

The policy to state HOTS in Basic Competence (KD) of 2013 English curriculum and English teachers' practice in developing achievement indicator

by Gusti Nur Hafifah

Submission date: 29-May-2023 02:40PM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 2104405137

File name: 2022_Purwati-Munir-Hafifah_The_policy_to_state_HOTS.pdf (734.47K)

Word count: 6319

Character count: 35869



The policy to state HOTS in Basic Competence (KD) of 2013 English curriculum and English teachers' practice in developing achievement indicator

Oikurema Purwati^{*},¹ Ahmad Munir¹ Gusti Nur Hafifah²

¹Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia, ²Universitas Muhammadiyah Surabaya, Indonesia

Higher order thinking skills (HOTS) are already a trend in the educational sector. The concepts of HOTS are applied as a policy in the competencies required in the 2013 English curriculum, as stated in the regulation of the Indonesian ministry of education number 22, 2016. The concepts of HOTS are applied in statements of basic competence known as KD (Kompetensi Dasar) in the syllabus, to make all of the processes of teaching and learning result in the student's ability to be able to think and practice higher-order thinking skills in their daily life. This study analyzes the basic competence and achievement indicator written on the lesson plans that are created by the English teachers who follow the national teacher professional development program PPG held by UNESA in 2021. HOTS can be considered a significant point in developing indicators (as the objective) of teaching and learning. The development of indicators should have been in line with the theory of HOTS referring to Bloom's taxonomy; analyzing, evaluating, and creating. However, there are a lot of English teachers who still get difficulties in developing appropriate teaching-learning indicators for fulfilling HOTS concepts. In national practice, the policy of implementing HOTS as the basic competencies may not be carried out fully by the Indonesian English teachers. It is highly recommended that the curriculum developers comprehend the concepts of curriculum and the language theories applied in a curriculum. There should be a strong connection between the policymakers with the practitioners in developing and applying the curriculum.

OPEN ACCESS

ISSN 2503 3492 (online)

*Correspondence:

Oikurema Purwati
pungki_unesa@yahoo.co.id

Received: 3rd March 2022

Accepted: 23th August 2022

Published: 17th September 2022

Citation:

Purwati, O., Munir, A., & Hafifah, G. N. (2022). The policy to state HOTS in Basic Competence (KD) of 2013 English curriculum and English teachers' practice in developing indicator achievement. *J. Eng. Educ. Society*, 7:2. doi: [10.21070/jees.v7i2.1662](https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v7i2.1662)

Keywords: HOTS, basic competence (KD), curriculum, theory, policy, practice

INTRODUCTION

Educational practice cannot be separated from national policy. Therefore, the Indonesian government developed a curriculum that is concerning the abilities required in a global society in recent years. It is expected that the graduates have the competencies to mingle and compete in the global world. Since the curriculum is the art of philosophy of modern education, the curriculum applied in recent years carries out the important skills, HOTS. Implementing HOTS is crucial in recent years because the skills are considered to be significant skills in the 21st century. HOTS skills cover analyzing, evaluating, and creating whereas 21st-century skills integrate critical thinking, collaboration, communication, and creativity. Therefore, it can be stated that HOTS and the skills required for 21st-century education are intertwined ([Kohler, 2019](#); [Widodo, 2016](#)).

There is a trend to state HOTS as the objective of learning in many countries, previous study in China proves that the implementation of e-schoolbag has significantly endorsed the higher-order thinking skills of primary school students (Lie, 2007). Besides, it is beneficial to provide HOTS to the students because the implementation of HOTS is crucial to forming the characters of the global citizen with creative skills (Rachmawati et al., 2021). The Indonesian government also authorizes the execution of HOTS in the curriculum based on the ministry of education regulation (Permendikbud No. 20, 21, 22, Dan 23 Tahun 2016 Dan Permendikbud No.24 Tahun 2016, n.d.). Concerning the importance of HOTS, the Indonesian government, especially the ministry of education, thinks that there is a need to state the skills in basic competence (Kompetensi Dasar/KD) of the 2013 English Curriculum. By stating HOTS in KD 3 (cognitive domain) and KD 4 (psychomotor domain but known as the language skills) English teachers should develop competency achievement indicators (IPK) in a logical and coherent arrangement.

