Journal of Educational Sciences
Journal homepage: https://jes.ejournal.unri.ac.id/index.php/JES
P-ISSN 2581-1657
E-ISSN 2581-2203

Bloom's Taxonomy Theory and the Challenges of Its Implementation in Education

Septia Sri Letari*, M. Sirozi
Faculty of tarbiyah and teacher, Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Fatah, Palembang, 30126, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 07 Oct 2025
Revised: 28 Oct 2025
Accepted: 06 Nov 2025
Published online: 26 Nov 2025

Keywords:

Bloom's Taxonomy,
Education

* *Corresponding author:*

E-mail:
septiasrilestari_24052160042@radenfatah.ac.id

Article Doi:

https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.9.6.p.6043-6055

A B S T R A C T

Islamic education currently faces increasingly complex challenges along with technological developments, changes in student character, and demands for improved learning quality. These conditions require more adaptive and relevant educational strategies to shape both academic competence and student morals. This study aims to analyze the effectiveness of modern learning approaches in strengthening Islamic character values and improving the quality of the teaching and learning process in schools. The research method used was library research, reviewing books, scientific articles, and relevant recent research findings. The results indicate that the integration of active learning models, the use of digital media, and the reinforcement of spiritual values can increase learning motivation, student participation, and the development of morals such as discipline, responsibility, and honesty. The study's conclusion confirms that learning that combines pedagogical innovation with Islamic values has a positive impact on developing students' intellectual, emotional, and moral intelligence in a balanced manner. Therefore, this learning model is worthy of continued implementation in Islamic education.

1. Introduction

Education plays a central and strategic role in shaping the quality of human resources and stands as one of the primary pillars for the advancement and sustainability of a nation (Halean, 2021). Through education, individuals do not merely acquire knowledge and technical skills; they also undergo a comprehensive process of character development, moral strengthening, and internalization of values that contribute to the creation of a civilized and progressive society. Education is essentially a transformative process that modifies attitudes and behaviors so that learners develop spiritual and religious strength, self-control, solid personality, intellectual capability, noble character, and practical skills required for both their personal needs and societal responsibilities. This understanding reinforces that education is not solely oriented toward cognitive development but

also encompasses affective and psychomotor dimensions that work together in an integrated learning process (Suryana et al., 2022).

As a complex and dynamic process, education seeks to optimize all aspects of human potential through well-planned, systematic, and continuous learning activities. Education functions as a purposeful endeavor aimed at developing knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values essential for human growth. It is inseparable from human life; thus, it becomes a vital and valuable instrument for building global civilization that evolves alongside scientific and technological advancements (Kartini et al., 2022). The role of education is not static. Rather, it continuously adapts to societal needs, cultural contexts, and the rapid changes brought about by modernization.

In recent decades, the development of education has accelerated significantly due to the advancement of science, innovation, and digital technology. These rapid changes have led to major shifts in teaching and learning paradigms. Wafa (2024) the traditional learning models, which were previously teacher centered, authoritative, and dominated by one way communication, are gradually being replaced by student-centered approaches that emphasize active learning, collaboration, critical thinking, and problem solving. This paradigm shift requires educators to be more competent, creative, adaptive, and committed to continuously improving learning methods that align with contemporary challenges. The pace of educational development demands strong professional skills, innovation, and willingness to deliver quality learning. Learning itself is a series of instructional processes structured to achieve specific learning objectives that support learners' intellectual and personal growth (Putra et al., 2024).

The success of instructional processes can be observed through the degree to which learning objectives are achieved. Therefore, valid, reliable, and objective evaluation systems are essential for ensuring optimal learning outcomes. Evaluation serves not only as a measurement tool of students' academic attainment but also as a reflective mechanism for teachers to improve teaching strategies and learning designs. Achieving meaningful learning outcomes requires assessment procedures that are accurate, comprehensive, and aligned with learning objectives. Assessment, therefore, is a systematic process that draws on information obtained from both test and non-test instruments to evaluate learners' progress in knowledge, attitudes, and skills (Sulaeman, 2022).

