign/second language helps instructors assess whether they are achieving their objectives. The taxonomy aims to assist instructors in understanding the curriculum, guiding planning and evaluation, and making decisions about the quality of instruction (Sönmez, 2019: 108). Furthermore, as it focuses more on the learners' learning rather than performance, it emphasizes the need to focus on the cognitive processes and types of knowledge required to meet the standards (Airasian & Miranda, 2002: 253). In this context, attention should be paid to how and in what way materials used in the teaching process, textbooks, questions, and activities are prepared, whether the learning outcomes meet higher-order cognitive skills, and which outcomes are selected.

The Purpose and Significance of the Study

Bloom's Revised Taxonomy aims to guide instructors in understanding the curriculum, planning and assessment as well as facilitating communication about teaching quality (Sönmez, 2019: 108). Using Bloom's Taxonomy in the classroom encourages a shift in focus towards the learner, supporting the development of learner responsibility and a student-centered classroom. It also offers an opportunity to acquire knowledge in a structured manner rather than passively receiving it (Athanassiou, McNett & Harvey, 2003: 551). In this way, as creative and authentic individuals who question and adopt critical thinking and problem-solving skills, learners develop higher-order cognitive skills. Therefore, instructors who will guide learners in using these skills are expected to have competence in the relevant cognitive processes.

The literature review shows that there has been no study regarding the competence, awareness, or opinions of instructors in teaching Turkish as a foreign language on this subject. In this line, the current study aims to investigate instructors' awareness of the development of Higher-Order Thinking Skills based on Bloom's Taxonomy in the context of teaching

Turkish as a foreign/second language. In this context, the study applied a questionnaire with questions and activities created based on Bloom's Revised Taxonomy to instructors. This way, the study sought to determine how instructors matched the verbs of cognitive levels with questions and activities, which cognitive levels they emphasized, and which levels they overlooked. Additionally, semi-structured interviews were conducted to explore instructors' views on practices in the field of teaching Turkish to foreigners. This study is significant in providing insights for instructors, curriculum developers, exam developers, test designers, assessment and evaluation experts, and prospective instructors who wish to work in the field.

Research Questions

In line with the study purpose, the research questions were formulated as follows:

1. How do instructors identify the cognitive levels of instructional activities?

a) Can instructors match questions/activities with appropriate cognitive levels?

b) Can instructors relate the verbs of the learning outcomes to appropriate cognitive levels?

2. Is there a significant difference in instructors' awareness of the taxonomy based on their age, educational level, and experience in the field?

3. What are instructors' views on using Bloom's Taxonomy in teaching Turkish as a foreign language?

Participants

The study data was collected through a questionnaire from 86 instructors aged between 23 and 60+ working at Turkish Language Teaching Centers (TÖMER, DİLMER) at state universities. Among 86 instructors who submitted the questionnaire, 23 participants volunteered for the semi-structured interviews. The interviews were conducted individually and recorded. This research project was examined at the meeting of the Ethics Committee of the Senate of Hacettepe University on 11 July 2023 with the number E-35853172-300-00002960094 and was found ethically appropriate. The data has been collected using a consent form. The findings regarding the demographic information of the participants are presented in the following tables.

Table 1. *Distribution of the participants regarding socio-demographic features*

		Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	25	29,1
	Female	61	70,9
Age	20-30 years old	24	27,9
	31-40 years old	42	48,8
	41-50 years old	17	19,8
	51 years old or older	3	3,5
Educational Background	Bachelor's degree	6	7,0
	Master's degree	41	47,7
	PhD degree	39	45,3
Year of Experience	1-3 years	22	25,6
	4-5 years	19	22,1
	6-9 years	21	24,4
	10 years or more	22	25,6
	Total	86	100,0

As is seen in Table 1, of all the participants, 70.9% were female; 48.8% were aged between 31 and 40; 47.7% had a master's degree, and 25.6% had 1-3 years of experience or more than 10 years of experience.

Table 2. *Distribution of the participants regarding the field of study*

		Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Undergraduate Major	Turkish Language Education		
	Linguistics		
	Turkish Language and Literature		
	Turkish Folklore		
	Contemporary Turkish Dialects and Literatures		
	Foreign Language Education		
	Foreign Language Philology		
Master's Degree Program	Turkish Language Education		
	Linguistics		
	Turkish Language and Literature		
	Turkish Folklore		

	Contemporary Turkish Dialects and Literatures
	Foreign Language Education
	Foreign Language Philology
	Curriculum and Instruction
	Educational Administration
	Public Relations
PhD Program	Turkish Language Education
	Linguistics
	Turkish Language and Literature
	Turkish Folklore
	Foreign Language Education
	Educational Administration

As is seen in Table 2, 41.9% of the participants graduated from the Turkish Language and Literature undergraduate program, 36% graduated from the Foreign Language Teaching Master's program, and 36% graduated from the Foreign Language Teaching Doctoral program.

Assumptions

It is assumed that the questionnaire and semi-structured interview form prepared by the researchers are appropriate for the cognitive levels and that the instructors who participated in the study responded sincerely to the applied questionnaire and semi-structured interview form.

Research Method

In this study, a descriptive survey model was employed. Survey research is a model used when there is a need to determine individuals' attitudes, behaviors, thoughts, and beliefs (Christensen, Johnson, & Turner, 2015). In survey research, the key aspect is to observe and present the existing situation or phenomenon as it is, without attempting to alter it (Karasar, 2013). Both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods are used in the study.

Ethics Committee Approval

Hacettepe University Social Sciences and Humanities Researches Ethics Board. Decision date: 11 July 2023. Document number: E-35853172-300-00002960094

Data Collection Tools

The study data was gathered through a questionnaire and a semi-structured interview form applied to instructors aged 23-60+ working at Turkish Language Teaching Centers (TÖMER) in state universities. A questionnaire is defined as a research tool consisting of a series of questions aimed at describing people's living conditions, behaviors, beliefs, or attitudes (Büyüköztürk, 2017: 159). A semi-structured interview form allows both fixed-choice responses and in-depth information gathering in the relevant field (Büyüköztürk, 2017: 159).

The researchers developed a questionnaire based on the related literature (Coffman 2013; Gashan, 2015). The Questionnaire developed for the study consists of three sections. The first section was designed to collect demographic information about the participants. The second section comprises 10 in-class instructional scenarios. In this section, participants were asked to identify the type of thinking required by students in the activities presented within each scenario. Participants selected one of four possible cognitive levels most likely to be used in the activity. The wording used to define the cognitive levels was based on Bloom's Taxonomy of Thinking Skills (Bloom, 1984). Participants were instructed to choose the highest level of thinking/cognition they believed students would need for each activity. The scenarios were written in a way that they could be applied in classrooms and assessment processes for teaching Turkish as a foreign language. In the third section, participants responded to five questions in which they were asked to match action verbs used in learning outcomes with the appropriate cognitive levels. Expert opinions were sought to assess the validity of the items in the questionnaire.

A semi-structured interview form was developed to gather qualitative data. The researchers developed the interview questions based on their observations, their teaching experience and and the findings from the current literature (Sertdemir, 2021; Emre, 2020; Demir, 2019; Özyalçın, 2019; Güney, 2019; Ulutaş & Kara; İltar & Karataş, 2002). This part consisted of 8 questions and was intended to gauge participants' perceptions of critical thinking and critical thinking instruction in the field of teaching Turkish as a foreign/ second language.