In the recent curriculum (2013 English Curriculum), the concepts of HOTS (analyzing, evaluating, and creating) were written in the 'basic competence' (Kompetensi Dasar or KD). However, 87% of English teachers get difficulties comprehending the 'KD' (Soenoewati, 2015). She continues by stating that the 'KD' is arranged not in good order based on Bloom's taxonomy. The cognitive domain of Bloom's taxonomy is arranged illogically, for example, KD 3 mentions 'to analyze' but KD 4 states 'to arrange/compose'. In this case that the arrangement of KD 3 and KD 4 is not following the good order of Bloom's taxonomy of the cognitive domain. In this case, the policy to implement HOTS in the educational field is not properly supported by the curriculum developer to write the competencies in good and logical order of higher order thinking cognitive domain.

The curriculum as a legal document should be followed by all educational practitioners, especially teachers. The teachers use the curriculum as a guideline in their activities and teaching-learning process. As it is known that the teachers should develop competency achievement indicators based on basic competence stated in the curriculum. Here, the teachers should apply HOTS while developing the competency achievement indicator as the objectives of their activities in the teaching-learning process. As a consequence, the English teacher should master or surmount the action verbs related to the higher order thinking in developing competency achievement indicators (Indikator Pencapaian Kompetensi/IPK). It is also widely acknowledged that all the activities during the teaching-learning process are carried out based on the competency achievement indicator (the objectives of the teaching and learning process). However, the illogical order of cognitive domain for 'KD 3 and KD 4' may make the English teachers get perplexed to develop the 'IPK' following the order of higher order thinking.

HOTS based on Bloom taxonomy

It is widely recognized that cognition and language development are interrelated in language

education (Ghonsooly & Showqi, 2012; Li et al., 2016; Rachmawati et al., 2021). Regarding the cognitive domain, the cognitive domain was defined and outlined in 1956 by Bloom, whose book has become the standard model for such taxonomies (Porter & Brown, 1997). These categories can help language teachers to think through what students should be able to do. The 1956 learning taxonomy developed by Alan Bloom was updated and improved by (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). There are six levels of cognitive ability. The first three levels—remembering, comprehending, and applying—are regarded as lower-order cognitive skills. Additionally, the three other skills—analyzing, assessing, and creating—are regarded as higher-order thinking abilities. The ability to retrieve specific knowledge from long-term memory is referred to as remembering. Understanding, which refers to the capacity to create concepts from verbal, writing, and visual communication, is the second degree of cognitive ability. The ability to implement or carry out a certain technique to overcome challenges and apply knowledge is thus described as applying. The fourth cognitive level is analysis, which is the capacity to dissect a problem into its component parts and make decisions.

2013 English Curriculum Policy and Its Practices

Curriculum developers place a great emphasis on all skills required by students (Cuoco et al., 2021a, Cuoco et al., 2021b; Dharma et al., 2018). Therefore, the English curriculum is developed to the requirements of the learners' need to be able to use the language in its various textual forms (Null, 2017). In designing a curriculum, curriculum developers should determine its goal (Kostka & Bunning, 2017). A continuum of regional, school-based, national, and worldwide frameworks is employed in curriculum design (Mickan & Wallace, 2019). Furthermore, the curriculum can be used as a starting point for raising a country's educational standards. (Indriyanto, 2012). The curriculum developers should also foster students' success in the future (Guardado & Light, 2020). In addition, education authorities and practitioners should reflect on their policy and practice in language education to face the current challenges of the educational system (Beacco et al., 2016). The difficulty of developing a curriculum has prompted a reconsideration of its role in English education. (Graves & Lopriore, 2009). Moreover, in designing a curriculum, theory, and practice regarding what curriculum today should be taken into consideration (Moore, 2012). In summary, teaching practices are ideally based on the curriculum set by the developers or policymakers to accomplish the general aims of education. Hence, Curriculum developers must also consider the needs and situation analysis of the education aspects like teachers' quality, learners' competence, learning facilities, and the challenges that might occur at schools.

Basic Competence (Kompetensi Dasar/KD) and its development to be the achievement indicator aims and objectives should be determined by curriculum developers because they refer to the knowledge, skills, and values required by learners. The nature of goals in educational program design has sparked significant controversy and debate in the curriculum literature (Richards, 2001). Here,

English teachers are expected to write lesson plans based on the outcomes of policy documents. Teachers will obtain the statement of competencies as the standard to be achieved in the lesson from a policy document or curriculum (Setyono, 2016). Setyono (2016) continues that teachers struggle with breaking down basic competence into indicators and developing learning objectives. As it is also known that basic competence may be regarded as learning outcomes that teachers can develop as learning indicators as the basis to do teaching-learning activities. It can be seen that basic competence in the 2013 Curriculum states HOTS. As a result, the teachers should be able to develop learning indicator achievement using observable and measurable (action) verbs suggested in the classification of Bloom's taxonomy cognitive domain (see Appendix 2).