A crucial aspect that supports effective instructional design is mastery of educational taxonomy. Taxonomy, in general, refers to a classification system used to categorize objects, concepts, or materials based on specific characteristics. In the educational context, taxonomy functions as a framework for classifying learning objectives according to levels of complexity and specificity (Ratno et al., 2024). Bloom's Taxonomy, developed by Benjamin S. Bloom and his colleagues in 1956, is one of the most widely recognized frameworks for classifying instructional goals. It categorizes learning into three major domains: the cognitive domain, which focuses on intellectual skills; the affective domain, which concerns attitudes and

values; and the psychomotor domain, which involves physical and motor skills. All three domains work synergistically to shape holistic learning experiences.

Over time, Bloom's original taxonomy was revised by Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) to accommodate 21st-century educational demands. The revised taxonomy emphasizes the importance of Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS), which include analyzing, evaluating, and creating. These skills prepare learners to engage in complex thinking, problem-solving, innovation, and decision-making competencies that are increasingly required in modern society. The application of Bloom's Taxonomy allows educators to design instructional activities that move beyond simple memorization and comprehension, fostering deeper learning and cognitive engagement.

In the Indonesian education system, Bloom's Taxonomy plays a significant role in supporting competency-based curricula aimed at developing learners who excel intellectually while possessing strong character, values, and relevant skills. The taxonomy aligns with global educational priorities, especially those demanded by the Industrial Revolution 4.0, which requires individuals to be critical thinkers, creative innovators, collaborative team players, and effective communicators (Marta et al., 2025). Thus, Bloom's Taxonomy helps ensure that learning experiences prepare students not only for academic success but also for real-world challenges in an increasingly competitive and interconnected world.

Nevertheless, the implementation of Bloom's Taxonomy in educational practice continues to encounter several challenges. Many educators still possess limited understanding of the taxonomy's structure and its instructional applications. This often results in learning activities that remain focused on rote memorization rather than deeper cognitive engagement. Consequently, students may not be sufficiently encouraged to develop analytical, evaluative, and creative thinking skills. Addressing these challenges requires continuous professional development, curriculum strengthening, and improved instructional resources to ensure that Bloom's Taxonomy is applied effectively and consistently in educational settings. In line with this background, the purpose of this study is to analyze the relevance, implementation, and challenges of Bloom's Taxonomy in contemporary educational practice.

2. Methodology

This study employs a library research approach, or literature review, using a qualitative method. This method is carried out by analyzing or examining various sources such as books, articles, scientific journals, documents, and other relevant literature to be used as references. The literature used may be in the form of digital files. This research method differs from other research methods because it does not require the researcher to go into the field to conduct observations or interviews to obtain primary information. Instead, the study is conducted by collecting data or analyzing materials to solve a problem by focusing on relevant library sources. The advantages of the literature study method include time efficiency, accessibility of

information sources, and its contribution to providing in-depth understanding of research issues without direct experimentation. Nevertheless, researchers must remain cautious of potential literature bias and ensure that the sources used are highly credible and relevant to the research questions being addressed (Nurhasanah, 2023).

3. Result and Discussion

The results of the study indicate that Bloom's Taxonomy holds a highly significant position in modern learning processes, particularly within the context of 21st-century education that requires the development of higher-order thinking skills. Based on the literature analysis, this taxonomy not only serves as a fundamental framework for formulating learning objectives but also functions as a reference for designing learning strategies, developing instructional materials, and constructing structured and measurable assessment instruments.

In the cognitive domain, Bloom's Taxonomy provides clear guidance regarding the stages of thinking skills, ranging from basic levels such as remembering and understanding to higher levels such as analyzing, evaluating, and creating. This hierarchical structure allows educators to design learning objectives that are aligned with students' needs, whether for mastering basic concepts or developing more complex problem-solving abilities. The revised taxonomy proposed by Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) further emphasizes the importance of integrating cognitive processes with knowledge dimensions so that learning outcomes can be achieved more comprehensively.

