New Language Dimensions
Volume 1 (2) 2020
ISSN: 2746-8968 (online)
https://journal.unesa.ac.id/index.php/nld/index

Exploring Diverse Thinking Level Students' Challenges and Strategies in HOT Questions for English Writing

Talitha Rizky Satyaputri[1], Irma Soraya[2]

[1]*Sunan Ampel State Islamic University, Surabaya, Indonesia*
[2] *Sunan Ampel State Islamic University, Surabaya, Indonesia*
[*]*Corresponding Author: talithasatya@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT

The role of higher order thinking skill in the instructional process is undeniably essential especially in this millennial era that demands more critical thinking. However, the unpleasant fact showed that Indonesian students are still unfamiliar and having difficulty to solve HOTS question. Although HOTS has been implemented in Indonesia since 2013. One English language activity that involves HOTS the most is writing. That fact leads this present study to examine; 1) students' challenge in solving HOT question for English writing, and 2) students' strategies in solving HOT question. On top of that, present study also examined the challenge and strategy based on diverse students' thinking level. Researcher used descriptive qualitative method and for obtaining the data, researcher conducted a HOTS testing to determine students thinking level then conducted interview with the students representative from each thinking level to fulfil both of the research questions. The result highlighted that the same level of thinking students indeed had some different challenges and vice versa. Additionally, cognitive challenge becomes the major challenge comparing to the linguistic ones from both of HOT and LOT students' perspective. Then, the strategies that was implemented by students are ; 1) estimating the time, 2) re-reading the HOT question, 3) translating the question, 4) Paraphrasing the question, 5) pointing important keywords, 6) getting background knowledge from semantic and episodic memory, 7) asking peers for help, 8) scratching raw idea, 9) rereading the whole answer and self-reflecting. Overall LOT applied more strategies than HOT students.

Keywords: Higher Order Thinking Question For English Writing, Student's Strategy, Student' Challenge

INTRODUCTION

The unpleasant results from several surveys and previous researches strongly indicate that Indonesian students are not accustomed to solve HOT Question and still confront some hurdles answering them. Starting from survey of PISA (Program International School Assessment) in 2016 conveyed that the Indonesian pupils' HOTS and literacy skill is a way too far from satisfaction. The survey revealed that 70% of Indonesian pupils were only able to accomplish the C1 until C4 of Blooms Taxonomies learning objectives, meanwhile for C5 and C6 were still seemed complicated. Similarly, researches also have discovered there were still many pupils who scored low for the HOTS test (Kurniati, Harimukti, Jamil, 2019). By realizing the fact that HOTS technique such as HOT Questioning has been implemented in schools since 2013 exactly when K-13 curriculum officially established, this sort of issue was supposedly preventable. HOT Question has been already applied in the majority of school subjects.

Furthermore, it also appears in Indonesia national examination. Based on several previous study, the delivery of questioning technique can be through oral and written question (Cepni, Ayyaci, & Keles, 2011). English higher order written question is mostly implemented as the elicitation for students' writing (Sopiani, Said, & Ratnawati, 2019). This sort of HOT Question is required a long written answer, systematic, and in-depth thinking (Stecher, 1996). That is why it is considered as one of the challenging question for students and being the type of HOT question that applied in current research. The usage of HOT Question for writing was chosen because every HOTS aspect can be maximally involved while solving a question. Based on some theories this type of question always better than others types of questions when assessing higher order thinking (Reiner, C., Bothell, T., Sudweeks, R., & Wood, B, 2002). Because matching exercises, true or false questions, and multiple-choice items belong to selected response sort of questions which from a list of possibilities answer students are required to select the correct answer, meanwhile essay HOT Questions for writing obliges students to produce their own answer. HOT Question for writing also diminishes the possibility of guessing and factor luck when answering the question such as owned by others mentioned type of questions (Reiner, C., Bothell, T., Sudweeks, R., & Wood, B, 2002).

Realizing the current issue regarding student' unfamiliarity and difficulties of HOT Question, it can be realized that implementing HOT Question is not as smooth as people might think. In response to that case, some previous studies investigated the students' challenge in implementing HOT Question. Those studies focus on the several school subjects. Particularly for English language subject, a study has uncovered the students' difficulty in solving English oral HOT Question (Anil, 2017). The result conveyed that oral HOT Question students were unable to manage the nervousness and it leads students cannot show the best performance. Time issue also becomes the students' challenge in solving HOT Question. Because when students answer HOT Question orally they do not have much time to consider the detail aspects such as the word option, structure of the idea. Etc. Meanwhile, it possibly becomes a different story if the HOT Question is in the written form, since with the written form students have no pressure about nervousness and limited time.