The basic competence in the 2013 English Curriculum is classified into two types KD 3 (knowledge/cognitive competence) and KD 4 (skill/psychomotor competence). In practice, there is an agreement that the lesson plan developed should cover KD 3 and KD 4. It also happens to the teaching-learning process which is suggested to implement KD 3 and KD 4. KD 3 is considered a lower-order thinking skill in which the learners should identify and comprehend the concepts of certain texts. While KD 4 is regarded as the ability to use the texts in daily communication. Therefore, it is usual that in KD 3, the action verb used is to identify while in KD 4, the action verb used is to compose or arrange the texts in spoken and written form. In addition, KD 4 can be recognized as a higher-order thinking skill. As a consequence, the English teacher should develop the competency achievement indicator following the order from KD 3 to KD 4, from low order thinking to higher order thinking.

METHODS

This study employed a qualitative content analysis technique to analyze the basic competence and achievement indicator known as learning objectives related to the domain of cognitive level of Bloom's taxonomy of higher order thinking skills (analyzing, evaluating, and creating). Lesson plan written by the English teachers who follow the national program, Teacher Professional Program (Program Profesi Guru/PPG) held by UNESA in 2021. The teachers come from all over Indonesia. The lesson plans studied are written by English teachers from East Java, West Java, and Jakarta. This study focuses on the indicator achievement written by the teachers. The content analyzed for this study is basic competence (Kompetensi Dasar/KD) which represents HOTS and indicator achievement as considered teaching-learning objectives developed by English teachers in their lesson plan.

Objects for the analysis

The lesson plan was written by English teachers who followed the Teachers Professional Program (PPG) in the year 2021. The lesson plans selected for this study were written by English teachers from East Java, West Java, and

Jakarta. The lesson plans selected represented HOTS in basic competence (Kompetensi Dasar/KD). The lesson plans were selected to cover all levels of high school, junior high school (grade VIII), senior high school (grade XII), and vocational school (grade X). The basic competencies developed include KD.3.5 & 4.5 for grade VIII, KD 3.1 & 4.2.1 for grade XII and KD 3.5 and 4.5 for grade X. Lesson plan written by English teachers from Jakarta (Junior High School case), West Java (Senior High School case) and East Java (Vocational School case).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Case for Junior High School Grade VIII

The basic competencies shown for Grade VIII consist of 13 competencies (Appendix 1). The English teacher wrote the lesson plan based on basic competence 3.5 and 4.5 which states that the students will be able to compare social communicative function, generic structure of the text, and linguistic features of some special texts in the form of greeting cards to give and ask information concerning special days following the context of its use (3.5), while for the basic competence no 4.5 which states to arrange/compose/set up special texts in the form a greeting card (correctly and properly with the context), very short and simple related to special days and pay attention to the social function of the text, generic structure and linguistic features of the text.

Analyzing the basic competence above, it can be considered that the cognitive competence required to compare is quite ambiguous. The word compare may belong to the understanding cognitive domain or evaluating cognitive domain. The definitions of the word 'compare' according to revised Bloom's taxonomy action verbs are 'demonstrate understanding of facts and ideas by organizing, comparing, translating, interpreting, giving descriptions, and giving main ideas' ('understanding cognitive domain') and 'present and defend opinions by making judgments about information, the validity of ideas, or quality of work based on a set of criteria. Judging from the definition given, it can be traced that the outcome of this basic competence is the ability to evaluate the cognitive domain. However, the following basic competence to arrange or set up may belong to the understanding cognitive domain. In this case, it seems that there is a lack of coherence. Instead, the arrangement of basic competence does not begin with something less difficult to something difficult. There is a declining ability from evaluating to understanding.

Studying the achievement indicator written by the teachers which state 'to identify', 'to classify', 'to determine', 'to arrange a text', and 'to present'. Here, it can be found that there is no coherency of the ability. The indicators are started with identifying and classifying, but it declines to determine which means to name which belongs to the remembering cognitive domain. While the teaching-learning process will be ended by giving a presentation of the text which has been arranged/set up in the previous

activity. There is an illogical order of thinking presented in the competency achievement indicators written by the teacher. The study finding supports the previous study that teachers still encounter problems in developing HOT indicators and basic competence in a lesson plan (Indriyana & Kuswando, 2019; Sukmawijaya et al., 2020; Yunita et al., 2020).