Data Analysis

In the study, content analysis was used to analyze the qualitative data gathered via the open-ended questions of the questionnaire and the semi-struc-

tured interview form. Content analysis involves organizing and interpreting similar data under specific concepts and themes in a way that is understandable to the reader. It also uncovers underlying concepts and relationships between these concepts through coding (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2016). In this study, qualitative data were coded, categorized, and themed by three researchers, and the content analysis was organized into tables and interpreted based on the literature to answer the research question. The percentage of agreement regarding the dataset coded by different coders is significant for the reliability of the qualitative research. In the current study, the consistency of the coding in content analysis was calculated using the similarity formula conceptualized as inter-coder agreement, which is referred to as internal consistency in the Miles and Huberman model, and the percentage of agreement was found to be 86.2%. The data obtained from the closed-ended questions of the questionnaire were analyzed using SPSS software and presented in tables of percentages and frequencies. The study aimed to determine the instructors' awareness of their cognitive skills.

Statistical Data Analysis

The demographic data, educational background, and course history of the participants were analyzed using frequency analysis, and the distribution of the data was presented in tables with "n" and "%." Subsequently, statements related to cognitive skills and verbs of learning outcomes were tested using frequency analysis. The correctly answered statements were identified and compared along with their percentages. The data distribution was presented in tables with "n" and "%". Success levels were evaluated based on gender, age, education, and experience. Independent samples t-test was used for comparisons between two groups, and ANOVA was used for comparisons involving more than two groups.

Results

I. Findings Obtained from Quantitative Data

Table 3. *Distribution of the participants regarding courses and skills*

		Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Have you attended a course on how to develop students' lower and higher-level cognitive skills?	Yes	20	23,3
	No	66	76,7

Do you feel equipped to help students develop their cognitive skills?	Yes	25	29,1
	No	6	7,0
	Partially	55	64,0
	Total	86	100,0

As is seen in Table 3, 76.7% of the participants had not attended a course aimed at developing students' lower and higher-order cognitive skills; 64% felt somewhat equipped in this regard, and 29.1% believed they were well-equipped.

Table 4. *Distribution of the answers by the participants regarding questions on cognitive skills-1*

		n	%
The instructor shows the students a video about people considering traveling to five different cities. After the video, the instructor asks the students which city the people are planning to go to, by what means of transportation, and at what time they plan to travel.	Understanding	25	29,1
	Evaluating	5	5,8
	Remembering	50	58,1
	Applying	6	7,0
	Total	86	100,0

One of the close-ended questions in the questionnaire was "The instructor shows a video about people considering traveling to five different cities. After the video, the instructor asks the students which city the people are planning to go to, by what means of transportation, and at what time they plan to travel." 58.1% of the participants responded to this statement as "remembering." The correct response is "remembering."

Table 5. *Distribution of the answers by the participants regarding questions on cognitive skills-2*

		n	%
The instructor shows pictures related to professions to the students and asks questions such as 'Who is this?', 'Where is this person?', 'What does this person do?' Then, the instructor distributes matching cards with professions and their characteristics. The students are expected to match the professions with the appropriate characteristics.	Analyzing	13	15,1
	Understanding	30	34,9
	Remembering	25	29,1
	Applying	18	20,9
	Total	86	100,0

Another close-ended question in the questionnaire was "The instructor shows pictures related to professions to the students and asks questions such as 'Who is this?', 'Where is this person?', 'What does this person do?' Then, the instructor distributes matching cards with professions and

their characteristics. The students are expected to match the professions with the appropriate characteristics." 34.9% of the participants responded to this statement as "understanding." The correct response is "remembering," which was selected by 29.1% of the participants.

Table 6. *Distribution of the answers by the participants regarding questions on cognitive skills-3*

		n	%
The instructor goes to class with a health bag containing both medicine and medicinal herbs. The instructor talks about diseases and types of diseases with the students. The instructor asks questions such as 'Why do we get sick?' and 'What precautions should we take to avoid getting sick?' Later, students are asked to compare the beneficial and harmful aspects of medicines and medicinal herbs.	Understanding	24	27,9
	Evaluating	44	51,2
	Remembering	5	5,8
	Applying	13	15,1
	Total	86	100

The next close-ended question in the questionnaire was, "The instructor goes to class with a health bag containing both medicine and medicinal herbs. The instructor talks about diseases and types of diseases with the students. The instructor asks questions such as 'Why do we get sick?' and 'What precautions should we take to avoid getting sick?' Later, students are asked to compare the beneficial and harmful aspects of medicines and medicinal herbs." This was answered with "evaluating" by 51.2% of the participants. The correct response is "understanding," which was chosen by 27.9% of the participants.

Table 7. *Distribution of the answers by the participants regarding questions on cognitive skills-4*

		n	%
The instructor discusses global warming and climate change with the students. Based on this topic, students are asked to imagine what the world will be like in the future. Students write a text describing the lives of humans, animals and plants in the imagined scenario.	No answer	3	3,5
	Understanding	6	7,0
	Evaluating	39	45,3
	Applying	38	44,2
	Total	86	100

The next close-ended question in the questionnaire was "The instructor discusses global warming and climate change with the students. Based on this topic, students are asked to imagine what the world will be like in the future. Students write a text describing the lives of humans, animals, and

plants in the imagined scenario." 45.3% of the participants responded to this statement as "evaluating." The correct response is "understanding," which was chosen by 6% of the participants.

Table 8. *Distribution of the answers by the participants regarding questions on cognitive skills-5*

		n	%
The instructor gives students an informative text about the invention of paper, consisting of four paragraphs, but with the paragraphs in the wrong order. The students are asked to rearrange the paragraphs in a logical sequence and in accordance with the flow of time.	Understanding	34	39,5
	Evaluating	9	10,5
	Remembering	9	10,5
	Applying	34	39,5
	Total	86	100

The next close-ended question in the questionnaire was "The instructor gives students an informative text about the invention of paper, consisting of four paragraphs, but with the paragraphs in the wrong order. The students are asked to rearrange the paragraphs in a logical sequence and by the flow of time." 39.5% of the participants responded to this statement as "understanding." The correct response is "understanding."

Table 9. *Distribution of the answers by the participants regarding questions on cognitive skills-6*

		n	%
The instructor reads a narrative text consisting of four parts to the students. The instructor asks how many parts the text has and what the text is about. Then, the instructor asks the students to rearrange the parts of the text to create a new one.	Understanding	1	1,2
	Evaluating	22	25,6
	Remembering	10	11,6
	Applying	5	5,8
	Total	86	100

The next close-ended question in the questionnaire was "The instructor reads a narrative text consisting of four parts to the students. The instructor asked how many parts the text had and what the text was about. Then, the instructor asks the students to rearrange the parts of the text to create a new one." 55.8% of the participants responded to this statement as "applying." The correct response is "applying."

Table 10. *Distribution of the answers by the participants regarding questions on cognitive skills-7*

		n	%
The instructor reads a text to the students in which people share their memories. Based on this text, the students are asked to distinguish the emotional states of the individuals along with their reasons. A question is posed to the students: 'How would you react if you were in their shoes?'		1	1,2
	Analyzing	59	68,6
	Understanding	2	2,3
	Evaluating	19	22,1
	Applying	5	5,8
	Total	86	100,0

The next close-ended question in the questionnaire was "The instructor reads a text to the students in which people share their memories. Based on this text, the students are asked to distinguish the emotional states of the individuals along with their reasons. A question is posed to the students: 'How would you react if you were in their shoes?'" 68.8% of the participants responded to this statement as "analyzing." The correct response is "analyzing."