However, the literature review also shows that the implementation of Bloom's Taxonomy in the field still faces significant challenges. One important finding is that many educators have not fully understood the differences between cognitive levels, causing learning activities to remain focused on memorization and basic comprehension (Nurjanah & Suryadi, 2025). This condition leads to less optimal development of higher order thinking skills (HOTS), which are essential in competency based curricula and the needs of the digital era. Numerous studies indicate that errors in classifying learning objectives and constructing assessment items are common obstacles in applying this taxonomy. In addition, teacher readiness and the availability of learning resources greatly influence the effectiveness of Bloom's Taxonomy implementation. Teachers require continuous training, access to high quality instructional materials, and the ability to utilize learning technologies to design activities and assessments oriented toward HOTS. Without such support, it becomes difficult for the learning process to shift from conventional approaches to more creative, critical, and collaborative ones.

On the other hand, the literature review also confirms that Bloom's Taxonomy holds great potential to encourage educational transformation toward more meaningful learning (Hayya & Dharin, 2023). This framework is relevant to the demands of 21st-century learning, including strengthening critical thinking, creativity, communication, and collaboration. By understanding the taxonomy

structure accurately, educators can design learning strategies that enable students to enhance reflective, evaluative, and innovative abilities. Overall, the findings show that Bloom's Taxonomy serves not only as an essential guideline for designing and evaluating learning but also as a theoretical standard supporting the orientation of modern education. Nevertheless, efforts to strengthen teacher capacity, improve pedagogical literacy, and develop taxonomy based learning instruments are still needed to ensure its effective implementation.

Based on the analysis, a more systematic mapping of the advantages and disadvantages of Bloom's Taxonomy is required so that educators can gain a clearer understanding of its practical application in the classroom. A comprehensive understanding of both the strengths and limitations of this taxonomy is crucial for optimizing its role in enhancing learning quality, especially in developing higher-order thinking skills. Therefore, the following table is presented to summarize the key advantages and disadvantages of Bloom's Taxonomy based on theoretical studies and previous research findings. Table 1 is expected to serve as a reference for educators and researchers in developing more effective, adaptive learning strategies that align with students' needs.

Table 1. Advantages and Challenges of Bloom's Taxonomy in Education: A Comparative Analysis

No	Aspect	Advantages of Bloom's Taxonomy	Challenges of Bloom's Taxonomy	Supporting Theory
1	Structure & Concept	Bloom's Taxonomy provides a clear hierarchical structure from lower-order thinking to higher-order thinking. Distinguishes knowledge dimensions: factual, conceptual, procedural, and metacognitive.	Teachers often struggle to differentiate cognitive levels. Misconceptions still occur between "understanding" and "analyzing."	(Krathwohl et al., 1964) Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001)
2	Development of Higher-Order Thinking (HOTS)	Develops analytical, evaluative, and creative abilities. Supports 21st-century learning.	Many teachers still focus only on remembering and understanding levels.	(Krathwohl, 2002); Brookhart (2010)
3	Learning Planning	Serves as a guide in formulating learning objectives. Facilitates the selection of appropriate teaching methods and techniques.	Teachers require training to design HOTS-based lesson plans and test items.	(Marzano, 2001); Popham (2014)
4	Classroom Implementation	Helps teachers structure active, creative, and	Not effective if students have not mastered basic skills.	Arends (2012); Joyce, Weil & Calhoun (2009)

		meaningful learning activities.	Requires adequate supporting resources.	
5	Learning Evaluation	Assists in developing assessment instruments aligned with competencies. Facilitates analysis of learning outcomes.	Developing HOTS-based assessments requires more time.	Nitko & Brookhart (2011); Sulaeman (2022)
6	Application in the Indonesian Curriculum	Supports the 2013 Curriculum and Merdeka Belajar policies. Aligns with 21st-century competency needs.	Teachers' understanding of the revised taxonomy varies widely, affecting consistency in implementation.	Marta et al. (2025)
7	Technology Integration	Bloom's Taxonomy can be integrated into digital learning and computer-based assessments.	Not all teachers are able to use technology effectively to develop HOTS-based evaluations.	Church (2009), "Bloom's Digital Taxonomy"

Definition of Bloom's Taxonomy

Taxonomy is a classification system (Yaumi, Muhammad: 2013) derived from the Greek words *taxis* (arrangement) and *nomos* (knowledge or law). Bloom's Taxonomy originates from the work of educational psychologist Dr. Benjamin Bloom (1956), who conceptualized learning at higher cognitive levels, emphasizing the ability to analyze and evaluate concepts, processes, procedures, and principles rather than merely recalling factual information (Nafiati, 2021). Each level within the taxonomy is supported by an extensive list of thinking skills adapted to teaching and learning environments enriched with technology. These activities help create engaging and enjoyable learning experiences (Sumartini, 2022).