To obtain in-depth examination about how students work on their HOT Question for English writing, the present study also aims to examine the how students solving HOT Question for English Writing. Additionally, based on previous study, students who own high competence achieved better score in HOT questions contrast with medium and low categories of students Yulianti & Lestari, 2018). Therefore, there is a need to uncover how students actually process their written answer for HOTS based on their level of competence. So that, it can be known the difference between the strategies of students with high competence compare to students with medium and low competence. Furthermore, the result is expected obtained from the high competence students is expected to be a solution to those who is still lacking. Some previous studies have discovered the students' strategy for writing. But it focuses more into the technical process such as drafting, editing, and so on (Farida, 2014). Using the theory of thinking and writing (Helen & Arthur, 2004) and strategy to solve HOTS essay question (Clay, 2001), this present study will reveal the students' strategies in solving HOT Question for English writing with focusing on their thinking process specifically while structuring the idea.

Additionally, present study will provide a new contribution related to students' challenges and strategies in HOT Question for English based on diverse student's thinking level with consideration that in the instructional process always includes students with diverse thinking levels With descriptive qualitative method, the data of this research will be taken from the interview to fulfil both research question about challenge and strategy. Furthermore, a HOT

question testing is conducted before the interview, with the purpose for determining the student's thinking level based on the obtained score and letting students to experience HOT question for English writing. The result of this research is expected to give new insight for the teacher to find an effective way in implementing HOTS that can tackle students' challenges and based on the discovered strategy.

METHOD

The appropriate method for this study was descriptive qualitative research. A descriptive qualitative research aims to examine the situation profoundly and specifically (Nazir, 2003). In addition, the qualitative research also explores the occurrences in the natural settings and implements several methods to interpret, understand, explain and deliver the meaning (Garry, 1998). Since present research did not examine the implementation of higher order question that can be seen from the surface but it conducted complete in depth examination and understanding about each diverse level of thinking students' challenges and strategies in solving HOT Question for English writing. This research had two main instruments that done online which were testing the students with HOT Questions for English writing to determine their thinking level and semi-structured interview to fulfill the first and second research question.

The selection of the research subject was through random sampling. For the HOTS testing researcher picked fifteen out of thirty English Education students have various GPA or achievement score. So that from those students who have difference GPA, researcher could obtain the different testing result. Here, the HOT question for English writing was implemented. It contained of 5 HOT essay questions, that each of the question assessed each skill of HOTS. Furthermore, for the one on one semi structured interview step, it was recruited four students from the fifteen students who done the testing. The interview questions contained the questions about cognitive and linguistic challenge, also the difficulty in managing the time and understanding HOT question. Then for the second research question, present study also integrated some theories regarding with thinking in writing and strategy to solve essay question. Researcher picked two representative students for both higher and lower order thinking students, so that in the research findings there would be the comparison of challenge and strategy from the students with the same level of thinking and also students with different level of thinking.

Having the data collected, the next step was analyzing the data. The first data analysis process was document analysis. The document that has been analyzed in this present study is the fifteen students' paperwork answers of HOTS question. Researcher did scoring for each paperwork using scoring rubric guided by Susan Brookhart theory as the main reference with slightly modification from the researcher. The second data analysis process was the narrative analysis for interview result. Throughout the interview, researcher recorded all the interviewee's answers. Next, researcher made the transcription of all the interviewee's answers from the recordings.

New Language Dimensions
Volume 1 (2) 2020
ISSN: 2746-8968 (online)
https://journal.unesa.ac.id/index.php/nld/index

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

STUDENTS' CHALLENGE IN ANSWERING HOT QUESTION FOR ENGLISH WRITING

The results of the interview from four students with diverse thinking level, researcher figured out twelve challenges in answering HOT questions for English writing that were had by all students. The data is displayed in the table 1.1 below:

Table 1 Classification Students' Challenge In Answering HOT Question Based On Different Levels Of Thinking

NO	Students Challenge in Solving HOT Question	HOT Student 1	HOT Student 2	LOT Student 1	LOT Student 2
1.	Managing Time			√	√
Linguistic Difficulties					
2.	Tenses			√	√
3.	Lack of Vocabulary				√
4.	Preposition				√
5.	Word choice	√			
6.	Article	√			
Cognitive Difficulties					
7.	Lack of background knowledge			√	√
8.	Organizing Idea	√	√		√
9.	Generating Idea			√	√
10.	Expanding Idea	√	√	√	√
11.	Getting Started to write				√
12.	Linking the sentences	√			√

This table depicts the classification of various challenges in solving HOT Question for English writing based on students' level of thinking. The table shows that lower order thinking students encountered more challenges than higher order thinking students and it is dominated with cognitive challenge. The further and in depth explanation is described below.