Tablo 11. *Distribution of the answers by the participants regarding questions on cognitive skills-8*

		n	%
The instructor gives the students an untitled text that describes imaginary and real events. The students are asked how many sections the text has. Then, they are instructed to separate the sections describing imaginary and real events and give each section a title.	Analyzing	63	73,3
	Remembering	1	1,2
	Applying	8	9,3
	Creating	14	16,3
	Total	86	100,0

The next close-ended question in the questionnaire was "The instructor gives the students an untitled text that describes imaginary and real events. The students were asked how many sections the text had. Then, they are instructed to separate the sections describing imaginary and real events and give each section a title." 73.3% of the participants responded to this statement as "analyzing." The correct response is "analyzing."

Table 12. *Distribution of the answers by the participants regarding questions on cognitive skills-9*

		n	%
The instructor reads a fictional text about friendship with animal characters to the students. The students, based on these characters, share with their peers how a good friend should be. Then, the students are asked to write a text titled 'My Best Friend'.	Analyzing	8	9,3
	Remembering	31	36,0
	Applying	3	3,5
	Creating	44	51,2
	Total	86	100,0

The next close-ended question in the questionnaire was "The instructor reads a fictional text about friendship with animal characters to the students. Based on these characters, the students share with their peers how a good friend should be. Then, the students are asked to write a text titled 'My Best Friend'." 51.2% of the participants responded to this statement as "creating." However, the correct response is "evaluating" as the task involves making judgments about the qualities of a good friend, which falls under the level of "evaluating" in Bloom's Taxonomy.

Table 13. *Distribution of the answers by the participants regarding questions on cognitive skills-10*

		n	%
The instructor asks the students for their thoughts on the development of technology. Then, the class is divided into two groups. The students are given reciprocal discussion questions related to the topic. Accordingly, Group A argues that the future world will be a much better place. Group B argues that the future world will be a much worse place. The students provide detailed explanations about this topic.	Analyzing	27	31,4
	Remembering	38	44,2
	Applying	2	2,3
	Creating	19	22,1
	Total	86	100,0

The next close-ended question in the questionnaire was "The instructor asks the students for their thoughts on the development of technology. Then, the class is divided into two groups. The students are given reciprocal discussion questions related to the topic. Accordingly, Group A argues that the future world will be a much better place. Group B argues that the future world will be a much worse place. The students provide detailed explanations about this topic." 44.2% of the participants responded to this statement as "evaluating." The correct response is "evaluating."

Table 14. *Distribution of the answers by the participants regarding questions on cognitive* skills-11

		n	%
The instructor reads a literary text to the students. Then, the students are asked to rewrite the text by changing the characters and setting.”	Analyzing	3	3,5
	Remembering	3	3,5
	Applying	3	3,5
	Creating	77	89,5
	Total	86	100,0

The next close-ended question in the questionnaire was, “The instructor reads a literary text to the students. Then, the students are asked to rewrite the text by changing the characters and setting.” 89.5% of the participants responded to this statement as “creating.” The correct response is “creating.”

Table 15. *Distribution of the answers by the participants regarding questions on cognitive skills-12*

		n	%
The instructor reads a literary text to the students. Then, the students are asked to rewrite the text by changing the characters and setting.	Evaluating	2	2,3
	Synthesizing	15	17,4
	Applying	4	4,7
	Creating	65	75,6
	Total	86	100,0

The next close-ended question in the questionnaire was, “The instructor reads a literary text to the students. Then, the students are asked to rewrite the text by changing the characters and setting.” 75.6% of the participants responded to this statement as “creating.” The correct response is “creating.”

Table 16. *Distribution of the answers by the participants regarding questions on the verbs of learning outcomes*

		n	%
“Defining”	Remembering	70	81,4
	Applying	16	18,6
“Ordering”	Evaluating	32	37,2
	Applying	54	62,8

"Distinguishing"	Analyzing	86	100,0
"Criticizing"	Evaluating	78	90,7
	Applying	8	9,3
"Improving"	Evaluating	4	4,7
	Creating	82	95,3
	Total	86	100,0

When participants were asked to match the verbs of learning outcomes with the appropriate cognitive levels, they made the following associations: 81.4% of the participants matched "Defining" with "Remembering." 62.8% of the participants matched "Ordering" with "Applying." 100% of the participants matched "Distinguishing" with "Analyzing." 90.7% of the participants matched "Criticizing" with "Evaluating." 95.3% of the participants matched "Improving" with "Creating."

Table 17. *Evaluation of instructors' awareness of the taxonomy according to gender*

	Gender	n	Mean**	Sd.	t	p*
Instructors' Awareness of the Taxonomy	Male	25	10,28	2,189	-,395	,694
	Female	61	10,62	2,289		

*Independent Sample t test **Min: 1 - Max:1

The analysis of the instructors' awareness of the taxonomy according to the variable of gender revealed that there was no statistically significant difference between the genders ($p>0.05$). The results showed that the correct answers for both genders were quite similar. There was no statistically significant difference in the level of success according to the gender variable.

Table 18. *Evaluation of the instructors' awareness of the taxonomy according to age*

	Age	n	Mean**	Sd.	t	p*
Instructors' Awareness of the Taxonomy	20-30 years old	24	10,50	2,303	,550	,650
	31-40 years old	42	10,52	2,432		
	41-50 years old	17	10,82	1,776		
	51 years old and older	3	9,00	2,000		

*ANOVA

The analysis of the success level according to the age variable revealed no statistically significant difference between the ages (p>0.05). The results showed that the correct answers across age groups were quite similar. However, the number of correct answers in the age group of 51 years old and older was lower compared to the other groups. Despite this, there was no statistically significant difference in the success level according to the age variable.

Table 19. *Evaluation of the instructors' awareness of the taxonomy according to bachelor's degree*

	Bachelor's Degree	n	Ort.	Sd.	f	p*
Instructors' Awareness of the Taxonomy	Turkish Language Education	23	10,87	2,201	1,298	,268
	Linguistics	6	10,33	2,160		
	Turkish Language and Literature	36	10,42	2,347		
	Turkish Folklore	2	8,50	2,121		
	Contemporary Turkish Dialects and Literatures	5	9,00	2,550		
	Foreign Language Education	5	10,00	1,871		
	Foreign Language Philology	9	11,78	1,787		

*ANOVA

The analysis of the success level according to the Bachelor's degree variable revealed no statistically significant difference between the field of study in Bachelor's degree (p>0.05). The results showed that the correct answers across the groups were similar. The group with the least correct answers was identified as the Department of Turkish Folklore, while the group with the most correct answers was the Department of Foreign Language Philology. However, there was no statistically significant difference in the success level according to the Bachelor's degree variable.

Table 20. *Evaluation of the instructors' awareness of the taxonomy according to the year of experience*

	Year of Experience	n	Mean	Sd.	f	p*
Instructors' Awareness of the Taxonomy	1-3 years	22	11,09	2,348	,741	,531
	4-5 years	19	10,26	2,281		
	6-9 years	21	10,19	2,089		
	10 years and more	22	10,32	2,338		

*ANOVA

The analysis of the success level according to the year of experience variable revealed no statistically significant difference between the years of experience ($p>0.05$). The results showed that the correct answers across the groups were similar. The group with the most correct answers was those with 1-3 years of experience. However, there was no statistically significant difference in the success level according to the year of experience variable.

The findings from the survey data, in general, showed that the instructors answered the two activities related to the level of remembering correctly at the rate of 58.1% and 29.1%, respectively. For the level of *understanding,* the two activities were answered correctly by the instructors at the rate of 27.9% and 7.0%. In relation to the level of *application, the instructors provided correct answers to the two questions at the rate of 39.5% and 55.8%,* respectively. Looking at the activities related to the level of *analysis,* instructors answered them correctly at the rate of 68.6% and 73.3%. The two questions in the survey related to the level of *evaluation* were answered correctly by the instructors at the rate of 36.0% and 44.2%. Regarding the level of *creation, the instructors answered the activities correctly at the rate of 89.5% and 75.6%,* respectively. Based on these findings, the level at which the instructors faced the most difficulty was *understanding*, while the level at which they performed best was *creating*.