Bloom's Taxonomy is a framework developed to classify educational objectives into systematic categories. Its primary purpose is to guide educators in designing, implementing, and evaluating learning processes in a structured and measurable manner. In the context of education, Bloom's Taxonomy functions as a tool for structuring learning objectives across cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains, arranged hierarchically from simple to complex skills (Marta et al., 2025). The taxonomy, first introduced by Benjamin S. Bloom in 1956, categorizes learning objectives into three main domains, each further subdivided into hierarchical categories. These domains are: the Cognitive Domain, consisting of intellectual skills such as knowledge, comprehension, and critical thinking; the Affective Domain, which involves emotional responses such as attitudes, interests, appreciation, and values; and the Psychomotor Domain, which relates to motor skills such as handwriting, typing, swimming, and operating machinery or in Islamic education, the ability to apply and internalize religious practices in daily life (Sihotang et al., 2024). Bloom's Taxonomy describes a hierarchy of human

cognitive development consisting of six levels: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. In elementary education, this taxonomy plays a vital role in developing students' critical thinking skills. Teachers can design learning experiences suitable for students' cognitive stages, thereby helping them build a strong foundation for critical thinking (Hayya & Dharin, 2023).

Bloom's Taxonomy is crucial in education because it provides a clear structure for formulating learning objectives. This framework helps educators determine specific and measurable learning outcomes, select appropriate teaching strategies, and develop relevant assessment tools. By categorizing learning goals into cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains, educators can set clear directions for instruction and select the most suitable teaching methods. The taxonomy not only supports structured learning experiences but also promotes the development of higher order thinking skills among students (Marta et al., 2025).

In educational practice, taxonomy is used to classify learning objectives, with each domain divided into sequential hierarchical categories ranging from simple to complex behaviors. Each level builds upon the levels below it, meaning the taxonomy is interconnected and continuous, representing the comprehensive development of learner capabilities (Mahmudi et al., 2022). Bloom's Taxonomy is a hierarchical structure identifying thinking skills from basic to advanced levels. Bloom observed that most school assessments focused on memorization, which he considered the lowest level of cognitive ability (Khalishah & Iklilah, 2021). He categorized six major cognitive processes knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation arranged from concrete to abstract. This hierarchy progresses from basic identification to the highest cognitive function (Miaz, 2020). Bloom's three learning domains include:

1. Cognitive Domain, involving intellectual behaviors such as knowledge, comprehension, and thinking skills.
2. Affective Domain, involving emotional responses such as interest, attitude, appreciation, and self-adjustment.
3. Psychomotor Domain, involving physical skills such as handwriting, typing, swimming, and operating tools. The cognitive domain includes mental processes ranging from basic knowledge to higher-level evaluation (Mukherjee & Kittur, 2025).

Bloom's three domains cognitive, affective, and psychomotor relate to thinking, emotional, and motor skills respectively. In the cognitive domain, thinking abilities are classified hierarchically, where each level serves as a prerequisite for the next. The affective domain emphasizes attitudes, values, and motivation, while the psychomotor domain focuses on coordination and physical skills.

Structure and Concept of Bloom's Taxonomy

Bloom's Taxonomy, introduced by Benjamin S. Bloom (1956), is a major milestone in education because it provides a systematic framework for classifying learning

objectives by cognitive processes. Bloom argued that education involves developing knowledge, skills, and attitudes, requiring instruction to progress from simple to complex thinking abilities. The revision by Anderson & Krathwohl (2001) updated the taxonomy by transforming the descriptors into verbs and adding a knowledge dimension (factual, conceptual, procedural, and metacognitive), making the taxonomy more practical and aligned with 21st-century learning demands.