TIME MANAGEMENT

Based on the interview, both of lower order thinking students perceived that they were pursuing by time while finishing all the answer. Though having a hard time in managing time, but they both still could manage submitting on time. Meanwhile, higher order students 2, instead of did the HOT question worksheet immediately, HOT student 2 accessed some entertainment stuff first. Since the late submission was due to the negligence not the incapability in finishing the whole worksheet on time, so it does not count as time management difficulty. Speaking of time allotment, a previous study also found that giving more time can facilitate student to thinking more analytically (Hill, 2016). Comparing with the HOT Question in the spoken form, students also found an issue with the limited wait time (Chen, 2016). Students normally feel pressured because HOT Question is required in-depth thinking. To conclude, even though written and spoken form are different but they do share one similarity which is difficulty in time management.

LINGUISTIC DIFFICULTIES

From the perspective of both lower and higher order thinking students, linguistic aspect is not a big concern since they are in university level and familiar with English already so they only encountered little amount of linguistic difficulties. Basically, in the interview each participant conveyed the different linguistic problem. However, one linguistic difficulty that simultaneously owned by both LOT students is tenses. A study by Fareed that related about writing difficulty also included tenses as one of third semester university students' writing difficulties (Fareed, Ashraf, & Bilal, 2016). Additionally, another study revealed that among grammar, syntax, spelling, word order, punctuation difficulty, grammar (tenses) is the major writing challenge for ESL students in Bhutan (Nima, 2019). Meanwhile, for this present study, tenses difficulty was faced by EFL lower order thinking students.

Furthermore, if the challenge of tenses was encountered by both lower order thinking students, lack of English vocabulary is one of the linguistic problem that only faced by the LOT student 2. LOT student 2 explained that the minimum English vocabulary mastery, could hinder LOT student 2 to express the entire idea. On top of that, it can be seen from the answer in the paperwork, comparing to both HOT students the answer of LOT student 2 is way so short. In line with this finding, Nima's study revealed that vocabulary issue is on the third place of writing difficulty among high school students after tenses and word order (Nima, 2019). In addition, Kristin found that the major writing problem of third semester university students is vocabulary (Pratiwi, 2012). This supports present study's finding dealing with solving a HOT Question for English writing that also demands a wide range of vocabulary mastery to be able to express the idea completely. Further, for the case of HOT Question for English writing, lack vocabulary issue does not merely result in the insufficient answer but also failing in understanding the question.

Because from both of LOT students' confession the main factor of failing to understand the question is the lack of English vocabulary. They even translated per each word in the question. Peter's statement on his book about students' writing problem supports these findings. He believed if students do not have enough vocabulary, their writing process will not run smoothly (Westwood, 2008). As a proof both LOT students did not finish the sub questions number 2 that required students to search the evidence for the mentioned speech message. Also on number three LOT student 1 intentionally did not answer the sub questions that demand student to choose their preferences and the reason between online and offline learning. Thus, failing in understanding the question because of inadequate vocabulary mastery potentially cause insufficient students' answer that also can affect their score.

Another linguistic issue that occurred in the answering process of LOT student 2 is preposition, she told that deciding the suitable preposition was the tricky one. It is supported by a research that focused on Malaysian student's preposition error, explained this error happened due to the different concept between the target language and the mother tongue (Odacıoğlu, 2017). Thus, the difficulty of deciding the suitable preposition was proven also occurred for Indonesian student specifically LOT students.

On the other hand, HOT student 1 also had some issue regarding with the linguistic aspect. Those are article and word choice. Contrarily, HOT student 2 was totally facing no issue with the linguistic aspect. HOT student 1 confessed that it does not mean she has no idea or knowledge about the use of article and word choice but genuinely because of the carelessness. Speaking of carelessness while writing, it is indeed considered as a phenomenon of students' writing behaviour that caused writing error. A study figured out that carelessness

is the main factor of the basic writing error such as article, spelling, subject-verb agreement, plural form, verb form, preposition, word choice, capital letter, and so on (Silalahi, 2014). However, in this study only found the basic writing error in the use of article, preposition, and word choice. Regarding with word choice, HOT student 1 added that since the question number one about narrative story continuation, the word choice must be different for the answer of question number two and five which need more academic word. And HOT students 1 had a strong willingness to deliver the idea perfectly without the misconception from the reader. However, Paskal found the same result that word choice is one of challenge in writing hortatory exposition text (Paskal, Sada, & Husin, 2015). And for solving HOT question for English writing it must be more challenging since it demands a various kinds of writing such as narrative text for number one and argumentative text for number three and five so automatically choosing the proper word option would be so tricky.