II. Findings Obtained from Qualitative Data

In this section, the findings obtained from the data collected based on the interview questions prepared for the research question "What are instructors' views on the use of Bloom's Taxonomy in the field of teaching Turkish as a foreign language?" are presented in the form of codes and themes. The results are organized into tables and interpreted accordingly.

Table 24 below shows how and in what ways instructors benefit from Bloom's Revised Taxonomy in the measurement and evaluation processes of teaching Turkish as a foreign/second language.

Tablo 21. *Use of higher-order cognitive skills by instructors in the assessment and evaluation processes*

Theme	Codes	f	Participants
Using Higher-Order Cognitive Skills	Using intuitively	12	P1, P2, P5, P6, P9, P10, P11, P13, P19, P20, P21, P23
	Using directly	7	P3, P4, P7, P8, P12, P17, P22
	Not using	5	P14, P15, P16, P18, P24

Table 21 above shows how and in what ways instructors benefit from Bloom's Revised Taxonomy in the assessment and evaluation processes. At this stage, the instructors' opinions were grouped under one main theme. According to this, 5 instructors stated they did not benefit from it, while 18 instructors reported benefiting intuitively. 1 instructor stated that they benefited from it but did not feel confident in this area. Some instructors mentioned that measuring higher cognitive skills included in the taxonomy during the assessment and evaluation process was unnecessary, emphasizing that the main goal is to teach the language and that assessing language skills differs from higher-order cognitive skills. According to them, higher-order cognitive skills should be developed in academic Turkish courses and included in the assessment process. In this context, some of the participants stated their opinions as follows:

"We do not consciously benefit from it because not everyone has completed their studies at the Faculty of Education, the Institute of Educational Sciences, or in a doctoral/master's program in Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language. Some have completed their education in Contemporary Turkish Dialects, some in the Department of Turkish Language and Literature, and others in Linguistics. Since they completed their education in departments where there is not much content related to pedagogy or teaching, very few instructors are familiar with Bloom's Taxonomy." (P19)
"I'm not sure if this should be the case in language teaching. Do we really need to use Bloom's Taxonomy in the assessment and evaluation stage of language teaching? Every educator should know this to some extent. However, if a learner cannot use one of the higher-order cognitive skills, it does not mean they do not know the language. Therefore, it may not be

necessary to use Bloom's Revised Taxonomy in assessment and evaluation. The primary focus should be on how the language is used rather than higher-order cognitive skills. Advanced cognitive skills should be developed in academic Turkish courses." (P7)

"Unfortunately, I do not use Bloom's Taxonomy in the assessment and evaluation processes. This is because the exam formats are predetermined and prepared within the institution. So, I am not sure how much attention has been paid to the taxonomy when these exams are being prepared. Personally, I do not follow a separate assessment and evaluation process." (P16)

Table 22. *Activities used by the instructors to improve higher-order skills*

Theme	Categories	Codes	f	Participants
Activities Used to Improve Higher-Order Skills		Using fictional texts	1	P12
		Arranging a Paragraph	1	P21
	Activities for Reading Skill	Preparing a poster appropriate to the level	1	P4
		Reading literary texts	1	P4
		Breaking down the text into parts	1	P6
		Doing research on the mobile phone	1	P9
		Using websites	1	P12
		Preparing a portfolio	1	P2
		Brainstorming	2	P2, P9
		Creating a discussion environment	3	P3, P9, P11
		Making a presentation	1	P13
	Activities for Speaking Skill	Taboo	1	P8
		Assigning roles	1	P10
		Making a comparison	1	P15
		Question-Answer	1	P11
		Speaking clubs	1	P1

		Story completion	4	P2, P5, P12, P19
		Essay	2	P14, P22
		Rewrite the story by changing the character, the people, and the gender	1	P4
	Activities for Writing Skill	Filling the gaps in a song	1	P5
		Writing a play script	1	P5
		Completing the text by modifying it	1	P6
		Peer sharing	1	P2
		Caricature	3	P6, P8, P17
		Animated series	1	P6
		Animations	1	P6
		Turning an image into a writing activity	1	P6
		Writing a story	1	P7
		Creative writing	1	P7
		Preparing a School Newspaper	1	P7
		Short movie	2	P8, P10,
	Common Activities for Other Skills	Screenwriting	1	P10
		Using proverbs and idioms	1	P20
		Cooperation	1	P2

Table 22 above shows the activities used by the instructors to improve learners' higher-order cognitive skills. These activities are categorized based on the four basic language skills. Upon reviewing the categories, it is obvious that the majority of activities are related to reading, speaking, and writing skills. Activities related to listening skills are fewer and mostly integrated with the other skills. Instructors generally make use of texts, visuals, films and questions through in-class and out-of-class activities. In this context, the positive and negative views of the instructors regarding the development of higher-order cognitive skills are as follows:

"I believe that it is crucial to be able to make inferences, recall and build new knowledge based on what has been remembered, develop assumptions, present perspectives, advance arguments, and create something because we see it with graduate students. They learn Turkish, but they face difficulties when writing their thesis." (P23)

"After the A2 level, emphasis can be given to higher-order cognitive skills." (P7)

"In a foreign language, or more specifically in a second language where the native language is not present, it seems that reaching a sufficient cognitive level is not achievable during TÖMER training." (P14)

Table 23. *Positive outcomes regarding higher-order cognitive skills*

Theme	Categories	Codes	f	Participants
Positive Outcomes Regarding Higher-Order Cognitive Skills		Analyzing	1	P16
		Questioning	2	P2, P8
	Cognitive Outcomes	Problem-solving	1	P2
		Synthesizing previous and new information	1	P2
		Establishing relationships between concepts	1	P8
		Critical thinking and problem solving	2	P20, P23
		Gaining self-confidence	2	P3, P5
		Effective communication	1	P9
	Affective (psychological/ sociological/ cultural) outcomes	Communicating with official institutions	1	P1
		Being able to speak without embarrassment	2	P16, P22
		Being a social actor	1	P3
		Role-playing and finding motivation	1	P10

		Gaining the skill of mediating	1	P12
		Empathy	1	P12
		Free thinking	2	P13, P14
		Self-confidence	1	P16
		Active learning	1	P7
		Acceleration of learning processes	1	P11
		Long-term learning	1	P17
		Learning without rote memorization	1	P19
		Being aware of what you know and don't know	1	P15
		An increase in the level of awareness	1	P18
		Being able to understand movies and songs	1	P1
		Improving the use of language	1	P4
	Language-oriented outcomes (writing, speaking, role-playing, screenwriting, action-oriented...)	Development of productive skills	1	P6
		Acquiring screenwriting skills	1	P10
		Debate	1	P2, P13
		Ability to make intercultural comparisons	1	P18
		Being able to produce	1	P21
		Understanding proverbs and idioms	1	P1
		Being able to write an essay	1	P22

Table 23 above shows the positive outcomes resulting from the teaching process of higher-order cognitive skills. These outcomes are categorized into cognitive and affective (psychological-sociological-cultural) categories as well as learning processes and language use. According to the findings, instructors reported that students predominantly showed cognitive outcomes such as critical thinking, analysis, problem-solving, inquiry, and synthesis; affective skills like effective communication, motivation, self-confidence, trust in themselves, and the ability to speak without shame; an active and effective learning process that leads to increased awareness; and language skills such as intercultural comparison, debate, and essay writing also developed as positive outcomes. Furthermore, they mentioned that students had developed mediation skills, which positively impacted their process of becoming social actors. Given these outcomes, a study by Athanassiou, McNett, and Harvey (2003: 549) is significant. This study discusses the positive outcomes of higher-order cognitive skills. In the study, students shared their views on the taxonomy, stating that it served as a framework. They also used the metaphor "it gave us a closet with all the hooks for our ideas" to describe their understanding of the taxonomy. According to Athanassiou, McNett, and Harvey (2003), one result of using the taxonomy in class was a significant reduction in student visits during office hours.