The Case of Senior High School Grade XII

The case of grade XII basic competence is similar to the case of grade VIII, whereas the basic competence of no 3.1 is caption text (the students will be able to compare social communicative function, generic structure of the text, and linguistic features some special texts in the form of a caption to give and ask information concerning pictures /photo/graph/table following the context of its use). The basic competence for KD 4 (4.2.1) is to comprehend text contextually concerning the social function of the text, generic structure, and linguistic features of special text caption related to picture/photo/table/graph/chart by the context of its use. The basic competence selected here is no 3.1 'to compare' which has two definitions based on In accordance with Bloom's definition, students should "show understanding of facts and ideas by arranging, comparing, translating, interpreting, giving descriptions, and articulating important concepts." Present and defend beliefs by making judgments about facts, the validity of ideas, or quality of work based on a set of standards' ('understanding cognitive domain'). Judging from the definition given, it can be traced that the outcome of this basic competence is the ability to evaluate the cognitive domain).

While for the basic competence 4.2.1 is 'to comprehend the text contextually concerning the social function of the text, the generic structure of the text, and the linguistic features of the text in the form of special text, a caption for picture/photo/table/chart/graph. Evaluating the coherence of the basic competence from cognitive (KD 3) to basic competence (KD) 4, there is a decline in the cognitive domain. If the verb 'compare' belong to the cognitive domain 'evaluating', the following cognitive domain should be the 'creating' cognitive domain. The basic competence stated in KD 3 and KD 4 seems illogically arranged. Soenoewati (2015) findings that teachers complicate the formulation of KD that reflects their incapability to understand and develop the appropriate achievement indicators that accommodate HOT skills in basic competencies.

The indicator achievement was written by the teacher from West Java and also shows lower order thinking cognitive domain, although the last indicator achievement uses the action verb evaluating. The indicator achievement is started with the action verb 'to identify', followed by 'to classify', then 'to determine'. For basis competence 4, the teacher used action verbs 'to detect', 'to develop', and 'to evaluate. The competency achievement indicators written by the teacher seem to be logically developed although the basic competence stated in the curriculum is not arranged in good order based on Bloom's taxonomy (Anderson et al.,

2001; Sholikah et al., 2021; Wilson, 2013). It can be acknowledged that the teacher followed the logical order of the cognitive domain of Bloom's taxonomy and comprehend that different action verbs should be used in formulating the achievement indicator to reflect students' lower-order or higher-order thinking skills.

The Case for Vocational School Grade X

The syllabus for vocational is different from general high school. The English syllabus for vocational schools seems to be modified to be relevant to the need and the situation at vocational schools. The basic competence for a cognitive domain, no 3.5 is 'to analyze the social function of the text, the generic structure of the text and linguistic features some special texts in the form of announcement, giving and asking information concerning activities at school or workplace which is following the context of its use'. The basic competence of KD 4.5 is to 'arrange special text in the form of announcement, spoken or written, short and simple by paying attention to the social function of the text, the generic structure of the text and the linguistic features correctly and relevant to the context of its use'. The basic competencies stated in the syllabus show the declining ability related to the cognitive domain, from analyzing to applying. As it is known that in the process of teaching-learning, philosophically teaching something simple to something complicated.

The English teacher from East Java develop the indicator achievement for basic competence cognitive domain as follow, 'to ask generic structure of announcement relevant to the context of its use', 'to arrange the generic structure and expression about announcement related to its contextual use', 'to divide the students to make expression about announcement relate to the context', 'to make the generic structure from a various expression of announcement related to the contextual use'. While for the basic competence (KD 4), the teacher developed competency achievement indicators as follows, 'to present either in spoken or written mode' and 'evaluating the presentation'. The coherence of the cognitive order is questioning, not linear from remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating. If the basic competence starts with analyzing, it should be followed by evaluating and creating. Therefore, the order of KD 3 and KD 4 does not follow the proper order of Bloom's taxonomy. In addition, it seems that the teacher would teach the text indiscreetly.

Lic, 2007 claims that despite many years of formal English education, the results were unsatisfactory. Very few high school graduates are able to speak English clearly. Additionally, a lot of English teachers in Indonesia are not native speakers of the language they are instructing. Students were taught specific language abilities, such as grammar or vocabulary, rather than how to utilize English in context for everyday communication. Furthermore, she also mentions that the educational practitioners do not reflect the ideals of the curriculum concerning the development of basic competencies based on HOTS. In practice, English teachers still get difficulties developing basic competencies stated in

the curriculum into indicator achievement (Soenoewati, 2015). The process of disseminating the new curriculum should be carried out seriously so that the confusion about the concepts of the curriculum can be minimized. The 2013 Curriculum has been implemented for almost 7 years, but many English teachers do not know the linguistic concept underlying the basic competencies and also the teaching-learning materials. Therefore, the teachers and also the students do not get the gist of the curriculum as so many teachers still teach English discreetly. Therefore, teachers as the key curriculum implementers should change their perspective on the changing teaching-learning strategy (Nurhattati et al., 2020).