COGNITIVE DIFFICULTY

Cognitive process is the obligatory typical aspect for HOT Question that distinguishes HOT Question with other recall type of question. Since according to Brookhart, the principle of assessing HOTS have to demand student to use targeted thinking and content knowledge (Brookhart, 2010). On top of that, the interview result shows cognitive difficulty as the major challenge in solving HOT Question. In this present study, there are several branches of students' cognitive difficulties that examined separately. The first challenge is about background knowledge that becomes the basic provision for every sort of writing. The type of HOT Question for English writing is indeed required students to write a long and broad answer. Obviously if students have none of idea, it is impossible for them to write. Though the topic selections for HOT questions are the familiar and the happening cases nowadays, both of LOT students were still lacking of idea. A previous study discovered that lack of ideas in writing can lead to the repetition of ideas (Fareed, Ashraf, & Bilal, 2016). Apart from that, LOT student 2 even attempted to seek a help from others to obtain more ideas even though in the interview LOT student 2 did not explicitly say lacking of idea or background knowledge. That finding is supported by another study that found out particularly about low ability student only contributed brief answer for HOTS question (Yulianti & Lestari, 2018). Similar finding in this present study, LOT students produced limited answer as the cause of lacking idea.

Another cognitive challenge is organizing and generating the idea. Both processes actually have an insignificant difference and it is quite tricky to distinguish them. But some theories presented to emphasize its' difference. White defined organizing idea as the process of thinking which ideas that the most suitable to include in writing (White, 1986). It is proven as a crucial part in solving HOT Question for English writing since all the participants found it difficult moreover they actually lacked of idea. It led organizing idea as one factor to LOT student 2 in producing the answer. Different story from HOTS students 2 point of view that perceived organizing idea was complicated because overflowing ideas related to the topic of the question. It made her confused which idea should be chosen. And HOT student 1 only felt difficult organizing the ideas in number three since it is the hardest one based on HOT student 1 opinion. Fareed, Ashraf, and Bilal also revealed that students mostly did not organize their thought while writing (Fareed, Ashraf, & Bilal, 2016). In addition, another previous research found that even students who master in English grammar and structure, they might still have a problem in organizing idea (Aragón, Baires, & Rodriguez, 2013). Similarly, in this study HOT students who do not encountered linguistic problem but indeed it was hard for them to organize their idea. Although all participants with different thinking level found it difficult, but the

reasons and the difficulty level of organizing idea are different between each LOT and HOT students. For LOT students it was due to lack of ideas in the other hand HOT students found it difficult because unorganized overflowing ideas.

On the other hand, difficulty in generating the idea is only encountered by LOT student 2 since she required to combine the idea that was obtained from her friend and mother. Similarly, a previous study found the biggest technical students' problem in solving individual assignment is generating idea (Yee, 2013). According to Teo generating idea is a thinking ability to combine, add, or connect obtained idea with the background knowledge (Teo, 2003). Although generating the idea does not always refer to consolidate the new obtained information with the background knowledge but it can be about combining the idea from experience with something that has been seen or heard (White & Arndt, 1991). But based on the interview result, LOT student 1 did think she went through the process of generating idea because she only relied on the background knowledge and did not attempt to search additional information. Apart from that, if present research uncovered the difficulty of generating idea specifically from LOT student point of view, similarly another study found the HOTS question issue but from moderate ability student in concluding the information (Yulianti & Lestari, 2018). Concluding task can be belonged to generating idea since it involve the process of consolidation. So to conclude, generating idea is not merely proven as writing problem but also HOT Question problem. Since HOT Question also involves the ability of analysing, evaluating, and creating that demands more thinking process.

The next three cognitive problems are actually the others form of generating and organizing idea process. The reason it is another form of generating idea because it involves the ability of adding and combining the main idea and the supporting details. All the participants agreed that besides organizing idea, expanding the ideas was also such a challenge. It is supported by a previous research also discovered that Pakistan students still face difficulty in idea expansion (Fareed, Ashraf, & Bilal, 2016). In addition, Rass found one of students' problem in paragraph writing is providing supporting details into main topic such as reasons and example (Rass, 2015). HOT student 2 completed her opinion by conveying the difficulty in giving the suitable details of the main idea that she had. Also, how to make it those ideas into one good logical paragraph was also challenging because she wanted to deliver the ideas completely and made it understandable for the readers. Particularly for HOT student, though they were contributed the satisfying lengthy answer, likewise a previous research findings that conveyed high ability students were successfully finish the HOT question test with a high score. Yet, they still perceive expanding the idea was such a challenge (Yulianti & Lestari, 2018). Based on the interview answer from HOT student 2, it can be summed up the term of expanding idea means adding the supporting details of the main ideas then constructing it into one paragraph contains of the logical order of a sentences.

