



Students' perspective and problems in implementing higher order thinking skill (HOTS) in speaking for presentation class

Syafrayadin ^{a 1} , Dian Eka Chandra Wardhana ^b , Noermanzah ^c , Agus Rofi'i ^d ,
Awalludin ^e 

^{a,b,c} University of Bengkulu, Bengkulu, Indonesia
^d Universitas Majalengka, Jawa Barat, Indonesia
^e Universitas Baturaja, Sumatera Selatan, Indonesia

APA Citation:

Syafrayadin, S., Wardhana, D.E.C., Noermanza, N., Rofi'i, A., & Awalludin, A. (2022). Students' perspective and problems in implementing higher order thinking skill (HOTS) in speaking for presentation class. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 18(1), 477-487. Doi: 10.52462/jlls.196

Submission Date:04/05/2021

Acceptance Date:18/10/2021

Abstract

Higher Order Thinking Skill (HOTS) is a skill that should be known by students. If students have known and applied HOTS, students could improve their ability in all skills. The research aimed to know the students' perception and its problems in implementing Higher Order Thinking Skill (HOTS) in speaking class. The research employed a mixed method research with a questionnaire and interview guideline as instruments. The research participants were only 30 students of the English Education Study Program in one of State universities in Bengkulu, Indonesia. The data analysis were using statistical calculation for quantitative and data collection, data condensation, data display and conclusion for qualitative. The result shows that majority students had positive perceptions on implementing HOTS in speaking because they think that HOTS is going to train their brain to think critically, creatively and innovatively. Besides, some students had problems in applying it, like poor argument, lack of vocabulary and grammar, lack of knowledge about the material, nervous and not know what to ask. In brief, students had implemented HOTS, but not all students could use C6 or analyzing in HOTS. The problems could be solved by triggering the students to use HOTS in speaking class, especially for C65 and C6.

Keywords: Students' perspective; Higher Order Thinking Skill (HOTS); problems; speaking class; mixed method

1. Introduction

Speaking skill is needed for all people in the world to communicate with foreigners. Speaking skill is not for only outside classroom, but also inside the classroom for EFL learners. Hence, without speaking, the interaction in the classroom is difficult to be built by students and teachers. Especially in speaking, students can build their critical thinking, so they could speak with good quality. Higher order Thinking Skill (HOTS) is crucial to be implemented in all courses, especially in speaking class.

¹ Corresponding author.

E-mail address: syafrayadin@unib.ac.id

HOTs must be promoted by the lecturer, thus, students could know and understand about HOTS itself based on Taxonomy Bloom. Moreover, students need to apply all HOTS part in speaking class, according to Brookhart (2010), those parts are analyzing (C4), evaluating (C5) and creating (C6). In those parts, students do not need to only analyze and evaluate the speaking or material, but also students must create something in relation to the subject or course. Thus, they could increase their creativity and critical thinking in learning speaking. According to Brookharts (2010), Ping, Ahmad, Adnan, Hua (2017) & pratama & Retnawati (2018), HOTS has several advantages namely (1) students will be able to think independently, so they can make decision; (2) It will increase the students' ability or performance or achievement because they will know how to deal with the questions from the teacher or lecturer in teaching and learning process ; (3) it will make students think creatively, critically and innovatively because they will know how to analyze, evaluate and create; (4) it ensures students to prepare them in higher education; (5) it prepares students in adult life and working environments.

Based on the previous pre-observation to the classroom in one of the universities in Bengkulu, the researcher found that several students got problems in asking questions in speaking class because most of students just ask the questions in low higher order thinking category. Moreover, some students were lazy to ask the question in discussion because during pandemic the lecturer just ask to make a short video presentation for individual task in speaking. Syafryadin, Alamysah, Astrid, & Haryani (2021) found several problems in stimulating students to implement HOTs during learning process. Those problems were lack of knowledge, lazy to ask, less stimulating from the lecturer, lazy to speak because students just rely on lecturer's explanation, and several students just ask low order thinking skill category questions. These problems must be anticipated by the teacher in order to increase the students' HOTs ability.