In developing the basic competencies as the indicators of curriculum goals and objectives, it is really important to follow Bloom's taxonomy correctly, so that there will no confusion in arranging the basic competence as the basis in doing the teaching-learning process. It can be seen in the basic competencies stated in the curriculum seems that the basic competencies are not arranged following the theoretical framework of Bloom's taxonomy. The basic competencies stated in the curriculum do not follow the correct order of cognitive domain, from lower order thinking to higher order thinking. Therefore, it is very significant for curriculum developers and curriculum practitioners to have a proper understanding of how to develop basic competencies following Bloom's taxonomy. As a legal document, the curriculum should be developed to meet the need of the learners and also society's demands. As it can be seen that basic competence is the main focus in designing the teaching-learning process.

To keep up with developments happening in the world in all areas, the curriculum has remained open to improvement. (Kaya & Ok, 2016). A curriculum's primary objective is to assist everyone engaged in educational advancement in molding the personalities of the learners (Null, 2017). Null continues to state that curriculum is the heart of education. The curriculum has retained its institutional identity. Consequently, the curriculum should be redesigned (Madya, 2002). Improving the curriculum without improving the quality of the teachers will not be considered successful. It has been proven by the cases in which the teacher does not have enough knowledge to develop indicator achievement using Bloom's taxonomy cognitive domain. If the indicator achievement developed by teachers is not fulfilling the concepts appropriately, the teaching-learning process will not run effectively. As a result, if the objectives of the teaching and learning activities cannot be achieved, it will be a failure. As a fact, the students still have inadequate ability to use English for communication as required by the curriculum. Many curriculum experts contend that numerous factors must be considered in order to achieve desired results, including the adherence of curriculum practitioners to established standards. (Kaya & Ok, 2016). Therefore, the dissemination should be planned well and those who are involved in the dissemination program are the experts. As the consequence, in disseminating a new curriculum, not only education experts should participate, but also the

experts if the field of study should be involved. Any workshop or training held by the government or any educational institution should be well planned and given by a real speaker who masters the content of the curriculum.

CONCLUSION

In developing and applying a curriculum, there should be a strong connection between the policymakers with the practitioners. The dissemination of the curriculum should involve those experts in the theory and applying the curriculum. In addition, in developing a curriculum, it is significant to critically design it. As a legal document, the curriculum should be written in a logical order and concise, fulfilling the theories underlying its development, so that there will be no confusion among the curriculum practitioners. The practice of applying the curriculum, 2013 English Curriculum, is still not satisfying related to the teachers' ability in developing competency achievement indicators. This will be a failure in the field of teaching and learning English.

It is highly recommended that the curriculum developers should comprehend the concepts of the curriculum and the language theories applied in the curriculum. It cannot be neglected that the linguistics applied in the curriculum should be arranged following the theory of teaching-learning a language, especially English, and how assessment is conducted to measure the learners' ability in using the target language, English. The basic competence as the objectives of teaching and learning should be properly written following Bloom's taxonomy. In determining the basic competence as the standard to be achieved by English learners, it should be developed wisely following the level of Bloom's cognitive skills, especially in arranging from lower order thinking to higher order thinking.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work is supported by the fund given by the Post Graduate Program of Universitas Negeri Surabaya. Special gratitude to Ahmad Munir, Ph.D and Dr. Gusti Nur Hafifah.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, L. W., Krathwohl, D., Airasian, P., Cruikshank, K., Mayer, R., Pintrich, P., Raths, J., & Wittrock, M. (2001). Anderson and Krathwohl Bloom's Taxonomy Revised Understanding the New Version of Bloom's Taxonomy.
- Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (2001). *A Taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of educational objectives*. Allyn & Bacon. Pearson Education Group.
- Beacco, J.-C., Fleming, M., Goullier, F., Thürmann, E., & Vollmer, H. (2016). *A handbook for curriculum development and teacher training*.