Meanwhile, Peter analysed another form of generating idea difficulty which is create a logical order of a paragraph (Westwood, 2008). Similarly, as it said by HOTS student 1 and LOT student 2 they also struggled in connecting the sentences into a proper paragraph. Connecting sentences is still in the circle of generating and expanding idea, since it is regarding with combining each sentences that automatically is expected to be logically ordered.

The last cognitive problem of HOT Question is getting started to write. This problem is actually only owned by LOT student 2. However studies and theory are in line with this finding. White and Arndt agreed that getting started to write is the most difficult step in writing (White & Arndt, 1991). Miftah added student wastes more time in getting started because they felt so hard to acquire and generate or organize the ideas (Miftah, 2011). And again the problem in

getting started to write is still associated with generating and organizing idea. In short, though the cognitive challenge is dominated with problem in generating and organizing idea but there are several sub-skills of generating and organizing idea that are also essential to be concerned.

ANOTHER FINDING

Here, in additional finding the aspect that being discussed is regarding with the hardest HOT Question for English writing based on all participants' perspective. It aims to reveal whether the difficulty level of a question entirely depends on the thinking ability that it assesses. As known that the highest thinking ability according to Bloom taxonomy revised is creating (Krathwohl, 2002). In the researcher's self-created HOT Question for English writing, questions that assess creating ability is number one (narrative story continuation) and number four (creating solution). Surprisingly, from four different level of thinking students, three of them opined that the most challenging question is number three which about analyzing ability. The participant explained that question number three demands more answer which is analyzing the effectiveness and ineffectiveness of PSBB policy than number 4 which is about creating solution for school violation. Additionally, participants mentioned that the topic about PSBB policy is heavier rather than school-related topic. In line with this finding, Brookhart stated that the difficulty easy and hard level of a question and level of thinking (recall and HOT) are totally two different things (Brookhart, 2010). To sum up, the difficulty level of a question cannot determined merely by what thinking ability that it aims to assess. Even though a question aims to assess creating ability, it does not always mean the hardest one. But the factor of topic selection also needs to be considered.

STUDENTS' STRATEGY IN ANSWERING HOT QUESTION FOR ENGLISH WRITING

The strategies cover the action before reading the question, while reading question, seizing the idea, writing the answer, and finishing. The data of strategies is showed in table 1.2 below:

Table 2 Classification Students' Strategies in Answering HOT Question
Based on Different Levels of Thinking

NO	Students Strategy in Solving HOT Question	HOT Student 1	HOT Student 2	LOT Student 1	LOT Student 2
1.	Considering the Time			√	
2.	Rereading the HOT Questions	√			√
3.	Translating The HOT Questions			√	√
4.	Paraphrasing the HOT question			√	√
5.	Pointing important keyword	√	√	√	
6.	Source of idea (semantic and periodic memory)	√	√	√	√
7.	Asking peers for help				√
8.	Scratching raw idea				√
9.	Rereading the whole answer and self-reflecting	√	√	√	√

This figure highlights the classification of various strategies in solving HOT Question for English writing based on students' level of thinking. The table shows that lower order thinking students applied more strategies than higher order thinking students. Each strategy is described deeply in the explanation below.

CONSIDERING THE TIME BEFORE READING THE QUESTION

Providing the time allotment for the test of HOT question for English writing was intended to examine student's strategy towards time management. Since HOT Question also demands more time to think so that student can work maximally (Chen, 2016). However, only LOT 1 was the one who estimated the time before solving the questions. Meanwhile, others participants stated that they just managed the time by finishing the easiest question to the hardest one. Based on the theory of test taking tips, students supposedly calculate the time before doing the essay questions test so that they have remaining time to revise their work (Lincoln University, 2016). The outcome for estimating the time before doing the question, result in LOT student 1 submitting the paperwork on time, and HOT student 2 who did not calculate the time even been careless with the time ended up handing in the paperwork late. From those phenomena, it can be concluded estimating the time is one strategy that might be effective in solving HOT Question.