In this context, some of the participants stated their opinions as follows:
"When I use these, the students become more engaged in the lesson and feel like a part of it. They become a part of it (teaching), they reason, and they try to solve something. This makes them more productive, and it also creates a more communicative teaching environment." (P9)

"It ensures lasting learning and truly helps students maintain the level they have reached, meaning they can stay at that level regardless of how high they rise." (P17)

Table 24. *Definitions of critical thinking according to instructors*

Theme	Codes	f	Participants
Critical Thinking	Ability to look without prejudice	1	P2
	Ability to see both positive and negative aspects	3	P2, P13, P15,
	Ability to analyze	2	P4, P9
	Ability to express one's thoughts without jumping to conclusions	3	P6, P10, P22
	Reasoning	3	P7, P14, P16
	Deep thinking	1	P23
	Questioning	3	P8, P19, P23
	A conscious and mindful approach	1	P23
	Problem-solving	2	P9, P20
	Synthesizing	2	P9, P20
	Ability to see from a different perspective	2	P11, P18
	Ability to generate new ideas	1	P17
	Ability to think outside the box	1	P21
	Seeking answers without fear	1	P24

Table 24 above shows the instructors' thoughts on critical thinking. According to this table, instructors define critical thinking as "reasoning, analyzing, questioning, problem-solving, seeing things from different perspectives, and being able to view both the positive and negative sides of an event or situation." In this context, some of the participants stated their opinions as follows:

"I think it is not accepting the information presented to you as it is and asking, 'Does this mean something else? Is this information true? Should I accept the information presented to me completely, or should I verify it from other sources? Could there be another perspective on this?' This kind of questioning is reasoning." (P14)

"It is the ability to look at something, an object, or a thought with both its positive and negative aspects. (P13)

"I think critical thinking is about not getting caught up in prejudices too much, not being too influenced by stereotypes, but establishing a cause-and-effect relationship, definitely grounding it on a certain basis. Perhaps, I shouldn't say 'definitely' here, as it might be a constraint for critical

thinking, I don't know, but at least being able to evaluate both the positive and negative sides of events." (P2)

"Instead of accepting something as absolutely right or wrong, I can say it's about perceiving and expressing it by adding something to it with one's own thoughts." (P6)

Table 25. *The adequacy of textbooks for developing metacognitive skills*

Theme	Codes	f	Participants
The adequacy/appearance of metacognitive skills in textbooks	Not adequate. Needs materials.	21	P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P9, P10, P11, P12, P13, P14, P15, P16, P17, P18, P19, P20, P22, P23, P24
	Partially adequate.	3	K7, K8, K21

Table 25 above shows the appearance of higher-order skills in textbooks within the framework of instructors' opinions. According to this, the majority of instructors believe that the textbooks are inadequate. One instructor stated that the themes in the textbooks were sufficient but that the questions below the texts needed to be diversified. Another instructor found the textbooks partially adequate. In this context, some of the participants stated their opinions as follows:

"The likelihood of the activities in the book not aligning with the higher-order skills in the programs is very high." (P22)

"So actually, our primary goal is not to teach the language, right? While teaching the language, of course, we can develop the student's cognitive skills. This is not our main goal, and this is not the primary purpose of the books either." "Books cannot be sufficient. I think they are not enough for a university-level student to develop or create such high-level skills." (P15)

"I think it's not sufficient because each book has a specific program or certain limitations. Therefore, it is definitely not possible to load everything into the book. I mean, it's not possible to explain everything in the book. So, in a way, the responsibility falls on the instructor." (P17)

Table 26. *Factors that hinder critical and creative thinking*

Theme	Categories	Codes	f	Participants
Factors That Hinder Critical and Creative Thinking		Low level of motivation	3	P1, P12, P8
		Introversion and shyness	3	P20, P6, P10
		Individual differences	3	P20, P23, 8
	Individual Factors	Feeling insecure	1	P1
		Emotional dimension	1	P1
		Gender, age, hereditary factors	2	P23, P5
		Anxiety	1	P1
		Reticence	1	P1
		Shyness/hesitation due to the instructor or peers	1	P6
		Attention deficit	1	P6
		Lack of knowledge		P15
		Learners' interest		P6
		Established learning habits		P11
		Family attitude/authority		P23, P2, P22
		Religious-ethnical elements		P1, P20
		Social pressure		P1
		Political attitudes		P2
	Social Factors	Socio-economic conditions		P2
		Cultural codes		P1
		Learners' culture		P22
		Educational policy of the country		P2, P18
		Academic success		P23
	Factors Regarding Educational Background	Not developing the skills in their mother tongue		P1, P3
		Unable to think critically		P24

		Insufficient proficiency in the target language	P3
		Student's level of preparedness	P19, P13
		Processes of reading and understanding	P4
		Insufficient knowledge	P5
		Reading rate and habit	P5, P14
		The problem of writing in the native language/ the problem of creative thinking	P6
		Instructor's way of teaching	P17
		Lack of coherence-consistency	P1
	Instructor-related Factors	Instructor feedback	P12
		Instructor's incompetence about methods and strategies	P3
		Language factor / proficiency in the native language	P7
		Wrong book choice	P9
		Instructor's attitude	P23, P2, P8, P9, P12, P21, P6
	Physical Factors	Physical environment (classroom environment)	P8, P14

Table 26 above shows the factors that hinder learners' critical/creative thinking processes. These factors are categorized into five groups: individual barriers, social barriers, barriers related to the learner's educational background, instructor-related barriers, and physical barriers. When looking at the factors that hinder the development of higher-order cognitive skills, factors such as low motivation, shyness, anxiety, family attitude, religious-ethnic elements, habits in the learner's native language, the student's readiness, and reading habits emerge as the most prominent. In this context, some of the participants stated their opinions as follows:

"There may be several factors here. First and foremost, the main factor is the language factor. The student may have a problem related to the language." (P7)

"I think, for example, that instructors have a very large share in this. Because they truly dedicate some of their time, and by living in the country, they come with a motivation to learn the language. I think we, as instructors, might be the problem. It could be the wrong book choice, the instructor's attitude being incorrect, or we might not be providing training that aligns with the student's needs due to such things. Therefore, I feel that the student cannot develop critical thinking, and the instructor may not even know why." (P9)

"One of the most important reasons for this could be personal, like the student's level of shyness." (P10)

"The main point here is the student's bias and readiness. This, of course, can vary depending on the country." (P13)

Table 27. *Educational needs regarding Bloom's Revised Taxonomy*

Theme	Codes	f	Participants
Training on the use of Bloom's Revised Taxonomy in assessment and evaluation processes	I would like to attend.	23	P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P8, P9, P10, P11, P12, P13, P14, P15, P16, P17, P18, P19, P20, P21, P22, P23, P24
	I wouldn't like to attend.	1	P7

Table 27 above shows the instructors' willingness to participate in training on how and in what way Bloom's Revised Taxonomy can be used in assessment and evaluation processes. According to this, most instructors stated that they would be able to participate if such training were designed. In contrast, only one instructor expressed that they did not wish to participate because they had already taken this training at the undergraduate level. In this context, the instructors' opinions are as follows:

"Of course, I would love to. While conducting the survey, I especially couldn't decide between some of the levels." (P15)

"I wouldn't want to participate in such a training. Because, as I said, I believe that everyone who has graduated from the Faculty of Education or the field of educational sciences must have some idea about Bloom's Taxonomy." (P7)

"Of course, I would want to, because as instructors, honestly, yes, we look at it every time and try to benefit from it every time while preparing each question, but some things are still very vague for us. For example, listing—what level is that for me? We can do a listing at the recall level or at the analysis level, so it's a bit vague." (P4)

"Of course, I would want to. We are involved in the practical aspect of the work, but academically, I have always felt lacking. I still feel deficient." (P10)

Conclusion

The current study aimed at evaluating questions and activities prepared according to Bloom's Revised Taxonomy in teaching Turkish as a foreign/ second language in terms of instructor awareness. The study was conducted with 86 instructors aged between 23-60 working at Turkish Teaching Centers (TÖMER). Data were collected using a questionnaire form and a semi-structured interview form. Analysis of the collected data resulted in significant findings. In light of these findings, results regarding the research question and sub-research questions are presented below.