- Cuoco, A., Goldenberg, E. P., & Mark, J. (2021a). Contemporary curriculum issues: Organizing a curriculum around Mathematical habits of mind. *The Mathematics Teacher*, 103(9), 682–688. <https://doi.org/10.5951/mt.103.9.0682>
- Cuoco, A., Goldenberg, E. P., & Mark, J. (2021b). Contemporary curriculum issues: Organizing a curriculum around Mathematical habits of mind. *The Mathematics Teacher*, 103(9), 682–688. <https://doi.org/10.5951/mt.103.9.0682>
- Dharma, Y. P., Joni, T., Aristo, V., Persada, S., & Sintang, K. (2018). An analysis of English textbook relevance to the 2013 English curriculum. *Journal of English Educational Study*, 1(1), 6611. <https://doi.org/10.31932/JEES.V1I1.277>
- Ghonsooly, B., & Showqi, S. (2012). The effects of foreign language learning on creativity. *English Language Teaching*, 5(4), 161–167. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n4p161>
- Graves, K., & Lopriore, L. (2009). *Developing a New Curriculum for School-Age Learners*. TESOL Language Curriculum Development Series. Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc. 1925 Ballenger Avenue Suite 550, Alexandria, VA 22314.
- Guardado, M., & Light, J. (2020). *Curriculum Development in English for Academic Purposes: A Guide to Practice*. Springer Nature.
- Indriyana, B. S., & Kuswandono, P. (2019). Developing Students Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS) in reading: English teachers strategies in selected Junior High Schools. *JET (Journal of English Teaching)*, 5(3), 204. <https://doi.org/10.33541/jet.v5i3.1313>
- Indriyanto, B. (2012). Pengembangan kurikulum sebagai intervensi kebijakan peningkatan mutu pendidikan. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Kebudayaan*, 18(4), 440. <https://doi.org/10.24832/jpnk.v18i4.100>
- Kaya, S., & Ok, A. (2016). The second grade English language curriculum: Theory-practice congruence. *Pegem Eğitim ve Öğretim Dergisi*, 6(4), 491–512. <https://doi.org/10.14527/pegegog.2016.024>
- Kohler, M. (2019). Language education policy in Indonesia: A struggle for unity in diversity. In *The Routledge international handbook of language education policy in Asia* (pp. 286–297). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315666235-20>
- Kostka, I., & Bunning, L. (2017). Curriculum design in English language teaching. TESOL Press. Available from: TESOL International Association. <http://www.tesol.org>.
- Li, H., Liu, J., Yang, X., Xiao, J., & Yang, G. (2016). An empirical study on developing higher-order thinking skills of primary students with e-schoolbag. Proceedings - 2016 International Symposium on Educational Technology, ISET 2016, 44–49. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISET.2016.26>
- Lie, A. (2007). Education policy and EFL curriculum in Indonesia: Between the commitment to competence and the quest for higher test scores. *TEFLIN Journal*, 18(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.15639/TEFLINJOURNAL.V18I1/1-15>
- Madya, S. (2002). Developing standards for EFL in Indonesia as part of the EFL teaching reform. *TEFLIN Journal*, 13(2), 142–151. <https://doi.org/10.15639/TEFLINJOURNAL.V13I2/142-151>
- Mickan, P., & Wallace, I. (2019). The routledge handbook of language education curriculum design. In *The Routledge Handbook of Language Education Curriculum Design*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315661032>
- Moore, A. (2012). *Teaching and learning: Pedagogy, curriculum, and culture*. Taylor and Francis.
- Null, W. (2017). *Curriculum: From theory to practice (Second Edi)*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. www.rowman.com
- Nurhattati, Matin, Buchdadi, A. D., & Yusuf, C. F. (2020). Teacher certification in Indonesia: An education policy analysis. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(5), 1719–1730. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.080508>
- Permendikbud No. 20, 21, 22, dan 23 Tahun 2016 dan Permendikbud No.24 Tahun 2016. (n.d.). Retrieved August 18, 2022, from <http://20283530.siap-sekolah.com/2016/09/02/permendikbud-no-20-21-22-dan-23-tahun-2016/#.Yv4GoHZBw2w>
- Porter, P. A., & Brown, D. (1997). The elements of language curriculum: A systematic approach to program development. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(4), 814. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587769>
- Rachmawati, D. L., Purwati, O., Anam, S., & Setiawan, S. (2021). Between perception and practice: The emergency of encouraging EFL teachers to implant HOTS in their classrooms. *TESOL International Journal*, 16(4.4), 40–58.
- Richards, J. C. (2001). Curriculum development in language teaching. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511667220>
- Setyono, B. (2016). Providing variations of learning modalities to scaffold pre-service EFL teachers in designing lesson plan. *Prosiding Ictte Fkip Uns 2015*, 1(1), 336–343.
- Sholikah, E., Supriyadi, S., & Nuraeningsih, N. (2021). Relationship between Higher-order Thinking Skills (HOTS) and English achievement. *Prominent*, 4(1), 45–53. <https://doi.org/10.24176/pro.v4i1.5791>
- Soenowati, D. I. D. (2015). English core competencies, basic competencies, and assessment for junior high school in curriculum 2013; between facts and hopes. *Register Journal*, 8(2), 1. <https://doi.org/10.18326/rgt.v8i1.1-18>
- Sukmawijaya, A., Yunita, W., & Sofyan, D. (2020). Analyzing Higher Order Thinking Skills on the compulsory English textbook for tenth graders of Indonesian Senior High Schools. *JOALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics & Literature)*, 5(2), 137–148. <https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v5i2.10565>