Studies about higher order thinking skill (HOTs) in speaking have been conducted by several researchers. Firstly, they focused on the students' speaking achievement. They found that by Implementing HOTS in speaking class, it could improve their speaking skill because they would know the questions' quality when they talk because the questions that contain HOTS, surely it is good question (Setyarini, Muslim, Rukmini, Yuliasri, & Mujianto, 2018; Cesarandari, Aswandi & Oikurema, 2019; Bahrudin, Soheh & Mukamilah, 2020; Bahrudin, Halomoan & Sahid, 2020). Furthermore, in 2019-2020, there were also researchers who promoting HOTS in speaking skill. Setyarini & Ling, (2019) promoted Higher order thinking skills in storytelling for teaching English to young adolescents in 21st century. They found that English teachers could promote high order thinking by using storytelling because students were enjoyable. Besides, Akatsuka (2019) fostered students in speaking by implementing HOTS' questions in the classroom. In addition, Riza & Setyarini (2020) researched on promoting HOTS in speaking skill by using flipped classroom. They found that HOTS in flipped classroom could promote students in speaking English. Moreover, other studies also still had a relation to the higher order thinking, where the researchers used project-based learning to Improve HOTs in speaking skill. The result shows that project-based learning could promote HOTs in speaking skill. It also motivates students to speak (Pertiwi, 2019; Setiawan, Puspitasari, & Baptista, 2020).

Based on the previous studies, the current research is different with the previous ones because the present research focused on the students' perception on the implementation of Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTs) in learning speaking. Therefore, the aims of the research are to know students' perception toward the implementation of higher order thinking skills (HOTs) in speaking class and students' problems in implementing HOTS in speaking class.

1.1. Literature Review

HOTS in Speaking

Higher order thinking skills is important to be implemented by the lecturer or teacher in the classroom. This is a cognitive part that should be introduced and owned by students. According to Brookhart, (2010), there are six levels of cognitive domain in taxonomy bloom from remembering (C1), understanding (C2), applying (C3), analyzing (C4), evaluating (C5), and creating (C6). The cognitive levels from C1, C2 and C3 are categorized as lower order thinking skill (LOTs), while C4, C5, C6 are classified as higher order thinking skills (HOTS). Students need to implement HOTS in speaking, thus, they can have good quality in talking about something. In Higher order thinking skills implementation in speaking class, C4 means that students need to analyze other students' talk and get the meaning of their friends' talk. Besides, students also analyzed the teachers' talk, the material during teaching and learning process. C5 means that students must evaluate what are weakness and strength of themselves in speaking. Students need to also evaluate what their friends' speaking in the classroom. Furthermore, in C6 or creating is the highest level of Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS). In this level, students should create something in speaking class. For example, students could speak based on their own words based on the topic that has been decided by the teacher. They could give suggestion and recommendation about the materials and other creations.

Problems in Implementing HOTS in Speaking Class

In applying HOTS in the classroom is not easy as people think because the teacher or lecturer must have comprehensible knowledge about higher order thinking skills. There are no specific problems in implementing HOTS in speaking class, but there are still problems for using HOTS in the classroom in general. It means that HOTS can be identified by analyzing the students' questions in the classroom or the interaction. Syafryadin, Alamysah, Astrid, & Haryani (2021) found problems for students in implementing HOTS in learning English. Those problems were (1) students were less of English skill knowledge; (2) students were lazy to ask; (3) students were usually to speak or ask the question with lower order thinking skill; (4) the teacher was not maximum to promote higher order thinking skills in the classroom.

Students' Perception of HOTS Implementation in Speaking Class

Perception can be defined as a view or process of information taken by human brain or sensory information (Robbins, 2003). There are two indicators of perception namely acceptance or reabsorption and understanding or evaluation. In relation to Higher order thinking in speaking class, the students give their perception towards the implementation of HOTS itself. Jusnaeni (2020) had found that students had positive perception towards HOTS used by English teachers in one of the senior high schools. Heong, Yunos, Osman, Sulong, Kiong (2010) & Chorina (2021) also found that students had good perception on the implementation of HOTS, but they were difficult in implementing C6 or creating in HOTS in during learning English.

1.2. Research Questions

The research questions of this research are (1) What is the students' perception on the implementation of Higher Order Thinking Skill (HOTS) in Speaking Class? And (2) what are the students' problems in implementing Higher Order Thinking Skill (HOTS) in Speaking Class?