RE-READING THE HOT QUESTION

It is mentioned multiple times that providing introductory material or information as one of principle for HOT Question. And that is formed a HOT Question sort of broad and crucial to be understand. Re-reading the question is one of strategy that is done by LOT student 2 to deepen the understanding of the questions. She even did re-read the question for more than four times since as mentioned in the previous section that she struggled in understanding some number of questions. Based on LOT student 2 explanation, re-reading the question could assist to analyse the purpose of the question. On contrast a study reported that rereading is not as effective as another strategy in analysing the passage (Weinstein, McDermott, & Roediger, 2010). Another thing, for HOT student 1 did re-reading the question to solve the problem of HOT student 1 in expanding the idea and linking the sentences. It is supported by Attiyat who proved reading can boost the idea for writing (Attiyat, 2019). But in term of HOT Question for English writing, the reading material is from the HOT Question itself. To conclude, strategy of rereading the question based on this study can overcome the challenge in understanding the question for LOT student and as the stimulation to expand the ideas for HOT student.

TRANSLATING AND PARAPHRASING THE HOT QUESTION

This strategy is specifically intended for the LOT students. Since both of them faced the same difficulties in understanding the question and lack of English vocabularies. So as EFL students, they did translation for the question to their first language to make it easier to understand. In line with this finding, Al Musawi reported that EFL students tend to do translation the English vocabularies for writing and reading rather than for English idioms and grammatical rules (Al-Musawi, 2014). Moreover, LOT student 2 even did translation in each words of the questions. On the other hand HOT students did not apply translation as the strategy to tackle HOT Question for English writing.

Next strategy besides translating that was applied by LOT students is paraphrasing the question. They stated that translating was inadequate to make the question more understandable. It is supported by a theory of strategy in solving essay question that agreed students supposedly paraphrase the original question into their own simple version of question (Clay, 2001). Just exactly like what LOT student 1 did to simplify the question based on her own understanding. Furthermore, Chen also reported that paraphrasing and simplification are indeed ways to clarify the question (Chen, 2016). Similarly, LOT student 2 paraphrased the

question number two with her own word because it contains of so many academic words. So it can be concluded that translating and paraphrasing the question are the strategies of LOT students in analysing or understanding the purpose of the question.

POINTING IMPORTANT KEYWORDS

This is actually the last strategy assist to comprehend the questions. Different from translating and paraphrasing the question that only experienced by LOT student, pointing important keywords of the question was applied by both HOT and LOT students except LOT student 2. HOT student 1 perceived the important keywords is the main question or the instruction itself. Similarly, a statement from Lincoln University for answering essay question, students required to focus on the important keywords (Lincoln University, 2016). Selecting important keywords is indeed an effective strategy more particularly for HOT Question. Since HOT Question inevitably long there must be few words as emphasis of the whole question. It is proven implemented by both HOT and LOT students.

SOURCE OF THE IDEAS (SEMANTIC, EPISODIC MEMORY, AND ASKING PEERS FOR A HELP)

According to the statement from Lincoln University, the process after reading the question are thinking and gathering ideas (Lincoln University, 2016). As discussed previously that the major difficulty in solving HOT Question is in the circle of organizing and generating idea. It led researcher in this section to examine how they seized and combined the ideas. According to theory from White and Arndt generating idea involves the three sorts of memory, those are episodic memory intended to events and experience, semantic memory intended to information and idea, lastly unconscious memory intended to emotion and feeling (White & Arndt, 1991). However the result of the interview shows that all of the participants HOT and LOT students, acquired the background knowledge from their memory of experience and information that they read or heard before. For HOT student, though they had a hard time in organizing and expanding the idea they did not attempt to search for additional idea because they perceive using the background knowledge is sufficient. Oppositely, LOT student 2 aside from utilizing the semantic and episodic memory, LOT student 2 attempted to enrich the ideas by seeking the peers' opinion. Likewise the theory from Helen and Arthur stated learner would take an action if the knowledge about certain topic is inadequate for writing (Helen & Arthur, 2004).

Furthermore, regarding with the process of combining the idea, they explained learner combines the information that they know about the topic to compose meaningful and understandable text (Helen & Arthur, 2004). In line with that, both of HOT student consolidated the ideas from the semantic and episodic memory while LOT student 2 preferred to dominate the answer with the opinion from peers and few of her opinion. So it can be distinguished between how LOT and HOT students seizing the background knowledge and combining them. Asking peers or someone to assist is the LOT student's strategy to overcome the problem of limited knowledge.