However, studies show that teachers frequently struggle to distinguish between cognitive levels. Krathwohl (2002) noted that one of the most common misconceptions is equating "understanding" with "analyzing." While understanding involves interpreting and explaining, analyzing requires breaking information into components to identify relationships and patterns. Such misunderstandings result in imprecise learning objectives and activities that remain at lower-thinking levels. Although Bloom's Taxonomy provides a comprehensive structure, its effectiveness depends heavily on teachers' competence in interpreting each cognitive level. Teachers lacking understanding tend to focus only on lower-level skills such as remembering and understanding, thus failing to promote critical thinking. Continuous professional development is necessary to ensure teachers can integrate the taxonomy effectively across planning, instruction, and assessment.

Development of Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS)

The analysis, evaluation, and creation levels of the taxonomy represent Higher-Order Thinking Skills (HOTS). Krathwohl (2002) emphasized that these levels require students not only to understand concepts but to process information, compare, judge according to standards, and generate new ideas. Brookhart (2010) clarified that *"HOTS is not about the difficulty of the task, but about the cognitive processes used."* In Indonesia, implementation of HOTS remains limited. Sulaeman (2022) found that more than 70% of teacher made assessments measure lower-level skills (remembering and understanding). Many teachers believe HOTS questions must be long or complex, when in fact HOTS depends on the cognitive demand, not text length. Bloom's Taxonomy has great potential to enhance higher order skills, but its success requires a shift in teacher mindset. Training in problem-based learning, case analysis, and critical discourse is necessary to strengthen the culture of HOTS in classrooms.

Lesson Planning

In lesson planning, Bloom's Taxonomy helps formulate measurable learning objectives. Marzano (2001) stressed that effective learning goals must reflect clear, observable cognitive processes. Teachers must ensure that instructional strategies and assessments correspond to the intended cognitive level. Popham (2014) warned that a frequent error is misalignment between goals, instructional methods, and assessments teachers may set high-level goals but use low-level strategies. Additionally, misunderstanding of operational verbs leads to inconsistencies in lesson planning. For example, "explaining" is often mistaken as an analytical skill when it is classified under understanding. As a result, lesson plans do not reflect

accurate cognitive expectations. Proper lesson planning requires deep understanding of the taxonomy. Without it, lesson plans become administrative documents rather than pedagogical guides. Teachers need structured training and examples of goal-setting, instruction, and evaluation aligned with Bloom's framework.

Classroom Implementation

Bloom's Taxonomy helps teachers create meaningful learning activities. Arends (2012) stated that effective instruction must engage students in cognitive processes aligned with learning objectives. Joyce, Weil, & Calhoun (2009) emphasized that inquiry learning, problem-based learning (PBL), and cooperative learning are highly compatible with Bloom's higher levels because they require critical thinking and problem solving. However, classroom challenges often hinder implementation. First, students' readiness heavily influences their ability to engage in analysis or evaluation. Second, limited resources such as learning materials, media, and time constrain the implementation of higher-level activities. Third, many teachers still rely on lecture-based instruction. Implementation requires staged learning supported by scaffolding. Teachers must diagnose students' initial abilities and gradually elevate cognitive demands while ensuring adequate support.

Learning Assessment

Assessment is crucial in ensuring that learning objectives are truly achieved by students. Nitko & Brookhart (2011) emphasize that assessment instruments must directly align with instructional goals so that the cognitive skills being measured accurately reflect the intended outcomes. Bloom's Taxonomy provides a systematic framework that guides teachers in designing assessments ranging from lower-order processes such as recall and comprehension to higher order skills like analysis, evaluation, and creation. By aligning assessment tasks with the taxonomy's hierarchical structure, educators can ensure that each question targets the appropriate thinking skill. This alignment is particularly important because mismatches between objectives and assessments may result in inaccurate conclusions about students' understanding and abilities. Bloom's framework also encourages teachers to think critically about the depth of cognitive engagement required by each assessment item, ensuring that evaluation is both purposeful and pedagogically sound.