2. Method

To achieve the objectives of this research, mixed method design were employed in this research because the combination of quantitative and qualitative assisted the researcher to answer the research questions about the students' perception and students' problems in implementing HOTS in speaking. Mixed method design is one of the research approaches that mixed the quantitative and qualitative that helps the researcher to solve the problems (Creswell, 2014; Fraenkel, Wallen & Hyun, 2012).

2.1. Sample / Participants

The research was conducted in one of universities in Bengkulu with 120 students or three classes in 2nd semester as population and 30 students as a sample or one class. The technique of taking sampling is random sampling because they have almost the same ability in speaking after taking placement test before the research was implemented.

2.2. Instrument(s)

The research instruments for this research were questionnaire and interview guideline. The questionnaire were used to answer the research question about students' perception toward the implementation of higher order thinking skills (HOTS) in speaking class, while the interview guideline was employed to answer the research question about students' problems in implementing HOTS in speaking class. The instruments have been validated accordance with the indicator of HOTS from C4 until C6. Moreover, the instruments have been tried out by researcher and validated by experts of higher order thinking Skills. The questionnaires had been also validated statistically by using SPSS program.

2.3. Data Collection Procedures

The technique of data collection used questionnaire and instruments. The procedures of gathering data were (1) asking permission to the head of English study program; (2) discussing with the lecturer about HOTS; (3) observing during the lecturer teaching speaking; (4) distributing questionnaire about the perception of HOTS to the students; (5) interviewing 5 until 8 students about the problems in using HOTS in speaking class.

2.4. Data Analysis

The data were quantitatively and qualitatively analysed by the researcher. Quantitatively, the data were analyzed by using SPSS computer program, while qualitatively, the data were analyzed by using several steps from data collection, data condensation, data display and conclusion (Miles, Huberman, Saldana, 2014). Data collection refers to the gathering data from questionnaire and interview, data condensation means that the selection of the data have to be based on the research questions or research objective, data display means that the data of questionnaire and interviewed have been selected and identified, then the data were displayed into good way, so the reader could easily know the answer of the research questions. The data could be displayed into table, graph, or short manuscript. The last, conclusion refers to the summary of data that have reached the research objectives.

3. Results

Students' Perception towards the Implementation of HOTS in Learning Speaking

Before looking at the result of the questionnaire to see the students' perception, the researcher statistically informed the validity and reliability of the questionnaire. The result shows that the questionnaire is valid because all items scores for pearson correlation are higher than 0,3388 for df 32, while the questionnaire is also reliable because the cronbach's Alpha (0.792) is higher sig.0,05. You can see the table 1 for reliability.

Table 1. Reliability result

Reliability Statistics		
Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.702	.796	20

As for the result of questionnaire can be seen in table 2.

Table 2. Questionnaire result

No.	Aspects	Scale			
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1	I am able to compare one's opinion with other's opinion in speaking class or during discussion	7 (21,9%)	25(78,1%)	0	0
2	I am able to analyze the meaning of what is my lecturer talking about in speaking class or in the classroom	5 (15,6%)	27 (84,4%)	0	0
3	I am able to ask the question with needs analysis to answer it	1 (3,1%)	26 (81,3%)	5 (15,6%)	0
4	I am able to correlate my answer or my statement with the experience, my knowledge and theories (if possible)	5 (15,6%)	23 (71,9%)	4 (12,5%)	0
5	I am able to speak clearly or with detail explanation or description	3 (9,4%)	22 (68,8%)	8 (25%)	0
6	I am able to speak logically	2 (6,3%)	26 (81,3%)	7 (21,9%)	0
7	I am able to do documentation to my speaking or other people's talk by recording, making video or note taking	5 (15,6%)	22 (68,8%)	5 (15,6%)	0
Analyzing (C4)	Mean score	14,58%	89,1%	15,1%	0%
8	I am able to conclude what is my friend or my lecturer	2 (6,3%)	30 (93,8%)	0	0