SCRATCHING RAW IDEAS

Having the idea gathered, the next step before writing the actual answer is scratching the raw idea. Three out of four participants did nothing before writing the actual answer, they just keep writing-erasing- rewriting the answer. But contrarily, LOT student 2 jotted down the raw opinion from peers in the paper first then combining with her own idea. After that, she directly

wrote the actual answer on the paperwork. It is supported by Peter Elbow that believed raw idea writing is the first writing stage to effectively accommodate the overflowing unstructured ideas without worrying about the words selection, grammatical rules, and structured. Additionally, it will assist student to generate more idea and write easier (Elbow, 2001). So basically scratching raw idea in HOT Question is like the mini version of drafting in writing process. However, though HOT student skipped this step but they still could manage to provide a long broad answer.

REREADING THE WHOLE ANSWER AND SELF-REFLECTING

The last strategy in solving HOT Question for English writing is rereading the whole answer and self-reflecting that was actually implemented by all participants both HOT and LOT students. This process is similar with editing or revising step in writing. According to Helen and Arthur student would read and reread their writing so they can be clearer and monitor their writing by asking themselves regarding with their choices of content for the writing (Helen & Arthur, 2004). Differently, HOT student 2 did this process throughout the writing process not as the finale editing process. However, since this process was done by all the participant, we can conclude that rereading the answers and self-reflecting is one of obligatory finale step in solving HOT Question for English writing.

CONCLUSION

Overall, the research findings uncovered that the students' challenge in solving HOT question for English writing does not merely depend on the how low and high the thinking level is. In fact students with same level of thinking encountered the some different challenges and students with the different level of thinking actually faced several same challenge. So the challenge in solving HOT Question indeed cannot merely be determined by the level of thinking. The students' challenges in this study are classified into linguistic and cognitive difficulty. Also there is one challenge out of those two categories which is failing managing the time. Several cognitive challenges that are revealed in this study are, lack of background knowledge, difficulty in organizing and generating idea, difficulty in expanding idea and providing supporting details, linking the sentence, and lastly, getting started to write. And the linguistic challenges includes difficulty in the use of tenses, preposition, article, word choice, and lack of English vocabulary.

Generally, as what occurred in the students' challenge result, also happened in the findings related with the students' strategy in solving HOT question for English writing. Students' strategy also cannot be determined totally depend by the thinking level. Based on the research finding related with students' strategies in solving HOT Question for English writing, the lower order thinking students performed more strategies than higher order thinking students. The strategies before reading the questions is estimating the time, re-reading the question, translating, paraphrasing the question, pointing important keyword are the strategies to analyze the question easier. And strategies while generating idea are acquiring background knowledge from the episodic and semantic memory and asking peers for a help. Then, scratching raw idea as the previous step before writing the answer. Lastly strategy after finishing the whole questions are re-reading the answers and self-reflection whether the answer is satisfying enough or not. Moreover, of that the some of the participants also attempted to overcome their own challenges with the unexpected strategies. Such as LOT students' strategy in doing the translation for the problem of understanding the question and HOTS student

strategy in rereading the question as stimulation for seizing the idea. HOTS student did that to solve the problem in organizing and expanding the idea. So actually implementing HOT Question for English writing in the instructional is perfect for pre-writing activity because of the existence of the lengthy HOT Question that can be used as idea elicitation.

REFERENCES

Al-Musawi, Numan. (2014). Strategic Use of Translation in Learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL) among Bahrain University Students. Comprehensive Psychology. 3. 10.2466/10.03.it.3.4.

Anil, B. (2017). Higher Order Questioning in SL Classroom. *The Buckingham Journal of Language and Linguistics,* Vol. 8, 47-55.

Aragón Jiménez, C. A., Baires Mira, D. C., & Rodriguez, G. S. (2013). An Analysis of The Writing Skill Difficulties of the English Composition I Students at the Foreign Language Department of the University of El Salvador. Undergraduate work, retrieved from http://ri.ues.edu.sv/5519/.

Attiyat, Nazzem. (2019). The Impact of Pleasure Reading on Enhancing Writing Achievement and Reading Comprehension. *Arab World English Journal*. 155-165. 10.24093/awej/vol10no1.14.

Brookhart, S. M. *How to Assess Higher-Order Thinking Skills in Your Classroom*. Alexandria, Va: ASCD. 2010.

Çepni S, Ayvacı HŞ, Keleş E. (2011). School and High School Entrance Examination in Science Asked by Bloom Taxonomy Comparison of The Question at The Beginning of The New Millennium. *Science Education Symposium in Turkey*.

Chen, M. H. (2016). Theoretical Framework for Integrating Higher-order Thinking into L2 Speaking. Vol. 6, No. 2, 217-226.

Clay, B. (2001). *Is This A Trick Question?: A Short Guide to Writing Effective Test Questions*. Kansas Curriculum Centre.