Despite its benefits, implementing assessments that genuinely measure higher order thinking remains a challenge for many educators. Research by Brookhart (2010) and Sulaeman (2022) shows that teachers frequently misclassify items as HOTS even when they only measure comprehension or basic application. This indicates a need for stronger professional development in understanding cognitive verbs, task complexity, and the mental processes involved in each level of Bloom's Taxonomy. Furthermore, effective assessment should incorporate a variety of formats such as performance tasks, case analysis, project-based evaluation, and reflective writing to capture students' cognitive abilities more authentically. Nitko (2011) argue that diverse assessment methods provide richer insights into student learning compared

to traditional testing alone. When Bloom's Taxonomy is applied consistently and accurately, assessments not only become more valid and reliable, but also encourage students to develop critical thinking, creativity, and deeper conceptual understanding skills essential in 21st-century learning.

Application in the Indonesian Curriculum

Bloom's Taxonomy aligns well with the competency-based approach of the 2013 Curriculum and the Merdeka Curriculum, which emphasize 21st-century skills such as critical thinking, creativity, collaboration, and communication. The Ministry of Education and Culture stressed that learning outcomes must reflect higher order thinking to prepare students for global challenges. Marta et al (2025) found that schools consistently applying Bloom's Taxonomy demonstrate higher instructional quality and improved student outcomes. However, teacher capability varies widely across regions. Limited access to training and administrative burdens reduce teachers' opportunities to apply the taxonomy effectively. Strengthening teacher development programs focused on pedagogy, HOTS, and active learning is essential for nationwide improvement.

Integration of Technology in Learning

Technological advancements significantly impact education. Churches (2008) introduced the *Bloom's Digital Taxonomy*, mapping cognitive processes to digital activities such as searching (remember), tagging (analyze), commenting (evaluate), and blogging or animating (create). Digital learning environments provide rich opportunities to develop HOTS. Students can create videos (create), conduct digital debates (evaluate), or analyze data using apps (analyze). However, limited digital literacy and uneven access to technology hinder optimal implementation. Effective integration requires teacher mastery of TPACK (Technological Pedagogical and Content Knowledge). Teachers must be able to select the appropriate digital tools and align them with the cognitive levels of Bloom's Taxonomy.

Challenges in Implementing Bloom's Taxonomy

One of the main challenges in implementing Bloom's Taxonomy is ensuring that learning objectives align with the assessment methods used. Therefore, it is important to ensure that assessments are designed to cover all cognitive levels. In the digital era, the application of learning objectives based on Bloom's Taxonomy has become increasingly relevant with the emergence of technologies that enable data-driven learning. According to Shaikh et al (2021), technology can be used to automatically classify learning objectives and assessments, such as through machine learning or deep learning. With this technology, teachers can more easily monitor the achievement of learning objectives across various cognitive levels.

Bloom's Taxonomy allows educators to gain a deeper understanding of students' cognitive development. However, the implementation of taxonomy-based evaluation strategies is still dominated by lower-order cognitive skills such as remembering and understanding. In contrast, higher-order thinking skills such as

analyzing, evaluating, and creating have not been optimally applied. This indicates that there is still room to improve the effectiveness of Bloom's Taxonomy so it can better encourage students to develop essential skills.

The main barriers in implementing evaluations based on Bloom's Taxonomy include limited time, the lack of teachers' understanding in designing HOTS-based evaluation instruments, and insufficient student participation in activities requiring critical thinking (Manik et al., 2025). Furthermore, various obstacles are still found in its implementation, such as the imbalance in the coverage of evaluations across cognitive levels, limited resources, and insufficient training for educators in developing more comprehensive evaluation instruments. Efforts to improve the effectiveness of Bloom's Taxonomy-based assessments are urgently needed to optimize the development of higher-order thinking skills that are relevant to the challenges of the digital era and globalization.