talking about in the classroom					
9	I am able to decide the right answer from my lecturer or friends' question	1 (3,1%)	25 (78,1%)	5 (15,6%)	1 (3,1%)
10	The lecturer gives me direction or instruction, so I can conclude the lesson	5 (15,6%)	26 (81,3%)	1 (3,1%)	0
11	I will ask the lecturer if there is something that I do not understand	3 (9,4%)	24 (75%)	5 (15,6%)	0
12	I will relate the topic or material that I know and the material that I have just learned	1 (3,1%)	28 (87,5%)	3 (9,4%)	0
13	I am able to speak something with proof or good argument	2 (6,3%)	24 (75%)	7 (21,9%)	0
Evaluating (C5)	Mean score	7,3%	81,78%	10,93%	0,51%
14	I am able to answer the questions asked by the lecturer based on my perspective	2 (6,3%)	28 (87,5%)	2 (6,3%)	0
15	I am able to provide or express my own opinion in speaking or during discussion	0	28 (87,5%)	4 (12,5%)	0
16	I am able to provide critics and suggestion in discussion or during the lesson	2 (6,3%)	22 (68,8%)	7 (21,9%)	1 (3,1%)
17	I am able to correct if my friend is wrong in speaking	2 (6,3%)	19 (59,4%)	10 (31,3%)	1 (3,1%)
18	I am able to conclude the lesson based my own perspective	1 (3,1%)	30 (93,8%)	1 (3,1%)	0
19	The lecturer gives me a chance to express my opinion in speaking class	3 (9,4%)	29 (90,6%)	0	0
Creating (C6)	Mean Score	5,23%	66,63%	12,51%	1,03%
Total Mean Scores		7,9%	79,62%	12,17%	0,48%

Table 2 shows that aspects of HOTS have been divided into three parts namely Analyzing (C4), Evaluating (C5), and Creating (C6). The first, C4 covers statements 1 until 7. The percentage of mean scores are 14,58 % strongly agree, 89,1% agree, 15,1 % disagree and 0% strongly disagree. It means that 89, 1% and 14, 58% showed positive responses on HOTS implementation. The second, C5 consists of statements 8 until 13. Its percentage shows that 7, 3% strongly agree, 81, 78% agree, 10, 93% disagree, and 0.51% strongly disagree. It indicates that majority students could apply C5 more than 70%. Even though, there are 10, 93% disagree and 0.51% strongly disagree, but it is under 11%. The third, C6 comprises statement 14 until 19. It is obtained that 5, 23% strongly agree, 66, 63% agree, 12, 51% disagree, and 1.03% strongly disagree. In C6, the percentage is lower than C4 and C6, it may cause the level of difficulty is higher than C4 and C5. Those mean scores percentages indicate that C4 percentage for strongly agree and agree for students' perception towards HOTS implementation in speaking class is higher than C5 and C6. Furthermore, in more details, in C4, some

students chose disagree for item 5 about 25% and 6 about 21, 9%. Even though, it is not more than 50%, but it must be noticed by the lecturer. In item 5 and 6, several students could not speak logically and with detail description. In C5, some students opted disagree for item 9 (15.6%) because some students could not be able to give the right answer from lecturer or friends' question. In C6, several students chose disagree for item 16 about 21.9% and 17 about 31.3%. These are because some students cannot provide critics and suggestion during discussion. Moreover, three students chose strongly disagree for item 9 (*I am able to decide the right answer from my lecturer or friends' question*), 16 (*I am able to provide critics and suggestion in discussion or during the lesson*), and 17 (*I am able to correct if my friend is wrong in speaking*). It shows that they could not reach those levels.

All in all, the mean scores percentage of students' perceptions towards HOTS were dominated by agree and strongly agree namely 7.9% and 79, 62%, while disagree and strongly disagree were 12, 7% and 0, 48%. This indicates that students had positive and negative perception on implementing HOTS in speaking class. However, positive perceptions were more dominant than negative perceptions.

Students' Problems in Implementing HOTS in Speaking Class

Students' problems in implementing HOTS can be seen from questionnaire result and interview result. Referring to questionnaire result, three students got problems for applying HOTS in evaluating (C5) and (C6). It can be seen in statement 9 for C5, "*I am able to decide the right answer from my lecturer or friends' question*". It shows that student cannot give the right answer or good answer from the questions of another student and lecturer. Moreover, statement 16 for C6, "*I am able to provide critics and suggestion in discussion or during the lesson*". In this case, student cannot do critics and suggestion during discussion in the classroom. In statement 17 for C6, "*I am able to correct if my friend is wrong in speaking*". It means that student could not give feedback to another friend if his or her friend did mistakes in speaking English.