Based on the main research question, "How do instructors identify the cognitive levels of instructional activities?", the sub-questions are as follows: a) Can instructors match questions/activities with appropriate cognitive levels? b) Can instructors relate the action verbs of the learning outcomes to appropriate cognitive levels?

The study findings concluded that participants predominantly gave incorrect answers to questions related to the cognitive skills of *remembering, understanding, applying,* and *evaluating*. At the same time, they mostly provided correct answers to questions concerning *analyzing* and *creating*. The participants generally gave correct answers to questions regarding the verbs of learning outcomes; however, they indicated uncertainty about the accuracy of their responses. The findings also showed that instructors intuitively utilized Bloom's Taxonomy in assessment and evaluation processes. The study found that instructors frequently employed activi-

ties such as *story completion*, *brainstorming*, *short films,* and *cartoons* to teach the higher-order cognitive levels of Bloom's Taxonomy. The positive outcomes of teaching these cognitive levels were identified as fostering *inquiry, problem-solving,* and *building self-confidence*.

The second research question of the study is as follows: Is there a relationship between instructors' age, educational level, experience in the department they graduated from, and their awareness of the taxonomy?

The study findings regarding this research question showed that 70.9% of the participants were women, and 48.8% were men. Regarding their fields of study, the majority had undergraduate degrees in Turkish Language and Literature (42%), while at the graduate level (37%) and doctoral level (57%), the predominant field was foreign language teaching. When the participants' levels of awareness were analyzed based on demographic data, the results showed that there was no statistically significant difference concerning the variables of gender, age, education, or experience.

The third research question in the study was "What are instructors' views on the use of Bloom's Taxonomy in the field of teaching Turkish as a foreign language?" In this context, the participants expressed their deficiencies in higher-order thinking skills and how to implement them in their classrooms, stating that they felt inadequate in teaching higher-order thinking skills to their learners.

To conclude, the current study showed that instructors had a low level of awareness regarding high-order thinking skills and the classification of Bloom's Taxonomy. The current findings align with related studies in the literature (Lauer, 2005; Alazzi, 2008; Stedman & Adams, 2012) that reveal instructors' uncertainty about critical thinking. The study found that instructors of Turkish as a foreign/second language held positive views about the importance of teaching high-order thinking skills. Instructors stated that critical thinking fosters learners' ability to think at higher levels, supports independent thinking, and encourages them to become active learners. Similar conclusions were drawn by some research in the field. Nurmatova and Altun (2023) conducted a comprehensive review emphasizing the importance of integrating Bloom's Taxonomy into instructional frameworks for novice EFL educators. They argued that when applied flexibly, the taxonomy serves as a valuable tool for designing student-centered lessons that cater to various cognitive levels, thereby enhancing

pedagogical effectiveness. The literature indicates that Bloom's Taxonomy continues to be a valuable framework in L2 education, particularly when adapted to include higher-order thinking skills and applied flexibly to accommodate diverse learning contexts. Educators are encouraged to move beyond a rigid hierarchical application, integrating the taxonomy with other pedagogical strategies to address the complex cognitive and communicative demands of language learning.

Despite providing valuable insights into instructors' awareness of Bloom's Revised Taxonomy in teaching Turkish as a foreign/second language, the current study has several limitations. First, the study was limited to a specific group of 86 instructors working at Turkish Teaching Centers (TÖMER), which may not fully represent the diversity of instructors across different institutions, regions, or instructional contexts. As such, generalizing the results should be approached with caution. Second, the study relied on self-reported data through questionnaires and interviews, which may have introduced bias due to social desirability or misinterpretation of cognitive levels by participants. Similar concerns have been raised in other studies investigating instructors' metacognitive awareness and pedagogical beliefs (Lauer, 2005; Alazzi, 2008). Third, while the study focused on instructor awareness, it did not evaluate the actual classroom practices or student outcomes, leaving a gap between perceived knowledge and real-world application. Observational data or classroom-based assessments could have provided a more comprehensive understanding of how Bloom's Taxonomy is implemented in practice.

The findings of this study underline the necessity of equipping instructors with both theoretical and practical knowledge related to higher-order thinking skills and their application through Bloom's Taxonomy. The fact that instructors showed partial or incorrect identification of certain cognitive levels suggests a need for structured professional development programs. Such programs should emphasize practical training on formulating learning outcomes, designing higher-order activities, and assessing student work aligned with the higherlevels of the taxonomy (analyzing, evaluating, and creating).

Moreover, the integration of Bloom's Taxonomy should be aligned with learner-centered methodologies, particularly in foreign language education, where authentic communication, interaction, and meaning negotiation take precedence (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). Since high-

er-order skills like problem-solving and critical evaluation are crucial in second language acquisition, textbooks, curricula, and assessments should reflect a balanced cognitive load. These findings advocate for curriculum planners and instructional designers to incorporate Bloom's Taxonomy not only as a classification tool but also as a dynamic framework guiding pedagogy, material development, and assessment design in the context of Turkish as a foreign language.

Future research could expand on this study by exploring how awareness of Bloom's Taxonomy translates into actual classroom practices. Mixed-method or longitudinal designs could be employed to track how instructors' knowledge evolves over time and affects student outcomes. Additionally, classroom observations and document analyses (e.g., of lesson plans or student assignments) could offer triangulated data to bridge the gap between awareness and practice, as recommended in previous studies (Brookhart, 2010; Stedman & Adams, 2012).

Another promising research area involves the integration of digital tools and artificial intelligence-based platforms in teaching higher-order thinking skills. Given the increasing digitization of language instruction, future studies could explore how online platforms facilitate or hinder the application of Bloom's Revised Taxonomy in virtual learning environments.

Ethics Statement

In this study, we declare that the rules specified in the "Directive on Scientific Research and Publication Ethics of Higher Education Institutions" have been followed.

Ethics Committee Approval

Hacettepe University Social Sciences and Humanities Researches Ethics Board. Decision date: 11 July 2023. Document number: E-35853172-300-00002960094

Conflict of Interest

There is no conflict of interest between the authors.

Author Contribution Rate

Authors contributed equally to the research. The authors declare that no other author contributed to the study and that the final version of the study was read and approved.

Funding
This research received no funding.

Use of AI for Writing Assistance
No AI was used for writing assistance.

References
[1] Airasian, P. W. & Miranda, H. (2002). The Role of Assessment in the Revised Taxonomy, *Theory Into Practice*, *41*(4), 249-254.

[2] Alazzi, K. F. (2008). Teachers' perceptions of critical thinking: A study of Jordanian secondary social studies teachers. *Social Studies, 99*(6), 243–248. https://doi.org/10.3200/TSSS.99.6.243-248

[3] Anderson, L.W. & Krathwohl, D.R. (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. New York: Logman.