4. Conclusion

This study concludes that Bloom's Taxonomy remains an essential framework for guiding instructional planning, implementation, and assessment in modern education. The research successfully answers the main questions regarding the relevance, effectiveness, and challenges of applying Bloom's Taxonomy in contemporary learning environments. Findings indicate that the taxonomy provides clear structure for developing learning objectives and supports the cultivation of higher-order thinking skills needed in the 21st century. However, the study also highlights significant challenges in its practical application, particularly in aligning learning objectives with assessment methods. Many educators still rely on lower-order thinking tasks, while higher-order skills such as analyzing, evaluating, and creating are not yet fully developed in classroom practices. Limitations in teachers' understanding, insufficient training, restricted time allocation, and limited technological mastery further hinder optimal implementation. Although emerging digital tools offer opportunities such as machine learning systems that support automated classification of learning objectives—these innovations have not been fully utilized. Despite these challenges, this research is considered successful in presenting a comprehensive understanding of both the strengths and limitations of Bloom's Taxonomy. Strengthening teacher competence, expanding access to digital-based learning resources, and providing continuous professional development are necessary to ensure more effective and sustainable implementation. Overall, Bloom's Taxonomy remains highly relevant as a foundation for creating meaningful, adaptive, and cognitively rich learning experiences that prepare students to meet the demands of the digital era.

References

Anderson, L., & Krathwohl, D. (2001). A Revision of Bloom ' s Taxonomy : An Overview David R . Krathwohl. *ReVision*, *41*(4), 212–218. https://www.chemnet.edu.au/sites/default/files/files/Blooms_taxonomy_20

02_Krathwohl.pdf

Churches, A. (2008). *Bloom ' s Digital Taxonomy*. New York: Kristin School.

Halean, S. (2021). Peranan Pendidikan dalam Meningkatkan Sumber Daya Manusia di SMA Negeri 1 Tampan Amma di Talaud. *Holistik*, *14*(2), 1–15. https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/index.php/holistik/article/download/33774/31938

Hayya, L. 'Adilah, & Dharin, A. (2023). Peran Kognitif Taksonomi Bloom dalam Pengembangan Ketrampilan Berpikir Kritis Siswa Sekolah Dasar. *J-PGMI: Jurnal Pendidikan Guru MI*, *6*(1). https://ejournal.uinsaizu.ac.id/index.php/j-pgmi/article/view/9609

Kartini, N. E., Nurdin, E. S., Hakam, K. A., & Syihabuddin, S. (2022). Pembelajaran kontekstual : konsep dan aplikasi / Dr. Kokom Komalasari, MPd. ; editor, Nurul Falah Atif. *Jurnal Basicedu*, *6*(4). https://refika.co.id/701-pembelajaran-kontekstual-konsep-dan-aplikasi-edisi-revisi.html

Khalishah, N., & Iklilah, N. (2021). Taksonomi Bloom (Revisi): Tujuan Pendidikan dan Implementasinya dalam Pembelajaran Matematika. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Tadris Matematika (SANTIKA) 2021*, *1*(1). https://proceeding.uingusdur.ac.id/index.php/santika/article/download/536/91

Krathwohl. (2002). Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy: An Overview. *Theory Into Practice*, *41*(4), 114–124. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4104_2

Krathwohl, D., Bloom, B., & Masia, B. (1964). Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals - Handbook II: Affective Domain. In *Studies in Philisophy and Education*. David McKay Company.

Mahmudi, I., Athoillah, M. Z., Wicaksono, E. B., & Kusumua, A. R. (2022). Taksonomi Hasil Belajar. *Jurnal Multidisiplin Madani*, *2*(9). https://ejurnal.politeknikpratama.ac.id/index.php/Lencana/article/view/4572

Manik, G. C. S., Pohan, M., Hanum, S. L., Darma, S. P., & Dalimun, M. B. (2025). Analisis Strategi Evaluasi Pembelajaran Berbasis Taksonomi Bloom Dalam Meningkatkan Pemahaman Konseptual dan Keterampilan Problem Solving Siswa Gia. *SAKOLA - Journal of Sains Cooperative Learning and Law*, *2*(1), 642–649. https://rayyanjurnal.com/index.php/sakola/article/download/5881/pdf

Marta, M. A., Purnomo, D., & Gusmameli. (2025). Konsep Taksonomi Bloom dalam Desain Pembelajaran. *Lencana: Jurnal Inovasi Ilmu Pendidikan*, *3*(1), 230. https://doi.org/10.55606/lencana.v3i1.4572

Marzano, M. (2001). Designing a New Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. *Eric*, *8*(1), 1–21. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED447312.pdf