Based on the interview results, several students had problems in implementing HOTS in speaking class. Those problems were poor argument, lack of vocabulary and grammar, lack of knowledge about the material, nervous and not know what to ask. The first, poor argument means that some students were difficult to express their ideas because they do not have evidence and supporting theory. It is proved by "*My problem is to facilitate my statement with supportive reason and evidence, I can't express my argument clearly when I try to speak my own perspective*". The second, some students were hard to ask and answer the question because they do not have enough background knowledge, and inadequate vocabulary and grammar knowledge. As some students said, "*sometimes I have a problem to deliver my idea if I don't have a background knowledge of the topic, sometimes I have a problem to deliver my idea if I don't have a background knowledge of the topic, less vocabulary and grammar* ". Yes, it happens if I don't learn more about the materials before. The third, the problem was about psychological factor. It includes mood, anxiety or nervous. Students could not implement HOTS in speaking class when their mood is not good and they feel nervous or anxiety in speaking. As several students stated. "*I cannot implement it when my mood is not really good, sometimes, and it is due to my low self-esteem so that i feel nervous whenever i want to start to speak in front of many people, and it makes my mind go blank, I am nervous*".

In short, the problems still occurred in speaking class when applying higher order thinking in speaking class, even though several students did not have problems on it.

4. Discussion

Students had implemented Higher Order Thinking Skill in speaking class. Students had applied analyzing (C4), evaluating (C5), and creating (C6). Referring to the results of this study, majority students used C4 in speaking class. It indicates that students like analyzing something when speaking. Moreover, creating (C6) is the minority one. Students were seldom to apply it because they think that it is hard for them. Overall, most of students had positive perceptions on implementing HOTS in speaking class. This finding is in line with Junaeni (2020) who found that students had positive perspective on implementing HOTS in English class in senior high school. The different is only about the research site and focus. Students think that HOTS assisted them to learn critically, creatively and innovatively. They could train themselves to ask and speak with good analysis.

In detail, in analyzing (C4), students obtained 14.58% strongly agree, 89.1% agree, 15.1% disagree and 0% strongly disagree. Even though, some students got 0% strongly disagree, but several students opted 15.1% for disagree. It indicated that several students could not maximally apply C4 in speaking class. Item for C4 starts from Item 1 until item 7. Then, students only chose disagree for item 3,4,5,6 and 7. For item 1 and 2, some students chose strongly agree and agree because some students could compare one opinion to another opinion in speaking and analyze the meaning to what the lecturer has spoken in speaking class, as in item 1 (I am able to compare one's opinion with other's opinion in speaking class or during discussion) and 2 (I am able to analyze the meaning of what is my lecturer talking about in speaking class or in the classroom). However, for item 3,4,5,6 and 7, some students chose disagree because they could not do or implement it maximally. In brief, C4 is dominated positive perspective by students.

In evaluating (C5) part, students chose 7, 3% strongly agree, 81, 78% agree, 10, 93% disagree and 0, 51% strongly disagree. It is almost same as C4, there were more than 70% students could implement C5 as one of divisions in HOTS, but some students still could not do it during speaking class. Only item 8, all students opted agree and strongly agree, but item from 9 until 13, some students chose disagree and strongly disagree. It means that some students could not undertake the things under category of C5. Dominantly, some students could not decide the right answer from the lecturer or their friends' questions. Besides, some students did not ask the lecturer if they did not understand. They just kept silent. Then, some students could not speak with good argument, thus they were not self-confident to speak. It is proved by statements in item 9 (I am able to decide the right answer from my lecturer or friends' question), 11(I will ask the lecturer if there is something that I do not understand), and 13 (I am able to speak something with proof or good argument). Nevertheless, in this part, majority of students gave positive responses.