- Widodo, H. P. (2016). Language policy in practice: Reframing the English language curriculum in the Indonesian secondary education sector. In *English language education policy in Asia* (pp. 127-151). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-22464-0_6
- Wilson, L. O. (2013). Understanding the new version of Bloom's Taxonomy. *The Second Principle*, 721(2001), 1–16.
- Yunita, W., Syahrial, & Hati, G. M. (2020). English teachers' knowledge on higher order thinking skills (HOTS). *ENGLISH REVIEW: Journal of English Education*, 9(1), 205–216. <https://doi.org/10.25134/ERJEE.V9I1.3800>

Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright © 2022 Oikurema Purwati, Ahmad Munir, Gusti Nur Hafifah. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Indicators made by the English teachers

Junior High School case (Grade VIII)

Kompetensi Dasar (Basic Competence)	Indikator Pencapaian Kompetensi (Achieving Indicator Competence)
<p>3.5. membandingkan fungsi sosial, struktur teks, dan unsur kebahasaan beberapa teks khusus dalam bentuk greeting card, dengan memberi dan meminta informasi terkait dengan hari-hari spesial, sesuai dengan konteks penggunaannya</p>	<p>1. mengidentifikasi aspek dan komponen dalam greeting card terkait dengan memberi dan meminta informasi dengan tepat</p> <p>2. mengklasifikasikan teks greeting card dengan mempertimbangkan body/isis dalam greeting card</p> <p>3. menentukan jenis-jenis greeting card terkait dengan hari-hari spesial dengan tepat</p>
<p>4.5. Menyusun teks khusus dalam bentuk greeting card, sangat pendek dan sederhana, terkait hari-hari spesial dengan memperhatikan fungsi sosial, struktur teks, dan unsur kebahasaan, secara benar dan sesuai konteks</p>	<p>1. membuat teks greeting card terkait dengan hari-hari spesial dengan tepat</p> <p>2. menampilkan hasil karya kelompok dan menempel hasil karya teks greeting card</p>

Senior High School case (Grade XII)

Kompetensi Dasar (Basic Competence)	Indikator Pencapaian Kompetensi (Achieving Indicator Competence)
<p>3.1. Membedakan fungsi sosial, struktur teks, dan unsur kebahasaan beberapa teks khusus dalam bentuk teks caption, dengan memberi dan meminta informasi terkait gambar/foto/tabel/grafik/bagan, sesuai dengan konteks penggunaannya</p>	<p>1. Siswa dapat mengidentifikasi fungsi dari teks caption</p> <p>2. Siswa dapat mengklasifikasikan struktur teks dan unsur kebahasaan dalam teks caption</p> <p>3. Siswa dapat menentukan jenis-jenis teks caption</p>
<p>4.2.1 menangkap makna secara kontekstual terkait fungsi sosial, struktur teks, dan unsur kebahasaan teks khusus dalam bentuk caption terkait gambar/foto/tabel/grafik/bagan</p>	<p>1. Siswa dapat mendeteksi informasi yang hilang dalam caption teks</p> <p>2. Siswa dapat mengembangkan teks caption</p> <p>3. Siswa dapat mengevaluasi teks caption</p>

Vocational School Case (Grade X)