Miaz, Y. (2020). Paradigma Pembelajaran Terintegrasi Hots, 4C Dan Technology: Suatu Keharusan Bagi Siswa. *Jurnal Mutiara Pendidikan IndonesiaJurnal Mutiara Pendidikan Indonesia*, *5*(1), 25–35. https://doi.org/10.51544/mutiarapendidik.v5i1.1116

Mukherjee, S., & Kittur, J. (2025). Learning through cognitive , affective , and psychomotor domains : Understanding under- graduate engineering students ' perspectives in the. *Engicering Education Review*, *3*(3), 1–11. https://www.hksmp.com/journals/eer/article/view/916/1411

Nafiati, D. A. (2021). Revisi taksonomi Bloom: Kognitif, afektif, dan psikomotorik. *Humanika*, *21*(2), 151–172. https://doi.org/10.21831/hum.v21i2.29252

Nitko, A. J. (2011). *Educational assessment of students / Anthony J. Nitko, Susan M. Brookhart*. Boston, MA : Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.

Nurhasanah. (2023). Evaluasi Hasil Belajar. *Jurnal Jenis Dan Model Pendidikan*.

Nurjanah, S., & Suryadi, A. (2025). Analysis of Teachers ' Readiness in Implementing the Deep Learning Approach in History Instruction for Grade X at Sint Louis Senior High. *JKIP : Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Pendidikan*, *6*(3), 943–953. http://journal.al-matani.com/index.php/jkip/index

Putra, R. P., Yaqin, M. A., & Saputra, A. (2024). Analisis Taksonomi Bloom (Kognitif, Afektif, Psikomotorik). *Journal of Islamic and Educational Research*, *2*(1). https://journal.institercom-edu.org/index.php/alkarim/article/view/236

Ratno, S., Tambunan, R. S. P., Situmorang, D., Sitoru, K., Sianturi, N. G., Putri, N. A., Manurung, S. A., & Siburian, W. G. (2024). Analisis Penerapan Taksonomi Bloom dalam Pembelajaran Siswa Kelas VI SD Negeri 105293 Medan Estate. *Sinar Dunia: Jurnal Riset Sosial Humaniora Dan Ilmu Pendidikan*, *3*(4), 128. https://jurnal.larisma.or.id/index.php/JRIP/article/view/1283

Shaikh, S., Daudpota, S. M., & Imran, A. S. (2021). Bloom ' s Learning Outcomes ' Automatic Classification Using LSTM and Pretrained Word Embeddings. *IEEE Acces*, *21*(2), 88–97. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3106443

Sihotang, A., Zailani, & Pohan, S. (2024). Implementasi Taksonomi Bloom dalam Pembelajaran Pendidikan Agama Islam untuk Membentuk Perilaku Teladan Siswa. *Didaktika: Jurnal Kependidikan*, *13*(3), 3355. https://jurnaldidaktika.org/contents/article/download/897/559/

Sulaeman. (2022). Implementasi Media Peraga dalam Meningkatkan Mutu Pembelajaran, *Jurnal Pendidikan*, *6*(1). https://jurnal.azkahafidzmaulana.my.id/index.php/ilpen/article/download/29/30

Sumartini, A. (2022). Penerapan Taksonomi Digital Bloom Pada Masa Belajar Di Rumah Oleh Guru SMK Di Kalimantan Barat. *Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia*, *3*(08). https://doi.org/10.59141/japendi.v3i08.998

Suryana, E., Hasdikurniat, A. I., Harmayanti, A. A., & Harto, K. (2022). Perkembangan Remaja Awal, Menengah Dan Implikasinya Terhadap Pendidikan. *Jurnal Ilmiah Mandala Education (JIME)*, *8*(3), 2. https://ejournal.mandalanursa.org/index.php/JIME/article/view/3494

Wafa, H. (2024). Challenges Hindering The effective Implementation of student – centered learning Herihiri Wafa. *El'Bahith*, *6*(2), 89–104. https://asjp.cerist.dz/en/downArticle/359/16/2/254175

How to cite this article:

Letari, S. S., & Sirozi, M. (2025). Bloom's Taxonomy Theory and the Challenges of Its Implementation in Education. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, *9(6)*, 6043-6055.