[4] Arslan, G. ve Batur, Z. (2022). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde bir soru türü önerisi: kültürel soru. *Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi,* 24, 339-360. https://doi.org/10.29228/asos.54779

[5] Atasoy, G. (2021). *İki dillilere Türkçe öğretiminde 21. yüzyıl becerileri ve yenilenmiş Bloom taksomisine dayalı etkinlik tasarımı* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi. İstanbul.

[6] Athanassiou, N., McNett, J. & Harvey, C. (2003). Critical thinking in the management Classroom: Bloom's Taxonomy as a learning tool. *Journal of Management Education, (27)*5, 533-555. https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562903252515

[7] Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*(1), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.1

[8] Bandura, A. (2006). Toward a psychology of human agency. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 1*(2), 164–180. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6916.2006.00011.x

[9] Birgin, O. (2016). Bloom Taksonomisi. Erhan Bingölbali vd. (Ed.) *Matematik eğitiminde teoriler* içinde (p.839-860). Pegem Akademi.

[10] Bloom, B.S. (Ed). (1956). *Taxonomy of Educational objectives, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain*, Newyork: David Mckay.

[11] Bümen, N. T. (2006). Program geliştirmede bir dönüm noktası: yenilenmiş Bloom Taksonomisi. *Eğitim ve Bilim, (31)*142, 3-14.

[12] Brookhart, S. M. (2010). *How to assess higher-order thinking skills in your classroom.* Alexandria: ASCD.

[13] Christensen, L. B., Burke-Johnson, R., & Turner, L.A. (2015). *Araştırma yöntemleri desen ve analiz*.(12 Basımdan Çeviri). (Çev. Ed. Ahmet Aypay). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

[14] Coffman, D. M. (2013). *Thinking about thinking: An exploration of preservice teachers' views about higher order thinking skills* (Doctoral dissertation). University of South Florida. ABD.

[15] Değer, A.C. & Fidan, Ö. (2004). İkinci dilde okuma alt becerilerinin geliştirilmesine yönelik malzeme oluşturma-geliştirme önerileri, *Dünyada Türkçe Öğretimi,* 126, 7-18. https://doi.org/10.1501/dilder_0000000021

[16] Demir, T. T. (2019). *İleri düzey yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretimi ders kitaplarındaki okuma etkinliklerinin revize edilmiş bloom taksonomisine göre incelenmesi* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Uşak Üniversitesi. Uşak.

[17] Emre, K. (2020). *Türkçenin yabancı dil olarak öğretimi programının yenilenmiş bloom taksonomisine göre değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi. Çanakkale.

[18] Forehand, M. (2005). Bloom's taxonomy: original and revised. In M. Orey (Ed.), *Emerging perspectives on learning, teaching, and technology*. Available Website: http://www.coe.uga.edu/epltt/bloom.htm.

[19] Gashan, A. K. (2015). Exploring Saudi pre-service teachers' knowledge of critical thinking skills and their teaching perceptions. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, *3*(1), 26-33.

[20] Güney, E. Z. (2019). *Yabancılara Türkçe öğretimi ders kitaplarında bulunan metin altı soruların yenilenmiş bloom taksonomisine göre analizi* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi. Çanakkale.

[21] İltar, L. ve Karataş, A.G. (2022). Türkçenin yabancı dil olarak öğretiminde kullanılan C1 sınavlarının yenilenmiş Bloom Taksonomisi'ne göre incelenmesi. *Rumelide Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi, 31,* 108-121. https://doi.org/10.29000/rumelide.1220495

[22] Karasar, N. (2013). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi* (25. Basım). Nobel Akademik Yayınları.

[23] Köğce, D., Aydın, M. ve Yıldız, C. (Çev.) (2009). Bloom Taksonomisinin revizyonu: genel bir bakış. *İlköğretim Online, 8*(3), 1-7.

[24] Krathwohl, D. R. (2002). A revision of Bloom's Taxonomy: an overview, *Theory ınto Practıce*, 41, 212-218. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4104_2

[25] Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

[26] Lauer, T. (2005). Teaching critical-thinking skills using course content material. *Journal of College Science Teaching, 34*(6), 34–44.

[27] Nurmatova, S., & Altun, M. (2023). *A comprehensive review of Bloom's taxonomy integration to enhancing novice EFL educators' pedagogical impact*. Arab World English Journal (AWEJ), 14(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol14no1.1

[28] Özyalçın, K. E. (2019). *Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenenlerin yenilenmiş bloom taksonomisine göre metin altı soru yazma becerileri üzerine bir değerlendirme.* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi. Çanakkale.

[29] Sertdemir, E. (2021). *Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde kullanılan Türkçe yeterlik sınavlarını yenilenmiş bloom taksonomisine göre incelenmesi* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi. Çanakkale.

[30] Sönmez, H. (2019). An examination of the revised Bloom's Taxonomy as a model in the curriculum design process, Researcher, 7, 106-148.

[31] Stedman, N. L. P., & Adams, B. L. (2012). Identifying faculty's knowledge of critical thinking concepts and perceptions of teaching critical thinking instruction in higher education. *Nacta Journal, 56*(1), 9–14.

[32] Ulum, Ö. G. (2022). Is the Revised Bloom's Taxonomy Revisited in the EFL/ESL Reading Textbooks? *OPUS Journal of Society Research*, 19(45), 170–177.

[33] Ulutaş, M. ve Kara, M. (2019). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretimi ders kitaplarındaki metin altı sorularının yenilenmiş Bloom Taksonomisi'ne göre incelenmesi. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Der-*

gisi, 8(4), 2198-2214.

[34] Ulutaş, M. ve Kara, M. (2019). TÖMER Türkçe öğretim programları okuma kazanımlarının bilişsel stratejiler açısından incelenmesi. *Dil Eğitimi ve Araştırmaları Dergisi, 5*(2), 232-250. https://doi.org/10.31464/jlere.575801

[35] Utami, D. F., Nurkamto, J., Marmanto, S., & Taopan, L. L. (2019). The implementation of higher-order thinking skills in EFL classroom: Instructors' perceptions. *Proceeding of the International Conference on Future of Education, 2*(1), 64-72. https://doi.org/10.17501/26307413.2019.2107

[36] Yıldız, D. ve Ateşli, A. (2022). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde web 2.0 araçlarıyla Bloom Taksonomisine uygun etkinlik örnekleri. *Uluslararası Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçe Öğretimi Dergisi, 5*(1), 4-25.

Genişletilmiş Özet

Bu çalışma, Bloom'un Yenilenmiş Taksonomisi'nin yabancılara Türkçe öğretiminde uygulanmasını ele almakta ve bu bağlamda öğretici farkındalığını değerlendirmektedir. Araştırmanın temel dayanağı, dil öğretiminin ezber temelli bir yaklaşımdan uzaklaşarak analiz, değerlendirme ve yaratıcılık gibi üst düzey düşünme becerilerini (Higher-Order Thinking Skills – HOTS) geliştirmeye odaklanması gerekliliğidir. Anderson ve Krathwohl (2001) tarafından ortaya konulduğu üzere Bloom'un taksonomisi, öğreticilerin öğrenicilerde daha derin bilişsel katılımı ve eleştirel düşünme becerilerini teşvik eden öğrenme hedefleri belirlemeleri için bir çerçeve sunmaktadır. Yapılan araştırmalarda Türkçenin yabancı/ikinci dil olarak öğretiminde kullanılan ders kitapları, kur sonu sınavları, Türkçe Yeterlik Sınavları, beceri alanları, öğretim programları, kazanımlar, metinler, metin altı soruları Bloom Taksonomisine göre incelenmiştir (Sertdemir, 2021; Emre, 2020; Demir, 2019; Özyalçın, 2019; Güney, 2019; Ulutaş ve Kara; İltar ve Karataş, 2002). İlgili çalışmaların ortak sonuçlarına bakıldığında daha çok alt bilişsel düzeylere (hatırlama-anlama-uygulama) ağırlık verildiği; üst düzey bilişsel becerilere (analiz etme-değerlendirme-yaratma) ise gerekli önemin verilmediği görülmüştür. Bu durum, öğrenicilerin dil yeterliliklerini geliştirmesinin yanı sıra gerçek dünya bağlamında eleştirel düşünme becerilerini edinmelerini de sınırlayabilmektedir. Oysaki yabancı/ ikinci dil öğretiminin amaçları arasında öğrenicilerin sorgulayan, eleştirel düşünen, çözüm üreten, yaratıcı, özgün bireyler olabilmeleri için üst düzey bilişsel becerilerini geliştirmek de vardır. Öğrenicilerin bu becerileri kullanmaları için onlara yol gösterecek öğreticilerin de ilgili bilişsel süreç-