In creating (C6) part, students opted 5, 23% strongly agree, 66, 3% agree, 12, 51% disagree and 1, 03% strongly disagree. This indicated more than 60% students chose strongly agree and agree and it shows that most of students could implement C6 in speaking class. However, there were several students who choosing 21, 9% and 31, 3% disagree for item 16 (I am able to provide critics and suggestion in discussion or during the lesson) and 17 (I am able to correct if my friend is wrong in speaking). It is same as for strongly disagree, there were 2 students who opting it for item 16 and 17. It happened to those students because students were still not maximum in giving critics or suggestion during speaking class. Moreover, some students were not able to correct themselves and their friends if they did mistakes in speaking. In this C6, most of students still gave positive vibes on the implementation of HOTS, even though, several students gave negative perspective on it. Several studies had same findings in relation to the students' perception on the implementation of HOTS. They found that most of students had positive responses on the mastering of Higher Order Thinking Skills. It was proved by the mean score or mean value was 2.49 (Heong, Yunos, Osman, Sulong, Kiong, 2010). Moreover, Chorina (2021) also almost had similar finding with the current research namely all

students had good perception on HOTS, but they were difficult in implementing C6 or creating in HOTS in during learning English.

Moreover, in applying HOTS in speaking class, students faced several problems, such as poor argument, lack of vocabulary and grammar, lack of knowledge about the material, nervous and not know what to ask. Several students had poor argument because students they do not want to think critically. They were lazy to think hard. Besides, they do not have enough supporting idea and evidence, thus they were not easy to speak with good argument. The next problem is poor vocabulary and grammar. Several students were stuck to speak because they do not have adequate vocabulary. They also had lack of grammatical competence. Furthermore, they cannot ask or answer the question with HOTS because they do not have enough knowledge about the material. Therefore, they did not know what to ask. Nervous was also a problem for them. They cannot maximize in asking or answering the question during speaking because of it. In addition, referring to the result of questionnaire, there are 3 statements who categorized as strongly disagree. First, “I am able to decide the right answer from my lecturer or friends’ question”. It means that the student cannot answer the question from lecturer or friend during speaking class. The second, “I am able to provide critics and suggestion in discussion or during the lesson”. It means that student could not provide critics and suggestion during discussion. The last, “I am able to correct if my friend is wrong in speaking”. This statement means that student could provide the correct one when his or her friend did mistakes in speaking class. It is because they do not have enough knowledge. This finding is almost same as Syafryadin, Alamysah, Astrid, & Haryani (2021) who found that students had problems in implementing HOTS like lazy to ask, lack of knowledge skill, dominant to implement LOTS than HOTS and teacher was not maximum in applying HOTS.

In short, students had tried to implement HOTS in speaking class, even though there were several students could not maximize their abilities. The lecturer followed up the students who were still not optimum in using HOTS in speaking class. Thus, the problems could be minimized. Teachers trained students by stimulating them with giving question to those students gradually.

5. Conclusions

In conclusion, Higher Order Thinking Skill (HOTS) has important role in learning English for students because HOTS could stimulate their critical thinking. Students had learned about HOTS and implemented HOTS in learning speaking in the classroom. However, its implementation is not maximum because some students were still difficult to implement HOTS, especially for evaluating (C5) and creating (C6). For example, student could not be able to give critics and suggestion, and give the right answer with good argument. Even though, majority students had positive perceptions on HOTS implementation, the teacher should follow up the limitation of this research. As recommendation, the teacher must give extra time or lesson for students who cannot maximize in applying HOTS. It needs time to train students, thus they could implement C6 or creating in speaking class.

References

- Akatsuka, Y. (2019). Awareness of Critical Thinking Attitudes and English Language Skills: The Effects of Questions Involving Higher-order Thinking. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 23(1), 59–84. <https://doi.org/10.25256/paal.23.2.4>
- Brookhart, S. (2010). *How to Assess Higher-Order Thinking Skills in Your Classroom*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD

- Cesarandari, S., Aswandi., & Oikurema. (2019). Applying The Higher Order Thinking Skills (Hots) To Spoken Analytical Exposition In Oral Presentation Assessment. *International Conference on Bussiness*, 9(2), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.9790/1959-0902010105>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Method Approaches 4th Edition*. New York: SAGE Publication Inc.
- Chorina, G.V. (2021). The Correlation between students' perception and their levels of Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS) at SMAN 1 Palembang.
- Dinar V`incy Yunitaka Bahrudin, Moh., & Soheh, S. M. (2020). The Improvement of Students Speaking Skill by Using High Order Thinking Skills (HOTS) Method at MA. Al-Huda Sumber Nangka Desa Duko Timur Kecamatan Larangan Kabupaten Pamekasan. *SELL Journal*, 5(1), 47–57.
- Fraenkel, J R., Wallen, N.E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education 8th edition*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companiens Inc.
- Heong, Y.M., Yunos, J.B., Osman, N.B., Sulong, S.B., & Kiong, T.T. (2010). The perception of students' mastering the level of higher order thinking skills in technical education subjects. *REE & RHED*, 1-7
- Jusnaeni. (2020). Students' perception toward higher order thinking skills (hots) used by English teacher at SMA NEGERI 2 WAJO. Published Thesis. Makassar Muhammadiyah University.
- Miles, M.B., Huberman, A.M., Dan Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A Methods sourcebook*, Edition 3. USA: Sage Publications
- Pertiwi, D. R. (2019). HOTS based project in mechanical engineering department. *JELE (Journal of English Language and Education)*, 5(1), 45. <https://doi.org/10.26486/jele.v5i1.862>
- Ping, O.W., Ahmad, A., Adnan, M., & Hua, A.K. (2017). Effectiveness of higher order thinking skills (HOTS) based i-Think map concept towards primary students. *AIP Conference Proceeding*, 1847(1), 2. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4983886>.
- Pratama, G.S., & Retnawati, H. (2018). Urgency of Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS) Content Analysis in Mathematics Textbook. *IOP Conference Series: Journal of Physics*, 1097, 1-8. [Http://doi :10.1088/1742-6596/1097/1/012147](http://doi:10.1088/1742-6596/1097/1/012147)
- Riza, Z., & Setyarini, S. (2020). *EFL Flipped-Classroom: Promoting HOTS in Speaking Skill*. 430(Conaplin 2019), 251–255. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200406.051>
- Robbins. (2003). *Organizational Behavior* Prentice-Hall International Editions. Pretince Hall.
- Setiawan, R.S., Puspitasari, R.D., & Baptista., G. B. (2020). *Project-Based Learning: Terobosan Baru dalam Melatih HOTS pada Keterampilan Speaking Mahasiswa*, 5(November), 721–730.
- Setyarini, S., & Ling, M. (2019). Promoting Higher Order Thinking Skills in Storytelling for Teaching English to Young Adolescents in 21st Century. *KnE Social Sciences*, 3(10), 155. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v3i10.3897>
- Setyarini, S., Muslim, A. B., Rukmini, D., Yuliasri, I., & Mujianto, Y. (2018). Thinking critically while storytelling: Improving children's HOTS and English oral competence. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(1), 189–197. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v8i1.11480>
- Syafryadin, S., Harahap, A., Haryani, H., & Astrid, A. (2021). Boosting Classroom Interaction Based on Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS) in English Learning for Beginners. *International Journal*

of Language Education, 5(1), 477-489.

Uril, Bahruddin, Halomoan, M. M. S. (2020). Implementation of Hots in Debate Strategy To Improve the Ability of Speaking Arabic Among Students. *Solid State Technology*, 63(4), 816–826. <http://www.solid state technology.us/index.php/JSST/article/view/1322>

AUTHOR BIODATA

Syafryadin is a lecturer of the Postgraduate Program of English Education, Teacher Training and Education Faculty, University of Bengkulu. His research interests are teaching speaking, ICT in ELT and English language teaching.

Dian Eka Chandra Wardhana is a lecturer at the Postgraduate Program of Indonesian Education, Teacher and Training Faculty, University of Bengkulu, Indonesia. Her research interests are discourse teaching and Indonesian language teaching.

Noermanzah is a lecturer at the Postgraduate Program of Indonesian Education, Teacher and Training Faculty, University of Bengkulu, Indonesia. His research interests are discourse teaching, Indonesian teaching, and rhetoric in speech.

Agus Rofi'i is a lecturer in English Language Teaching at English Language Education Program of Faculty of Teacher and Training Education, Universitas Majalengka, Indonesia. His research interests are English language teaching.

Awalludin is a lecturer at the Study Program of Indonesian Language dan Literature Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Baturaja, Indonesia. His research interests are Indonesian teaching, literature teaching, Indonesian syntax, error analysis, and development of instructional materials.