E. Paskal, C. Sada, and S. Husin. (2015). Identification Students' Difficulties in Writing Hortatory Exposition among High Intermediate Level. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran*, vol. 4(2).

Elbow, Peter. (1981). Writing With Power: Techniques for Mastering the Writing Process. Oxford University Press Inc. New York.

Fareed, M., Ashraf, A., & Bilal, M. (2016). ESL Learners' Writing Skills: Problems, Factors and Suggestions. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*. Vol. 4(2), : 1. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311669829

Farida, U. (2014). Improving *The Eighth Grade Students' Writing Skill Through A Writing Process Method At Smp N 15 Yogyakarta In The Academic Year Of 2012/2013.* [An Undergraduate thesis]. State University of Yogyakarta.

Garry Anderson – Nanci Arsenault, Fundamentals of Educational Research, 2th edition. (USA:The Framer Press), 126.

Helen K. & Arthur E. (2004). *Thinking Strategy for Learners*. Public Education & Business Coalition.

Hill, J. B. (2016). Questioning Techniques: A Study of Instructional Practice. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 91(5), 660–671.

Kemendikbud. (2016). *Assessment for 21st Century Learning, Learning from various assessment results*. Jakarta: Badan Penelitian dan Pengembangan.

Krathwohl, David R. (2002). Revising Bloom's Taxonomy. Theory Into Practice. Autumn.

Kurniati, D. Harimukti, R. Jamil, NA. (2019). Kemampuan Berpikir Tingkat Tinggi Siswa Smp Di Kabupaten Jember Dalam Menyelesaikan Soal Berstandar Pisa. *Jurnal Penelitian dan Evaluasi Pendidikan*. Volume 20. No 2.

Lincoln University. (2016). Writing in Exams: Short Answer and Essay Questions. Te Wharepūrākau | Learning, Teaching and Library, ltl.lincoln.ac.nz/.

Miftah, M. Zaini. (2011). Mind Mapping: The Way to Generate and Organize Ideas". *Anterior Jurnal*. 80-89.

Nazir, M. (2003). Metode Penelitian (Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia), p.55.

Nima, Lobzang. (2019). Tenses With Esl Writing Tenses : A Case Study Of Bhutanese Secondary Students. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/335569972

Nuttall, C. (2000). Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language. Oxford: Macmillan.

Odacıoğlu, Mehmet. (2017). Malay ESL Students' Difficulties in Using English Prepositions. *International Journal of Languages, Literature and Linguistics*.

Pratiwi, K. D. (2012). Students' Difficulties in Writing English (A Study at The Third Semester Students of English Education Program At University of Bengkulu Academic Year 2011-2012).

Rass, Ruwaida. (2015). Challenges Face Arab Students in Writing Well-Developed Paragraphs in English. English Language Teaching. 8. 10.5539/elt.v8n10p49.

Reiner, C., Bothell, T., Sudweeks, R., & Wood, B. (2002). *Preparing effective essay questions*.

Scott C. (2009). A Case for The Sentence in Reading Comprehension. Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools. 40:184–191.

Silalahi, R. (2014). Error Analysis on Information and Technology Students' Sentence Writing Assignments". *International Journal of English Education* (IJEE), 1(2), 152–166. https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v1i2.1342.

Stecher, B. (1996). Using Alternative Assessments in Vocational. 19-23.

Sopiani, P.S., Said, S., Ratnawati. (2019). Investigating Students' Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS) in Writing Skill (A Case Study at the Eleventh Grade of a Senior High School in Banjar). *Journal of English Education and Teaching (JEET)*. Vol. 3, 328-342.

Teo, N. (2003). A Handbook for Science Teachers in Primary Schools. Singapore: Federal Publications.

Weinstein, Y., McDermott, K. B., & Roediger, H. L. (2010). A comparison of study strategies for passages: Rereading, answering questions, and generating questions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*: Applied, 16, 308–316. doi:10.1037/a0020992.

Westwood, P. (2008). What Teacher Need To Know about Reading and Writing Difficulties.

White, F. D. (1986). The Writer's Art: A Practical Rhetoric and Handbook. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

White, R. & Arndt, V. (1991). Process Writing. London: Longman.

Yee, Heong. (2013). Contributing Factors Towards Difficulties in Generating Ideas among Technical Students". *Journal of Technical Education and Training* (JTET). 5, 14-27.

Yulianti, SR. Lestari I. (2018). Higher Order Thinking Skill (HOTS) Analysis of Students in Solving HOT Question in Higher Education. *Perspektif Ilmu Pendidikan*, 32(2). https://doi.org/10.21009/PIP.322.10.