lerde yeterliğe sahip olması beklenmektedir. Ancak, yabancılara Türkçe öğretimi alanında öğreticilerin bu konudaki yeterlilikleri, farkındalıkları veya görüşlerine ilişkin bir çalışmanın olmadığı görülmektedir.

Bu araştırmanın temel amacı, öğreticilerin Bloom'un Yenilenmiş Taksonomisi'ne uygun öğretim etkinlikleri hazırlama konusundaki farkındalıklarını ve yeterliliklerini incelemektir. Çalışmada, öğreticilerin bilişsel seviyeleri doğru fiiller ve öğretim etkinlikleri ile ilişkilendirme becerileri değerlendirilmektedir. Böylece, öğreticilerin öğrenicilerde üst düzey düşünme becerilerini nasıl teşvik edebildiklerine dair farkındalıkları belirlenmiştir (Sönmez, 2019). Bu amaçları gerçekleştirmek için araştırmada nitel ve nicel verilerin bir araya getirildiği betimsel nitelikli tarama modeli kullanılmıştır. Çalışma kapsamında, Türkiye'deki Türkçe Öğretim Merkezlerinde (TÖMER) görev yapan 86 öğreticiden nicel veri toplamak amacıyla yapılandırılmış bir anket uygulanmıştır. Elde edilen veriler, SPSS kullanılarak istatistiksel olarak analiz edilmiştir. Ayrıca, 23 katılımcı ile yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler gerçekleştirilmiş ve Bloom'un Taksonomisi'nin öğretim uygulamalarına entegrasyonu konusundaki görüş ve deneyimleri derinlemesine incelenmiştir. Bu çok yönlü yaklaşım, araştırmacıların bulguları üçgenleme (triangulation) yoluyla doğrulamasına ve öğreticilerin öğretim stratejilerine dair daha kapsamlı bir anlayış geliştirmesine olanak tanımıştır. Çalışmada nitel veriler üç araştırmacı tarafından kod, kategori ve tema olarak kodlanmış, içerik analizi tablolaştırılmış ve araştırma sorusuna cevap verecek şekilde alanyazından hareketle yorumlanmıştır. Nitel araştırmanın güvenilirliği için farklı kodlayıcılar tarafından kodlanan veri setinin benzerlik oranı önemlidir. İçerik analizindeki kodlamaların araştırmacılar arasındaki tutarlılığını hesaplamak için Miles ve Huberman modelinde içsel tutarlılık olarak adlandırılan ve kodlayıcılar arasındaki görüş birliği olarak kavramsallaştırılan benzerlik formülü kullanılmış ve benzerlik oranı % 86,2 olarak tespit edilmiştir.

Araştırmanın bulguları, öğreticilerin üst düzey düşünme becerilerine ilişkin farkındalık düzeylerinin yetersiz olduğunu göstermektedir. Katılımcıların büyük bir kısmı, öğretim etkinlikleriyle ilişkili bilişsel seviyeleri doğru şekilde tanımlamakta zorlanmıştır. Sonuçlar, özellikle üst düzey bilişsel becerilere yönelik görevlerin sıklıkla yanlış sınıflandırıldığını ve bu durumun Bloom'un çerçevesini öğretim tasarımına uygulama konusunda genel bir eksikliğe işaret ettiğini ortaya koymuştur. Buna rağmen, nitel veriler öğreticilerin bu becerilerin öğretim sürecine entegrasyonunun önemi-

nin farkında olduğunu göstermektedir. Ancak birçok öğretici, bu becerileri etkili bir şekilde derslerine entegre etme konusunda kendilerini yetersiz hissettiklerini ifade etmiştir. Görüşmelerden elde edilen bazı temel bulgular şu şekildedir: Öncelikle, birçok öğretici, üst düzey düşünme becerilerini öğretimlerine dâhil etme konusunda kendilerine güven duymadıklarını belirtmiştir. İkinci olarak, öğrenicilerin derinlemesine öğrenmesini ve eleştirel düşünme becerilerini geliştirmesini sağlamak için bu becerilerin öğretilmesi gerektiği konusunda ortak bir görüş bulunmaktadır. Son olarak, öğreticilerin Bloom'un çerçevesini sezgisel olarak uygulamaya çalıştıklarını, ancak bunu dil öğretimine nasıl etkin şekilde entegre edecekleri konusunda kendilerini yetersiz ve bilgisiz hissettiklerini ifade etmişlerdir. Genel olarak, öğreticiler üst düzey düşünme becerilerinin ve Bloom'un Taksonomisi'nin değerini kabul etseler de, bu ilkeleri etkili bir şekilde öğretim süreçlerine uygulamak için yeterli bilgi ve eğitimden yoksun olduklarını düşünmektedirler.

Bu çalışma, öğreticilerin pedagojik yeterliliklerini ve özgüvenlerini artırmak için Bloom'un Yenilenmiş Taksonomisi üzerine mesleki gelişim ve hedefe yönelik eğitimlerin gerekliliğini vurgulamaktadır. Öğreticilere üst düzey düşünme becerilerini ders planlamalarına etkin bir şekilde dâhil edebilmeleri için gerekli bilgi ve araçlar sağlandığında, dil öğretiminin genel kalitesinin önemli ölçüde artırılabileceği sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. Bu, öğrenicilerin yalnızca dil yeterliliğini artırmakla kalmayıp, aynı zamanda akademik ve gerçek dünya bağlamlarında gerekli olan eleştirel düşünme becerilerini kazanmalarını da destekleyecektir. Araştırmanın bulguları, müfredat geliştiriciler ve öğretmen eğitim programlarının, öğreticileri daha donanımlı hale getirmek için üst düzey bilişsel becerileri önceliklendirmesi gerektiğini ortaya koymaktadır. Bu çalışma, yalnızca Bloom'un Yenilenmiş Taksonomisi'ne ilişkin öğretici farkındalığının artırılmasının gerekliliğini vurgulamakla kalmayıp, aynı zamanda dil öğretiminin özellikle yabancılara Türkçe öğretimi bağlamında daha etkili, eleştirel ve etkileşimli bir öğrenme deneyimine dönüşmesine olanak sağlayabilecek geniş çaplı bir eğitimsel çerçeve sunmaktadır. Üst düzey düşünme becerilerinin geliştirilmesi, bağımsız ve kendi kendini yönlendirebilen öğreniciler yetiştirmek açısından temel bir öncelik olarak kalmalı ve öğrenicilerin hedef dilde bilişsel gelişimlerini destekleyen bir eğitim anlayışı benimsenmelidir.