Kompetensi Dasar (Basic Competence)	Indikator Pencapaian Kompetensi (Achieving Indicator Competence)
<p>3.5. Menganalisis fungsi sosial, struktur teks, dan unsur kebahasaan beberapa teks khusus dalam bentuk pemberitahuan (announcement), dengan memberi dan meminta informasi terkait kegiatan sekolah/tempat kerja, sesuai dengan konteks penggunaannya</p>	<p>1. Menanyakan struktur teks mengenai pemberitahuan (announcement) sesuai dengan konteks penggunaannya</p> <p>2. Menyusun struktur teks dan berbagai ungkapan mengenai pemberitahuan (announcement) sesuai dengan konteks penggunaannya</p> <p>3. Membagi peserta didik membuat teks ungkapan mengenai pemberitahuan (announcement) sesuai dengan konteks penggunaannya</p> <p>4. Membuat struktur teks dari berbagai ungkapan mengenai pemberitahuan (announcement) sesuai dengan konteks penggunaannya</p>
<p>4.5. Menyusun teks khusus dalam bentuk pemberitahuan (announcement), lisan dan tulis, pendek dan sederhana dengan memperhatikan fungsi sosial, struktur teks, dan unsur kebahasaan, secara benar dan sesuai konteks</p>	<p>1. Mempresentasikan secara lisan dan tertulis pemberitahuan (announcement) dengan menggunakan struktur teks dan unsur bahasa yang tepat sesuai dengan konteks penggunaan</p> <p>2. Memberikan penilaian terhadap teman yang mempresentasikan teks (announcement) dengan konteks penggunaan</p>

Appendix 2. Revised Bloom's Taxonomy Action Verbs

A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing. (Anderson, L.W., & Krathwol, D.R. 2001)

Definitions	I. Remembering	II. Understanding	III. Applying	IV. Analyzing	V. Evaluating	VI. Creating
Bloom's Definition	Exhibit memory of previously learned material by calling facts, terms, basic concepts, and answers	Demonstrate understanding of facts and ideas by organizing, comparing, translating, interpreting, giving descriptions, and stating main ideas	Solve problems in new situations by applying acquired knowledge, facts, techniques, and rules in a different way	Examine and break information into parts by identifying motives or causes. Make inferences and find evidence to support generalizations	Present and defend opinions by making judgments about information, the validity of ideas, or the quality of work based on a set of criteria	Compile information together in a different way by combining elements in a new pattern or proposing alternative solutions
Verbs	Choose Define Find How Label List Match Name Omit Recall Relate Select Show Spell Tell What When Where Which Who Why	Classifying Compare Contrast Demonstrate Explaining Extend Illustrate Infer Interpret Outline Relate Rephrase Show Summarize Translate	Apply Build Choose Construct Develop Experiment with Identify Interview Make use of Model Organize Plan Select Solve Utilize	Analyze Assume Categorize Classify Compare Conclusion Contrast Discover Dissect Distinguish Divide Examine Function Inference Inspect List Motive Relationship Simplify Survey Take part in Test for Theme	Agree Appraise Assess Award Choose Compare Conclude Criteria Criticize Decide Deduct Defend Determine Disprove Estimate Evaluate Explain Importance Influence Interpret Judge Justify Mark Measure Opinion Perceive Prioritize Prove Rate Recommend Rule on Select Support Value	Adapt Build Change Choose Combine Compile Compose Construct Create Delete Design Develop Discuss Elaborate Estimate Formulate Happen Imagine Improve Invent Makeup Maximize Minimize Modify Original Originate Plan Predict Propose Solution Solve Suppose Test Theory

The policy to state HOTS in Basic Competence (KD) of 2013 English curriculum and English teachers' practice in developing achievement indicator

ORIGINALITY REPORT

13%

SIMILARITY INDEX

%

INTERNET SOURCES

8%

PUBLICATIONS

12%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	Submitted to Farmington High School Student Paper	2%
2	Submitted to Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar Student Paper	2%
3	Submitted to IAIN Tulungagung Student Paper	2%
4	Submitted to UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung Student Paper	1%
5	Submitted to Ivy Tech Community College Central Office Student Paper	1%
6	Submitted to Universitas Muria Kudus Student Paper	1%
7	Submitted to Capital Education Student Paper	1%

8	Submitted to Universitas Muhammadiyah Sumatera Utara Student Paper	1 %
9	Devinta Puspita Ratri, Peptia Asrining Tyas. "Review Locally Tailored ELT Textbooks to Meet Primary Students' Need: Textbooks Development", JEES (Journal of English Educators Society), 2022 Publication	1 %
10	Submitted to Victoria University Student Paper	<1 %
11	Epimaque Niyibizi, Emmanuel Sibomana, Cyprien Niyomugabo, Béatrice Yanzigiye, Amini Ngabonziza Jean de Dieu, Juliet Perumal. "Assessment in a Rwandan higher education institution: a quest for aligned assessment to promote socio-economic transformation", Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 2018 Publication	<1 %
12	Submitted to Universitas Islam Indonesia Student Paper	<1 %
13	Submitted to University of Bridgeport Student Paper	<1 %
14	Submitted to American Sentinel University Student Paper	<1 %

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches < 20 words

Exclude bibliography On